See a Social Security Number? Say Something!
Report Privacy Problems to https://public.resource.org/privacy
Or call the IRS Identity Theft Hotline at 1-800-908-4490

efile GRAPHIC print - DO NOT PROCESS | As Filed Data - | DLN: 93493045016041

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 black lung benefit trust or private foundation)

▶ The organization may have to use a copy of this return to satisfy state reporting requirements

OMB No 1545-0047

2009

Open to Public Inspection

A For the 2009 calendar year, or tax year beginning 07-01-2009 and ending 06-30-2010

B Check if applicable
- ☐ Address change
- ☐ Name change
- ☐ Initial return
- ☐ Terminated
- ☐ Amended return
- ☐ Application pending

Please use IRS label or print or type. See Specific Instructions.

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

City or town, state or country, and ZIP + 4
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

D Employer identification number
52-1744337

E Telephone number
(703) 682-9320

G Gross receipts $ 13,515,699

F Name and address of principal officer
WILLIAM H MELLOR
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

H(a) Is this a group return for affiliates? ☐ Yes ☑ No

H(b) Are all affiliates included? ☐ Yes ☐ No
If "No," attach a list (see instructions)

H(c) Group exemption number ▶

I Tax-exempt status ☑ 501(c) (3) ◀ (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 ▶ ☐ 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	9
5	Total number of employees (Part V, line 2a)	5	89
6	Total number of volunteers (estimate if necessary)	6	25
7a	Total gross unrelated business revenue from Part VIII, column (C), line 12	7a	0
b	Net unrelated business taxable income from Form 990-T, line 34	7b	0

		Prior Year	Current Year
Revenue 8	Contributions and grants (Part VIII, line 1h)	15,666,509	12,109,095
9	Program service revenue (Part VIII, line 2g)	716,558	820,003
10	Investment income (Part VIII, column (A), lines 3, 4, and 7d)	-6,190,699	49,786
11	Other revenue (Part VIII, column (A), lines 5, 6d, 8c, 9c, 10c, and 11e)	-29,170	-22,352
12	Total revenue—add lines 8 through 11 (must equal Part VIII, column (A), line 12)	10,163,198	12,956,532
Expenses 13	Grants and similar amounts paid (Part IX, column (A), lines 1–3)		0
14	Benefits paid to or for members (Part IX, column (A), line 4)		0
15	Salaries, other compensation, employee benefits (Part IX, column (A), lines 5–10)	6,099,486	6,100,673
16a	Professional fundraising fees (Part IX, column (A), line 11e)	13,419	14,406
b	Total fundraising expenses (Part IX, column (D), line 25) ▶ 857,851		
17	Other expenses (Part IX, column (A), lines 11a–11d, 11f–24f)	3,393,814	3,191,321
18	Total expenses Add lines 13–17 (must equal Part IX, column (A), line 25)	9,506,719	9,306,400
19	Revenue less expenses Subtract line 18 from line 12	656,479	3,650,132

		Beginning of Current Year	End of Year
Net Assets or Fund Balances 20	Total assets (Part X, line 16)	17,239,536	20,942,921
21	Total liabilities (Part X, line 26)	502,043	527,371
22	Net assets or fund balances Subtract line 21 from line 20	16,737,493	20,415,550

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

****** | 2011-02-11
Signature of officer | Date

WILLIAM H MELLOR PRESIDENT
Type or print name and title

Paid Preparer's Use Only

Preparer's signature: JENNY E HERRERA CPA | Date | Check if self-empolyed ☐ | Preparer's identifying number (see instructions)

Firm's name (or yours if self-employed), address, and ZIP + 4: RUBINO & MCGEEHIN CHARTERED
6903 ROCKLEDGE DRIVE SUITE 1200
BETHESDA, MD 20817

EIN ▶

Phone no ▶ (301) 564-3636

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

Part III Statement of Program Service Accomplishments

1 Briefly describe the organization's mission

THROUGH STRATEGIC LITIGATION, TRAINING, COMMUNICATION, ACTIVISM AND RESEARCH, THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE 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, SCHOOL 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

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 exempt purpose achievements for each of the organization's three largest program services by expenses Section 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) organizations and section 4947(a)(1) trusts 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 $ 7,545,759 including grants of $) (Revenue $ 820,003)

TO PROTECT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF AMERICANS THROUGH LITIGATION, EDUCATE THE PUBLIC ABOUT ISSUES VITAL TO LIBERTY THROUGH MEDIA RELATIONS AND OUTREACH EVENTS, TRAIN LAWYERS AND STUDENTS TO PRESERVE CIVIL LIBERTIES

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** ▶ $ 7,545,759

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*	1	Yes	
2	Is the organization required to complete Schedule B, Schedule of Contributors?	2	Yes	
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*	3		No
4	**Section 501(c)(3) organizations.** Did the organization engage in lobbying activities? *If "Yes," complete Schedule C, Part II*	4	Yes	
5	**Section 501(c)(4), 501(c)(5), and 501(c)(6) organizations.** Is the organization subject to the section 6033(e) notice and reporting requirement and proxy tax? *If "Yes," complete Schedule C, Part III*	5		
6	Did the organization maintain any donor advised funds or any similar funds or accounts where 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*	6		No
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*	7		No
8	Did the organization maintain collections of works of art, historical treasures, or other similar assets? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part III*	8		No
9	Did the organization report an amount in Part X, line 21, 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*	9		No
10	Did the organization, directly or through a related organization, hold assets in term, permanent,or quasi-endowments? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part V*	10		No
11	Is the organization's answer to any of the following questions "Yes"? *If so,complete Schedule D, Parts VI, VII, VIII, IX, or X as applicable.*	11	Yes	
	● Did the organization report an amount for land, buildings, and equipment in Part X, line10? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part VI.*			
	● 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.*			
	● 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.*			
	● 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.*			
	● Did the organization report an amount for other liabilities in Part X, line 25? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part X.*			
	● 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? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part X.*			
12	Did the organization obtain separate, independent audited financial statements for the tax year? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Parts XI, XII, and XIII*	12	Yes	
12A	Was the organization included in consolidated, independent audited financial statements for the tax year? **Yes** / **No** *If "Yes," completing Schedule D, Parts XI, XII, and XIII is optional* — **12A** No			
13	Is the organization a school described in section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii)? *If "Yes," complete Schedule E*	13		No
14a	Did the organization maintain an office, employees, or agents outside of the United States?	14a		No
b	Did the organization have aggregate revenues or expenses of more than $10,000 from grantmaking, fundraising, business, and program service activities outside the United States? *If "Yes," complete Schedule F, Part I*	14b		No
15	Did the organization report on Part IX, column (A), line 3, more than $5,000 of grants or assistance to any organization or entity located outside the U S ? *If "Yes," complete Schedule F, Part II*	15		No
16	Did the organization report on Part IX, column (A), line 3, more than $5,000 of aggregate grants or assistance to individuals located outside the U S ? *If "Yes," complete Schedule F, Part III*	16		No
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*	17		No
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*	18		No
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*	19		No
20	Did the organization operate one or more hospitals? *If "Yes," complete Schedule H*	20		No

Part IV Checklist of Required Schedules *(continued)*

21	Did the organization report more than $5,000 of grants and other assistance to governments and organizations in the United States on Part IX, column (A), line 1? *If "Yes," complete Schedule I, Parts I and II*	**21**		No
22	Did the organization report more than $5,000 of grants and other assistance to individuals in the United States on Part IX, column (A), line 2? *If "Yes," complete Schedule I, Parts I and III*	**22**		No
23	Did the organization answer "Yes" to Part VII, Section A, questions 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*	**23**	Yes	
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 questions 24b–24d and complete Schedule K. If "No," go to line 25*	**24a**		No
b	Did the organization invest any proceeds of tax-exempt bonds beyond a temporary period exception?	**24b**		
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?	**24c**		
d	Did the organization act as an "on behalf of" issuer for bonds outstanding at any time during the year?	**24d**		
25a	**Section 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) organizations.** Did the organization engage in an excess benefit transaction with a disqualified person during the year? *If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part I*	**25a**		No
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*	**25b**		No
26	Was a loan to or by a current or former officer, director, trustee, key employee, highly compensated employee, or disqualified person outstanding as of the end of the organization's tax year? *If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part II*	**26**		No
27	Did the organization provide a grant or other assistance to an officer, director, trustee, key employee, substantial contributor, or a grant selection committee member, or to a person related to such an individual? *If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part III*	**27**		No
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*	**28a**		No
b	A family member of a current or former officer, director, trustee, or key employee? *If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part IV*	**28b**	Yes	
c	An entity of which a current or former officer, director, trustee, or key employee of the organization (or a family member) was an officer, director, trustee, or owner? *If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part IV*	**28c**		No
29	Did the organization receive more than $25,000 in non-cash contributions? *If "Yes," complete Schedule M*	**29**	Yes	
30	Did the organization receive contributions of art, historical treasures, or other similar assets, or qualified conservation contributions? *If "Yes," complete Schedule M*	**30**		No
31	Did the organization liquidate, terminate, or dissolve and cease operations? *If "Yes," complete Schedule N, Part I*	**31**		No
32	Did the organization sell, exchange, dispose of, or transfer more than 25% of its net assets? *If "Yes," complete Schedule N, Part II*	**32**		No
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*	**33**		No
34	Was the organization related to any tax-exempt or taxable entity? *If "Yes," complete Schedule R, Parts II, III, IV, and V, line 1*	**34**		No
35	Is any related organization a controlled entity within the meaning of section 512(b)(13)? *If "Yes," complete Schedule R, Part V, line 2*	**35**		No
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*	**36**		No
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*	**37**		No
38	Did the organization complete Schedule O and provide explanations in Schedule O for Part VI, lines 11 and 19? **Note.** All Form 990 filers are required to complete Schedule O	**38**	Yes	

Part V Statements Regarding Other IRS Filings and Tax Compliance

				Yes	No
1a	Enter the number reported in Box 3 of Form 1096, *Annual Summary and Transmittal of U.S. Information Returns. Enter -0-* if not applicable	1a	36		
b	Enter the number of Forms W-2G included in line 1a *Enter -0-* if not applicable	1b	0		
c	Did the organization comply with backup withholding rules for reportable payments to vendors and reportable gaming (gambling) winnings to prize winners?	1c		Yes	
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	89		
b	If at least one is reported on line 2a, did the organization file all required federal employment tax returns? **Note:** If the sum of lines 1a and 2a is greater than 250, you may be required to e-file this return (see instructions)	2b		Yes	
3a	Did the organization have unrelated business gross income of $1,000 or more during the year covered by this return?	3a			No
b	If "Yes," has it filed a Form 990-T for this year? *If "No," 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			No
b	If "Yes," enter the name of the foreign country ▶ _____ See the instructions for exceptions and filing requirements for Form TD F 90-22 1, Report of Foreign Bank and Financial Accounts				
5a	Was the organization a party to a prohibited tax shelter transaction at any time during the tax year? . .	5a			No
b	Did any taxable party notify the organization that it was or is a party to a prohibited tax shelter transaction?	5b			No
c	If "Yes" to line 5a or 5b, did the organization file Form 8886-T, Disclosure by Tax-Exempt Entity Regarding Prohibited Tax Shelter Transaction?	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?	6a			No
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		Yes	
b	If "Yes," did the organization notify the donor of the value of the goods or services provided?	7b		Yes	
c	Did the organization sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of tangible personal property for which it was required to file Form 8282?	7c			No
d	If "Yes," indicate the number of Forms 8282 filed during the year	7d			
e	Did the organization, during the year, receive any funds, directly or indirectly, to pay premiums on a personal benefit contract?	7e			No
f	Did the organization, during the year, pay premiums, directly or indirectly, on a personal benefit contract? . .	7f			No
g	For all contributions of qualified intellectual property, did the organization file Form 8899 as required? . . .	7g			
h	For contributions of cars, boats, airplanes, and other vehicles, did the organization file a Form 1098-C as required?	7h			
8	**Sponsoring organizations maintaining donor advised funds and section 509(a)(3) supporting organizations.** Did the supporting organization, or a donor advised fund maintained by a sponsoring organization, have excess business holdings at any time during the year?	8			
9	**Sponsoring organizations maintaining donor advised funds.**				
a	Did the organization make any taxable distributions under section 4966?	9a			
b	Did the 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			

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

Section A. Governing Body and Management

				Yes	No
1a	Enter the number of voting members of the governing body	1a	10		
b	Enter the number of voting members that are independent	1b	9		
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		No
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		No
4	Did the organization make any significant changes to its organizational documents since the prior Form 990 was filed?		4		No
5	Did the organization become aware during the year of a material diversion of the organization's assets?		5		No
6	Does the organization have members or stockholders?		6		No
7a	Does the organization have members, stockholders, or other persons who may elect one or more members of the governing body?		7a		No
b	Are any decisions of the governing body subject to approval by members, stockholders, or other persons?		7b		No
8	Did the organization contemporaneously document the meetings held or written actions undertaken during the year by the following				
a	The governing body?		8a	Yes	
b	Each committee with authority to act on behalf of the governing body?		8b	Yes	
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		No

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

			Yes	No
10a	Does the organization have local chapters, branches, or affiliates?	10a	Yes	
b	If "Yes," does the organization have written policies and procedures governing the activities of such chapters, affiliates, and branches to ensure their operations are consistent with those of the organization?	10b	Yes	
11	Has the organization provided a copy of this Form 990 to all members of its governing body before filing the form?	11	Yes	
11A	Describe in Schedule O the process, if any, used by the organization to review the Form 990			
12a	Does the organization have a written conflict of interest policy? *If "No," go to line 13*	12a	Yes	
b	Are officers, directors or trustees, and key employees required to disclose annually interests that could give rise to conflicts?	12b	Yes	
c	Does the organization regularly and consistently monitor and enforce compliance with the policy? If "Yes," describe in Schedule O how this is done	12c	Yes	
13	Does the organization have a written whistleblower policy?	13	Yes	
14	Does the organization have a written document retention and destruction policy?	14	Yes	
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	15a	Yes	
b	Other officers or key employees of the organization	15b	Yes	
	If "Yes" to line a or b, 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?	16a		No
b	If "Yes," has the organization adopted a written policy or procedure requiring the organization to evaluate its participation in joint venture arrangements under applicable federal tax law, and taken steps to safeguard the organization's exempt status with respect to such arrangements?	16b		

Section C. Disclosure

17 List the States with which a copy of this Form 990 is required to be filed ▶ AL, AK, AZ, CO, CT, FL, KS, KY, ME, MD, MA, MI, MN, MS, NH, NJ, NM, NC, ND, OH, OK, OR, PA, RI, IN, UT, WA, WV, WI, NY, SC, VA, IL, MO

18 Section 6104 requires an organization to make its Form 1023 (or 1024 if applicable), 990, and 990-T (501(c)(3)s only) available for public inspection Indicate how you make these available Check all that apply

☑ Own website ☑ Another's website ☑ Upon request

19 Describe in Schedule O whether (and if so, how), the organization makes its governing documents, conflict of interest policy, and financial statements available to the public See Additional Data Table

20 State the name, physical address, and telephone number of the person who possesses the books and records of the organization ▶

STEVEN ANDERSON
901 NORTH GLEBE RD SUITE 900
ARLINGTON, VA 22203
(703) 682-9320

Part VII Compensation of Officers, Directors,Trustees, Key Employees, Highest Compensated Employees, and Independent Contractors

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 with or within the organization's tax year Use Schedule J-2 if additional space is needed

- List all of the organization's **current** officers, directors, trustees (whether individuals or organizations), regardless of amount of compensation, and **current** key employees Enter -0- in columns (D), (E), and (F) if no compensation was paid
- List all of the organization's **current** key employees 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 reportable compensation (Box 5 of Form W-2 and/or Box 7 of Form 1099-MISC) of more than $100,000 from the organization and any related organizations
- List all of the organization's **former** officers, key employees, or 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 the organization did not compensate any current or former officer, director, trustee or key employee

(A) Name and Title	(B) Average hours per week	(C) Position (check all that apply)						(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			
See add'l data										

1b Total . . . . . ▶	1,926,005	0	326,054

2 Total number of individuals (including but not limited to those listed above) who received more than $100,000 in reportable compensation from the organization ▶ 14

			Yes	No
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*	**3**		No
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*	**4**	Yes	
5	Did any person listed on line 1a receive or accrue compensation from any unrelated organization for services rendered to the organization? *If "Yes," complete Schedule J for such person*	**5**		No

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

(A) Name and business address	(B) Description of services	(C) Compensation

2 Total number of independent contractors (including but not limited to those listed above) who received more than $100,000 in compensation from the organization ▶ 0

Part VIII Statement of Revenue

			(A) Total revenue	(B) Related or exempt function revenue	(C) Unrelated business revenue	(D) Revenue excluded from tax under sections 512, 513, or 514
Contributions, gifts, grants and other similar amounts	1a	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 12,109,095				
	g	Noncash contributions included in lines 1a-1f $ 546,776				
	h	**Total.** Add lines 1a-1f . . . . . ▶	12,109,095			
Program Service Revenue		Business Code				
	2a	ATTORNEY FEES 541,100	796,507	796,507		
	b	HONORARIA 541,900	15,949	15,949		
	c	MISCELLANEOUS 541,900	7,547	7,547		
	d					
	e					
	f	All other program service revenue				
	g	**Total.** Add lines 2a–2f . . . . . ▶	820,003			
	3	Investment income (including dividends, interest and other similar amounts) . . . . . ▶	41,507			41,507
	4	Income from investment of tax-exempt bond proceeds . . ▶				
	5	Royalties . . . . . ▶				
		(i) Real / (ii) Personal				
	6a	Gross Rents 139,782				
	b	Less rental expenses 162,134				
	c	Rental income or (loss) -22,352				
	d	Net rental income or (loss) . . . . . ▶	-22,352			-22,352
		(i) Securities / (ii) Other				
	7a	Gross amount from sales of assets other than inventory 405,312				
	b	Less cost or other basis and sales expenses 397,033				
	c	Gain or (loss) 8,279				
	d	Net gain or (loss) . . . . . ▶	8,279			8,279
Other Revenue	8a	Gross income from fundraising events (not including $ _____ of contributions reported on line 1c) See Part IV, line 18 . . . a				
	b	Less direct expenses . . . b				
	c	Net income or (loss) from fundraising events . . ▶				
	9a	Gross income from gaming activities See Part IV, line 19 . . . a				
	b	Less direct expenses . . . b				
	c	Net income or (loss) from gaming activities . . ▶				
	10a	Gross sales of inventory, less returns and allowances . a				
	b	Less cost of goods sold . . b				
	c	Net income or (loss) from sales of inventory . . ▶				
		Miscellaneous Revenue / Business Code				
	11a					
	b					
	c					
	d	All other revenue				
	e	**Total.** Add lines 11a–11d . . . . . ▶				
	12	**Total revenue.** See Instructions . . . ▶	12,956,532	820,003	0	27,434

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) but are not required to complete columns (B), (C), and (D).

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 governments and organizations in the U S See Part IV, line 21				
2 Grants and other assistance to individuals in the U S See Part IV, line 22				
3 Grants and other assistance to governments, organizations, and individuals outside the U S See Part IV, lines 15 and 16				
4 Benefits paid to or for members				
5 Compensation of current officers, directors, trustees, and key employees	1,310,523	976,417	143,361	190,745
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	3,884,819	3,456,027	284,052	144,740
8 Pension plan contributions (include section 401(k) and section 403(b) employer contributions)	326,290	282,838	33,540	9,912
9 Other employee benefits	255,385	211,652	28,400	15,333
10 Payroll taxes	323,656	274,147	29,786	19,723
11 Fees for services (non-employees)				
a Management				
b Legal	227,439	212,905	15	14,519
c Accounting	56,664		56,664	
d Lobbying				
e Professional fundraising *See Part IV, line 17*	14,406			14,406
f Investment management fees				
g Other	241,651	217,729	8,015	15,907
12 Advertising and promotion	26,219	26,194		25
13 Office expenses	893,224	482,758	103,369	307,097
14 Information technology	5,406	2,868	2,061	477
15 Royalties				
16 Occupancy	856,661	671,294	107,745	77,622
17 Travel	316,181	301,501	4,454	10,226
18 Payments of travel or entertainment expenses for any federal, state, or local public officials				
19 Conferences, conventions, and meetings	56,768	49,815	4,985	1,968
20 Interest	5,903		5,903	
21 Payments to affiliates				
22 Depreciation, depletion, and amortization	348,051	280,817	42,528	24,706
23 Insurance	86,277	58,505	26,769	1,003
24 Other expenses Itemize expenses not covered above (Expenses grouped together and labeled miscellaneous may not exceed 5% of total expenses shown on line 25 below)				
a MISCELLANEOUS	70,877	40,292	21,143	9,442
b				
c				
d				
e				
f All other expenses				
25 **Total functional expenses.** Add lines 1 through 24f	9,306,400	7,545,759	902,790	857,851
26 **Joint costs.** Check here ▶ ☐ if following SOP 98-2 Complete this line only if the organization reported in column (B) joint costs from a combined educational campaign and fundraising solicitation				

Part X Balance Sheet

				(A) Beginning of year		(B) End of year
Assets	1	Cash—non-interest-bearing		2,671	1	2,671
	2	Savings and temporary cash investments		1,849,539	2	6,267,612
	3	Pledges and grants receivable, net		3,711,305	3	3,066,919
	4	Accounts receivable, net		15,296	4	23,957
	5	Receivables from current and former officers, directors, trustees, key employees, and highest compensated employees Complete Part II of Schedule L			5	
	6	Receivables from other disqualified persons (as defined under section 4958(f)(1)) and persons described in section 4958(c)(3)(B) Complete Part II of Schedule L			6	
	7	Notes and loans receivable, net			7	
	8	Inventories for sale or use			8	
	9	Prepaid expenses and deferred charges		109,001	9	164,179
	10a	Land, buildings, and equipment cost or other basis *Complete Part VI of Schedule D*	10a 2,030,078			
	b	Less accumulated depreciation	10b 1,535,074	699,514	10c	495,004
	11	Investments—publicly traded securities		10,826,656	11	10,897,025
	12	Investments—other securities See Part IV, line 11			12	
	13	Investments—program-related See Part IV, line 11			13	
	14	Intangible assets			14	
	15	Other assets See Part IV, line 11		25,554	15	25,554
	16	**Total assets.** Add lines 1 through 15 (must equal line 34)		17,239,536	16	20,942,921
Liabilities	17	Accounts payable and accrued expenses		237,153	17	263,641
	18	Grants payable			18	
	19	Deferred revenue			19	
	20	Tax-exempt bond liabilities			20	
	21	Escrow or custodial account liability *Complete Part IV of Schedule D*			21	
	22	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 Complete Part X of Schedule D		264,890	25	263,730
	26	**Total liabilities.** Add lines 17 through 25		502,043	26	527,371
Net Assets or Fund Balances		**Organizations that follow SFAS 117, check here ▶ ☑ and complete lines 27 through 29, and lines 33 and 34.**				
	27	Unrestricted net assets		10,649,593	27	15,276,961
	28	Temporarily restricted net assets		6,087,900	28	5,138,589
	29	Permanently restricted net assets			29	
		Organizations that do not follow SFAS 117, check here ▶ ☐ 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		16,737,493	33	20,415,550
	34	Total liabilities and net assets/fund balances		17,239,536	34	20,942,921

Part XI Financial Statements and Reporting

			Yes	No
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?	2a		No
b	Were the organization's financial statements audited by an independent accountant?	2b	Yes	
c	If "Yes," to 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	2c	Yes	
d	If "Yes" to line 2a or 2b, check a box below to indicate whether the financial statements for the year were issued on a consolidated basis, separate basis, or both ☑ Separate basis ☐ Consolidated basis ☐ Both consolidated and separated basis			
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?	3a		No
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	3b		

efile GRAPHIC print - DO NOT PROCESS | As Filed Data - | DLN: 93493045016041

SCHEDULE A (Form 990 or 990EZ)

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.** ▶ **See separate instructions.**

OMB No 1545-0047

2009

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 11, check only one box)

1 ☐ A church, convention of churches, or association of churches **section 170(b)(1)(A)(i).**

2 ☐ A school described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii).** (Attach Schedule E)

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 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)

10 ☐ An organization organized and operated exclusively to test for public safety See **section 509(a)(4).**

11 ☐ 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 that describes the type of supporting organization and complete lines 11e through 11h

a ☐ Type I **b** ☐ Type II **c** ☐ Type III - Functionally integrated **d** ☐ Type III - Other

e ☐ By checking this box, I certify that the organization is not controlled directly or indirectly by one or more disqualified persons other than foundation managers and other than one or more publicly supported organizations described in section 509(a)(1) or section 509(a)(2)

f If the organization received a written determination from the IRS that it is a Type I, Type II or Type III supporting organization, check this box ☐

g Since August 17, 2006, has the organization accepted any gift or contribution from any of the following persons?

	Yes	No
(i) a person who directly or indirectly controls, either alone or together with persons described in (ii) and (iii) below, the governing body of the the supported organization? **11g(i)**		
(ii) a family member of a person described in (i) above? **11g(ii)**		
(iii) a 35% controlled entity of a person described in (i) or (ii) above? **11g(iii)**		

h Provide the following information about the supported organization(s)

(i) Name of supported organization	(ii) EIN	(iii) Type of organization (described on lines 1- 9 above or IRC section (see instructions))	(iv) Is the organization in col (i) listed in your governing document? Yes	(iv) No	(v) Did you notify the organization in col (i) of your support? Yes	(v) No	(vi) Is the organization in col (i) organized in the U S ? Yes	(vi) No	(vii) Amount of support?
Total									

Part II **Support Schedule for Organizations Described in IRC 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.)

Section A. Public Support

Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in)	(a) 2005	(b) 2006	(c) 2007	(d) 2008	(e) 2009	(f) Total
1 Gifts, grants, contributions, and membership fees received (Do not include any "unusual grants ")	7,458,731	8,481,530	8,986,386	15,666,509	12,109,095	52,702,251
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	7,458,731	8,481,530	8,986,386	15,666,509	12,109,095	52,702,251
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)						6,742,254
6 **Public Support.** Subtract line 5 from line 4						45,959,997

Section B. Total Support

Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in)	(a) 2005	(b) 2006	(c) 2007	(d) 2008	(e) 2009	(f) Total
7 Amounts from line 4	7,458,731	397,121	8,986,386	15,666,509	12,109,095	52,702,251
8 Gross income from interest, dividends, payments received on securities loans, rents, royalties and income from similar sources	306,816	397,121	482,173	385,623	181,289	1,753,022
9 Net income from unrelated business activities, whether or not the business is regularly carried on						
10 Other income (Explain in Part IV) Do not include gain or loss from the sale of capital assets						
11 **Total support** (Add lines 7 through 10)						54,455,273

12	Gross receipts from related activities, etc (See instructions)	12	2,384,502

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

Section C. Computation of Public Support Percentage

14	Public Support Percentage for 2009 (line 6 column (f) divided by line 11 column (f))	14	84 400 %
15	Public Support Percentage for 2008 Schedule A, Part II, line 14	15	85 050 %

16a **33 1/3% support test—2009.** 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 ☑

b **33 1/3% support test—2008.** If the organization did not check the 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 ☐

17a **10%-facts-and-circumstances test—2009.** 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 IV how the organization meets the "facts and circumstances" test The organization qualifies as a publicly supported organization ☐

b **10%-facts-and-circumstances test—2008.** 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 IV how the organization meets the "facts and circumstances" test The organization qualifies as a publicly supported organization ☐

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 ☐

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

(Complete only if you checked the box on line 9 of Part I.)

Section A. Public Support

Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in)	(a) 2005	(b) 2006	(c) 2007	(d) 2008	(e) 2009	(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) 2005	(b) 2006	(c) 2007	(d) 2008	(e) 2009	(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 IV)						
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 501(c)(3) organization, check this box and **stop here** ▶

Section C. Computation of Public Support Percentage

15	Public Support Percentage for 2009 (line 8 column (f) divided by line 13 column (f))	15
16	Public support percentage from 2008 Schedule A, Part III, line 15	16

Section D. Computation of Investment Income Percentage

17	Investment income percentage for **2009** (line 10c column (f) divided by line 13 column (f))	17
18	Investment income percentage from **2008** Schedule A, Part III, line 17	18

19a **33 1/3% support tests—2009.** 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—2008.** 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 **Supplemental Information.** Supplemental Information. Complete this part to provide the explanation required by Part II, line 10; Part II, line 17a or 17b; or Part III, line 12. Provide any other additional information. See instructions

efile GRAPHIC print - DO NOT PROCESS | As Filed Data - | DLN: 93493045016041

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.** ▶ **See separate instructions.**

OMB No 1545-0047

2009

Open to Public Inspection

If the organization answered "Yes," to Form 990, Part IV, Line 3, or Form 990-EZ, Part VI, 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," to 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," to Form 990, Part IV, Line 5 (Proxy Tax) or Form 990-EZ, line 35a (regarding proxy tax), then

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

Name of the organization	Employer identification number
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE	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 expenditures ▶ $ _____

3 Volunteer hours _____

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 funtion 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 State the names, addresses and employer identification number (EIN) of all section 527 political organizations to which payments were made 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-

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

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)	7,840	
b Total lobbying expenditures to influence a legislative body (direct lobbying)	31,167	
c Total lobbying expenditures (add lines 1a and 1b)	39,007	
d Other exempt purpose expenditures	9,429,527	
e Total exempt purpose expenditures (add lines 1c and 1d)	9,468,534	
f Lobbying nontaxable amount Enter the amount from the following table in both columns	623,427	
g Grassroots nontaxable amount (enter 25% of line 1f)	155,857	
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	

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

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? ☐ Yes ☐ 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 instructions for lines 2a through 2f on page 4.)

Lobbying Expenditures During 4-Year Averaging Period

Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in)	(a) 2006	(b) 2007	(c) 2008	(d) 2009	(e) Total
2a Lobbying non-taxable amount	584,089	597,302	633,515	623,427	2,438,333
b Lobbying ceiling amount (150% of line 2a, column(e))					3,657,500
c Total lobbying expenditures	71,721	37,102	66,099	39,007	213,929
d Grassroots non-taxable amount	146,022	149,326	158,379	155,857	609,584
e Grassroots ceiling amount (150% of line 2d, column (e))					914,376
f Grassroots lobbying expenditures	15,762	5,335	30,753	7,840	59,690

Part II-B Complete if the organization is exempt under section 501(c)(3) and has NOT filed Form 5768 (election under section 501(h)).

		(a) Yes	(a) No	(b) Amount
1	During the year, did the filing organization attempt to influence foreign, national, state or local legislation, including any attempt to influence public opinion on a legislative matter or referendum, through the use of			
a	Volunteers?			
b	Paid staff or management (include compensation in expenses reported on lines 1c through 1i)?			
c	Media advertisements?			
d	Mailings to members, legislators, or the public?			
e	Publications, or published or broadcast statements?			
f	Grants to other organizations for lobbying purposes?			
g	Direct contact with legislators, their staffs, government officials, or a legislative body?			
h	Rallies, demonstrations, seminars, conventions, speeches, lectures, or any similar means?			
i	Other activities? If "Yes," describe in Part IV			
j	Total lines 1c through 1i			
2a	Did the activities in line 1 cause the organization to be not described in section 501(c)(3)?			
b	If "Yes," enter the amount of any tax incurred under section 4912			
c	If "Yes," enter the amount of any tax incurred by organization managers under section 4912			
d	If the filing organization incurred a section 4912 tax, did it file Form 4720 for this year?			

Part III-A Complete if the organization is exempt under section 501(c)(4), section 501(c)(5), or section 501(c)(6).

			Yes	No
1	Were substantially all (90% or more) dues received nondeductible by members?	1		
2	Did the organization make only in-house lobbying expenditures of $2,000 or less?	2		
3	Did the organization agree to carryover lobbying and political expenditures from the prior year?	3		

Part III-B Complete if the organization is exempt under section 501(c)(4), section 501(c)(5), or section 501(c)(6) if BOTH Part III-A, lines 1 and 2 are answered "No" OR if Part III-A, line 3 is answered "Yes".

1	Dues, assessments and similar amounts from members	1	
2	Section 162(e) non-deductible lobbying and political expenditures **(do not include amounts of political expenses for which the section 527(f) tax was paid).**		
a	Current year	2a	
b	Carryover from last year	2b	
c	Total	2c	
3	Aggregate amount reported in section 6033(e)(1)(A) notices of nondeductible section 162(e) dues	3	
4	If notices were sent and the amount on line 2c exceeds the amount on line 3, what portion of the excess does the organization agree to carryover to the reasonable estimate of nondeductible lobbying and political expenditure next year?	4	
5	Taxable amount of lobbying and political expenditures (see instructions)	5	

Part IV Supplemental Information

Complete this part to provide the descriptions required for Part I-A, line 1, Part I-B, line 4, Part I-C, line 5, and Part II-B, line 1i
Also, complete this part for any additional information

Identifier	Return Reference	Explanation

efile GRAPHIC print - DO NOT PROCESS | As Filed Data - | DLN: 93493045016041

SCHEDULE D (Form 990)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Supplemental Financial Statements

▶ Complete if the organization answered "Yes," to Form 990, Part IV, line 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, or 12.
▶ Attach to Form 990. ▶ See separate instructions.

OMB No 1545-0047

2009

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" to Form 990, Part IV, line 6.

		(a) Donor advised funds	(b) Funds and other accounts
1	Total number at end of year		
2	Aggregate contributions to (during year)		
3	Aggregate 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? ☐ Yes ☐ No

6 Did the organization inform all grantees, donors, and donor advisors in writing that grant funds may 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 ☐ Yes ☐ No

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

1 Purpose(s) of conservation easements held by the organization (check all that apply)
☐ Preservation of land for public use (e g , recreation or pleasure)
☐ Preservation of an historically importantly land area
☐ Protection of natural habitat
☐ Preservation of a certified historic structure
☐ Preservation of open space

2 Complete lines 2a–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 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 8/17/06	2d

3 Number of conservation easements modified, transferred, released, extinguished, or terminated by the organization during the taxable 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 and enforcing conservation easements during the year ▶ _____

7 Amount of expenses incurred in monitoring, inspecting, 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 170(h)(4)(B)(ii)? ☐ Yes ☐ No

9 In Part XIV, 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" to Form 990, Part IV, line 8.

1a If the organization elected, as permitted under SFAS 116, 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 XIV, the text of the footnote to its financial statements that describes these items

b If the organization elected, as permitted under SFAS 116, 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) Revenues included in 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 relating to these items

a Revenues included in Form 990, Part VIII, line 1 ▶ $ _____

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

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

3 Using the organization's 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 XIV

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" to 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 XIV and complete the following table

		Amount
c Beginning balance	1c	
d Additions during the year	1d	
e Distributions during the year	1e	
f Ending balance	1f	

2a Did the organization include an amount on Form 990, Part X, line 21? ☐ Yes ☐ No

b If "Yes," explain the arrangement in Part XIV

Part V Endowment Funds. Complete if the organization answered "Yes" to 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					
b Contributions					
c Investment earnings or losses					
d Grants or scholarships					
e Other expenditures for facilities and programs					
f Administrative expenses					
g End of year balance					

2 Provide the estimated percentage of the year end balance held as

- a Board designated or quasi-endowment ▶ %
- b Permanent endowment ▶ %
- c Term endowment ▶ %

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

		Yes	No
(i) unrelated organizations	3a(i)		
(ii) related organizations	3a(ii)		
b If "Yes" to 3a(ii), are the related organizations listed as required on Schedule R?	3b		

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

Part VI Investments—Land, Buildings, and Equipment. See Form 990, Part X, line 10.

Description of investment	(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		907,333	819,698	87,635
d Equipment		1,122,745	715,376	407,369
e Other				0
Total. Add lines 1a-1e *(Column (d) should equal Form 990, Part X, column (B), line 10(c).)* ▶				495,004

Part VII Investments—Other Securities. 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
Financial derivatives		
Closely-held equity interests		
Other		
Total. *(Column (b) should equal Form 990, Part X, col (B) line 12)* ▶		

Part VIII Investments—Program Related. See Form 990, Part X, line 13.

(a) Description of investment type	(b) Book value	(c) Method of valuation Cost or end-of-year market value
Total. *(Column (b) should equal Form 990, Part X, col (B) line 13)* ▶		

Part IX Other Assets. See Form 990, Part X, line 15.

(a) Description	(b) Book value
Total. *(Column (b) should equal Form 990, Part X, col.(B) line 15.)* . . . . . ▶	

Part X Other Liabilities. See Form 990, Part X, line 25.

1 (a) Description of Liability	(b) Amount
Federal Income Taxes	
DEFERRED RENT	216,475
CAPITAL LEASE LIABILITY	47,255
Total. *(Column (b) should equal Form 990, Part X, col (B) line 25)* ▶	263,730

2. Fin 48 Footnote In Part XIV, 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

Part XI Reconciliation of Change in Net Assets from Form 990 to Financial Statements

1	Total revenue (Form 990, Part VIII, column (A), line 12)	1	12,956,532
2	Total expenses (Form 990, Part IX, column (A), line 25)	2	9,306,400
3	Excess or (deficit) for the year Subtract line 2 from line 1	3	3,650,132
4	Net unrealized gains (losses) on investments	4	27,925
5	Donated services and use of facilities	5	
6	Investment expenses	6	
7	Prior period adjustments	7	
8	Other (Describe in Part XIV)	8	
9	Total adjustments (net) Add lines 4 - 8	9	27,925
10	Excess or (deficit) for the year per financial statements Combine lines 3 and 9	10	3,678,057

Part XII Reconciliation of Revenue per Audited Financial Statements With Revenue per Return

1	Total revenue, gains, and other support per audited financial statements			1	13,146,591
2	Amounts included on line 1 but not on Form 990, Part VIII, line 12				
a	Net unrealized gains on investments	2a	27,925		
b	Donated services and use of facilities	2b			
c	Recoveries of prior year grants	2c			
d	Other (Describe in Part XIV)	2d			
e	Add lines **2a** through **2d**			2e	27,925
3	Subtract line **2e** from line **1**			3	13,118,666
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 XIV)	4b	-162,134		
c	Add lines **4a** and **4b**			4c	-162,134
5	Total Revenue Add lines **3** and **4c.** (This should equal Form 990, Part I, line 12)			5	12,956,532

Part XIII Reconciliation of Expenses per Audited Financial Statements With Expenses per Return

1	Total expenses and losses per audited financial statements			1	9,468,534
2	Amounts included on line 1 but not on Form 990, Part IX, line 25				
a	Donated services and use of facilities	2a			
b	Prior year adjustments	2b			
c	Other losses	2c			
d	Other (Describe in Part XIV)	2d	162,134		
e	Add lines **2a** through **2d**			2e	162,134
3	Subtract line **2e** from line **1**			3	9,306,400
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 XIV)	4b			
c	Add lines **4a** and **4b**			4c	0
5	Total expenses Add lines **3** and **4c.** (This should equal Form 990, Part I, line 18)			5	9,306,400

Part XIV Supplemental Information

Complete this part to 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, Part XI, line 8, Part XII, lines 2d and 4b, and Part XIII, lines 2d and 4b Also complete this part to provide any additional information

Identifier	Return Reference	Explanation
Part XII, Line 4b - Other Adjustments		SUBLEASE EXPENSES - MAIN OFFICE
Part XIII, Line 2d - Other Adjustments		SUBLEASE EXPENSES - MAIN OFFICE

efile GRAPHIC print - DO NOT PROCESS | As Filed Data - | DLN: 93493045016041

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" to Form 990, Part IV, question 23.
▶ Attach to Form 990. ▶ See separate instructions.

OMB No 1545-0047

2009

Open to Public Inspection

Name of the organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

Part I Questions Regarding Compensation

			Yes	No
1a	Check the appropiate box(es) if the organization provided any of the following to or for a person listed in Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a Complete Part III to provide any relevant information regarding these items ☐ First-class or charter travel ☐ Housing allowance or residence for personal use ☐ Travel for companions ☐ Payments for business use of personal residence ☐ Tax idemnification and gross-up payments ☐ Health or social club dues or initiation fees ☐ Discretionary spending account ☐ Personal services (e g , maid, chauffeur, chef)			
b	If any of the boxes in line 1a are checked, did the organization follow a written policy regarding payment or reimbursement orprovision of all the expenses described above? If "No," complete Part III to explain	**1b**		
2	Did the organization require substantiation prior to reimbursing or allowing expenses incurred by all officers, directors, trustees, and the CEO/Executive Director, regarding the items checked in line 1a?	**2**		
3	Indicate which, if any, of the following the organization uses to establish the compensation of the organization's CEO/Executive Director Check all that apply ☑ Compensation committee ☐ Written employment contract ☑ Independent compensation consultant ☑ Compensation survey or study ☑ Form 990 of other organizations ☑ Approval by the board or compensation committee			
4	During the year, did any person listed in 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?	**4a**		No
b	Participate in, or receive payment from, a supplemental nonqualified retirement plan?	**4b**		No
c	Participate in, or receive payment from, an equity-based compensation arrangement?	**4c**		No
	If "Yes" to any of lines 4a-c, list the persons and provide the applicable amounts for each item in Part III			
	Only 501(c)(3) and 501(c)(4) organizations only must complete lines 5-9.			
5	For persons listed in form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a, did the organization pay or accrue any compensation contingent on the revenues of			
a	The organization?	**5a**		No
b	Any related organization?	**5b**		No
	If "Yes," to line 5a or 5b, describe in Part III			
6	For persons listed in 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?	**6a**		No
b	Any related organization?	**6b**		No
	If "Yes," to line 6a or 6b, describe in Part III			
7	For persons listed in Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a, did the organization provide any non-fixed payments not described in lines 5 and 6? If "Yes," describe in Part III	**7**	Yes	
8	Were any amounts reported in Form 990, Part VII, paid or accured pursuant to a contract that was subject to the initial contract exception described in Regs section 53 4958-4(a)(3)? If "Yes," describe in Part III	**8**		No
9	If "Yes" to line 8, did the organization also follow the rebuttable presumption procedure described in Regulations section 53 4958-6(c)?	**9**		

Part II Officers, Directors, Trustees, Key Employees, and Highest Compensated Employees. Use Schedule J-1 if additional space needed.

For each individual whose compensation must be reported in Schedule J, report compensation from the organization on row (i) and from related organizations, described in the instructions on row (ii) Do not list any individuals that are not listed on Form 990, Part VII

Note. The sum of columns (B)(i)-(iii) must equal the applicable column (D) or column (E) amounts on Form 990, Part VII, line 1a

(A) Name		(B) Breakdown of W-2 and/or 1099-MISC compensation			(C) Retirement and other deferred compensation	(D) Nontaxable benefits	(E) Total of columns (B)(i)-(D)	(F) Compensation reported in prior Form 990 or Form 990-EZ
		(i) Base compensation	(ii) Bonus & incentive compensation	(iii) Other reportable compensation				
WILLIAM H MELLOR	(i)	359,475	80,000	0	49,000	13,829	502,304	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DEBORAH SIMPSON	(i)	158,410	15,000	0	23,527	320	197,257	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
JOHN KRAMER	(i)	199,963	15,000	0	28,000	13,829	256,792	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
BETH STEVENS	(i)	151,660	10,000	0	23,361	5,182	190,203	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCOTT BULLOCK	(i)	172,745	0	0	23,879	5,198	201,822	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DANA BERLINER	(i)	176,015	0	0	24,582	5,198	205,795	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
CLARK NEILY	(i)	163,953	0	0	22,398	5,226	191,577	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
STEVE SIMPSON	(i)	167,544	5,000	0	23,867	13,766	210,177	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ROBERT GALL	(i)	127,412	0	0	18,404	5,178	150,994	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part III Supplemental Information

Complete this part to provide the information, explanation, or descriptions required for Part I, lines 1a, 1b, 4c, 5a, 5b, 6a, 6b, 7, and 8 Also complete this part for any additional information

Identifier	Return Reference	Explanation
	Part I, Line 7	THE COMPENSATION COMMITTEE DETERMINES, ON AN ANNUAL BASIS, THE BONUS TO BE AWARDED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE INSTITUTE FOR ALL OTHERS, BONUSES ARE DETERMINED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE INSTITUTE ON AN ANNUAL BASIS ALL BONUSES ARE BASED UPON A BOARD APPROVED BUDGET

efile GRAPHIC print - DO NOT PROCESS | As Filed Data - | DLN: 93493045016041

Schedule L (Form 990 or 990-EZ)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Transactions with Interested Persons

▶ **Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, lines 25a, 25b, 26, 27, 28a, 28b, or 28c, or Form 990-EZ, Part V lines 38a or 40b.**

▶ **Attach to Form 990 or Form 990-EZ.** ▶ **See separate instructions.**

OMB No 1545-0047

2009

Open to Public Inspection

Name of the organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

Part I Excess Benefit Transactions (section 501(c)(3) and section 501 (c)(4) organizations only).

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 25a or 25b, or Form 990-EZ, Part V, line 40b

1	(a) Name of disqualified person	(b) Description of transaction	(c) Corrected? Yes	No

2 Enter the amount of tax imposed on the organization managers or disqualified persons during the year under section 4958 . . . . . ▶ $

3 Enter the amount of tax, if any, on line 2, above, reimbursed by the organization . . . . . ▶ $

Part II Loans to and/or From Interested Persons.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 26, or Form 990-EZ, Part V, line 38a

(a) Name of interested person and purpose	(b) Loan to or from the organization? To	From	(c) Original principal amount	(d) Balance due	(e) In default? Yes	No	(f) Approved by board or committee? Yes	No	(g) Written agreement? Yes	No
Total . . . . . ▶ $										

Part III Grants or Assistance Benefitting Interested Persons.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 27.

(a) Name of interested person	(b) Relationship between interested person and the organization	(c) Amount of grant or type of assistance

Part IV Business Transactions Involving Interested Persons.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 28a, 28b, or 28c.

(a) Name of interested person	(b) Relationship between interested person and the organization	(c) Amount of transaction	(d) Description of transaction	(e) Sharing of organization's revenues? Yes	No
STEVE SIMPSON	HUSBAND OF DEBORAH SIMPSON, MANAGING VP & SECRETARY	210,177	REGULAR EMPLOYEE OF THE INSTITUTE		No

efile GRAPHIC print - DO NOT PROCESS | As Filed Data - | DLN: 93493045016041

SCHEDULE M (Form 990)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

NonCash Contributions

▶Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, lines 29 or 30.
▶ Attach to Form 990.

OMB No 1545-0047

2009

Open to Public Inspection

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	(c) Revenues reported on Form 990, Part VIII, line 1g	(d) Method of determining revenues
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				
7	Boats and planes				
8	Intellectual property				
9	Securities—Publicly traded	X	11	546,776	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 ▶ (_____)				
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

		Yes	No
30a	During the year, did the organization receive by contribution any property reported in Part I, lines 1-28 that it must hold for at least three years from the date of the initial contribution, and which is not required to be used for exempt purposes for the entire holding period?		No
b	If "Yes," describe the arrangement in Part II		
31	Does the organization have a gift acceptance policy that requires the review of any non-standard contributions?	Yes	
32a	Does the organization hire or use third parties or related organizations to solicit, process, or sell non-cash contributions?	Yes	
b	If "Yes," describe in Part II		
33	If the organization did not report revenues in column (c) for a type of property for which column (a) is checked, describe in Part II		

Part II

Supplemental Information. Complete this part to provide the information required by Part I, lines 30b, 32b, and 33. Also complete this part for any additional information.

Identifier	Return Reference	Explanation
Third Party Use	Part I, Line 32b	THE INSTITUTE HAS A BROKERAGE ACCOUNT TO FACILITATE THE SALE OF DONATED STOCK

SCHEDULE O (Form 990)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Supplemental Information to Form 990

Complete to provide information for responses to specific questions on Form 990 or to provide any additional information.
▶ Attach to Form 990.

OMB No 1545-0047

2009

Open to Public Inspection

Name of the organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

Identifier	Return Reference	Explanation
Form 990, Part VI, Section A, line 1		William H Mellor serves as President & General Counsel and is employed by the organization
Form 990, Part VI, Section B, line 11		THE FORM 990 WAS REVIEWED BY THE INSTITUTE'S AUDIT COMMITTEE IN CONSULTATION WITH THE INSTITUTE'S INDEPENDENT AUDITORS AFTER REVIEW BY THE AUDIT COMMITTEE, THE FORM 990 WAS REVIEWED BY 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 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		THE PRESIDENT/GENERAL COUNSEL'S COMPENSATION IS SET BY THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AT THE FALL BOARD MEETING THE CHIEF FINANCIAL OFFICER PROVIDES THE BOARD'S COMPENSATION COMMITTEE WITH PRESENT AND PAST COMPENSATION AMOUNTS FOR THE PRESIDENT/GENERAL COUNSEL, AS WELL AS COMPARABLE DATA FROM FORM 990 FOR SIMILARLY SITUATED NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS THE CFO ALSO ENGAGES AN OUTSIDE VENDOR TO PROVIDE AN INDEPENDENT COMPENSATION SURVEY THE FULL BOARD (EXCEPT FOR THE PRESIDENT/GENERAL COUNSEL, WHO IS RECUSED) THEN VOTES TO DETERMINE COMPENSATION AND THE DECISION IS CONTEMPORANEOUSLY RECORDED AND COMMUNICATED TO THE CFO BY THE CHAIRMAN AND PLACED IN THE PRESIDENT/GENERAL COUNSEL'S CONFIDENTIAL EMPLOYMENT FILE 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 IN DETERMINING THE FISCAL YEAR BUDGET, THE COMPENSATION AMOUNTS OF OTHER OFFICERS AND KEY EMPLOYEES ARE DETERMINED IN COMPARISON TO SIMILARLY SITUATED OFFICERS AND KEY EMPLOYEES AT SIMILARLY SITUATED NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS SUCH DETERMINATION IS CONTEMPORANEOUSLY SUBSTANTIATED THROUGH RECORDATION OF THE PASSAGE OF THE BUDGET THE COMPENSATION DETERMINATION IS PLACED IN THE OFFICER OR OTHER KEY EMPLOYEE'S CONFIDENTIAL EMPLOYMENT FILE
Form 990, Part VI, Section C, line 19		THE INSTITUTE'S 990 IS AVAILABLE ON ITS AND OTHER WEBSITES THE INSTITUTE'S 990, FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, AND OTHER IRS DOCUMENTATION, GOVERNING DOCUMENTS AND CERTAIN OTHER POLICIES ARE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC UPON REQUEST FORM 990 IS AVAILABLE ON THE GUIDESTAR WEBSITE
FORM 990, PART XI, LINE 2C		THE INSTITUTE 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

Identifier	Return Reference	Explanation
CASE UPDATE		GARRIOTT V WINN THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE IS HEADED TO THE U S SUPREME COURT FOR THE FOURTH TIME IN NINE YEARS AT ISSUE IN THIS CASE IS A LONGSTANDING INDIVIDUAL TAX-CREDIT PROGRAM IN ARIZONA THAT ENCOURAGES INDIVIDUALS TO DONATE TO ORGANIZATIONS THAT PROVIDE PRIVATE-SCHOOL SCHOLARSHIPS TO LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME CHILDREN TO ENABLE THEM TO ESCAPE THE FAILING SCHOOLS TO WHICH THEY'VE BEEN RELEGATED BY THE GOVERNMENT AND ATTEND THE SCHOOLS THEIR PARENTS HAVE CHOSEN FOR THEM IJ IS DEFENDING ARIZONA PARENTS AND CHILDREN WHO BENEFIT FROM THE SCHOLARSHIPS, AS WELL AS THE ARIZONA SCHOOL CHOICE TRUST, A SCHOLARSHIP-GRANTING ORGANIZATION ALONG WITH OUR ALLIES, WE ARE ASKING THE COURT TO REVERSE AN UNFAVORABLE NINTH U S CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS DECISION SAYING THE ARIZONA PROGRAM IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL UNDER THE FEDERAL ESTABLISHMENT CLAUSE THE PLAINTIFFS, REPRESENTED BY THE ACLU OF ARIZONA, CLAIM THAT THE STATE, BY GIVING TAXPAYERS THE CHOICE TO DONATE TO BOTH RELIGIOUS AND NONRELIGIOUS SCHOOL TUITION ORGANIZATIONS, IS UNCONSTITUTIONALLY ADVANCING RELIGION BECAUSE MOST TAXPAYERS SO FAR HAVE CHOSEN TO DONATE TO RELIGIOUSLY AFFILIATED SCHOLARSHIP ORGANIZATIONS OUR ARGUMENT IS IN LINE WITH OUR PREVIOUS VICTORY FOR SCHOOL CHOICE AT THE U S SUPREME COURT IN ZELMAN V SIMMONS-HARRIS ARIZONA STRUCTURED ITS TAX CREDIT PROGRAM TO BE COMPLETELY NEUTRAL WITH REGARD TO RELIGION NEITHER TAXPAYERS NOR PARENTS HAVE ANY FINANCIAL INCENTIVE TO DONATE TO A RELIGIOUSLY AFFILIATED SCHOLARSHIP ORGANIZATION OVER A NONRELIGIOUS SCHOLARSHIP ORGANIZATION, OR TO SELECT RELIGIOUS OVER NONRELIGIOUS SCHOOLS CONSISTENT WITH THE UNIQUE APPROACH TO PUBLIC INTEREST LAW THAT WE'VE HONED OVER THE PAST 19 YEARS, THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE IS LITIGATING THIS CASE BOTH IN COURT AND IN THE COURT OF PUBLIC OPINION ALREADY THIS YEAR, WE EARNED A GEORGE F WILL COLUMN, "SLOW LEARNERS AT THE 9TH CIRCUIT", AS WELL AS AN OP-ED BY ONE OF OUR CLIENTS IN THE WASHINGTON TIMES OTHER COVERAGE OF THE CASE INCLUDED THE ASSOCIATED PRESS, LOS ANGELES TIMES, NATIONAL LAW JOURNAL, AND NUMEROUS BLOGS THAT THE COURT'S CLERKS READ, INCLUDING THE VOLOKH CONSPIRACY, SCOTUSBLOG, AND CATO INSTITUTE'S BLOG THE CASE WILL BE ARGUED IN THE FALL OF 2010 AND WE EXPECT A DECISION IN EARLY 2011 MPLS TAXI OWNERS COALITION V CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS, A NEW STAR TAXI, INC INTERVENOR IN THE SUMMER OF 2009 THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE CELEBRATED OUR SECOND FEDERAL APPEALS COURT VICTORY FOR ECONOMIC LIBERTY WHEN THE EIGHTH U S CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AFFIRMED A LOWER COURT RULING PROTECTING IJ-LED REFORMS TO MINNEAPOLIS' TAXI MARKET THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE'S MINNESOTA CHAPTER INTERVENED IN THE CASE IN 2007 ON THE SIDE OF THE CITY OF MINNEAPOLIS TO DEFEND ITS FREE-MARKET REFORMS THAT REMOVED A CAP ON THE NUMBER OF TAXIS ALLOWED TO OPERATE WITHIN CITY LIMITS IN RESPONSE TO THE FREE-MARKET AND CONSUMER-FRIENDLY REFORMS, THE ESTABLISHED TAXICAB CARTEL SUED THE CITY, CLAIMING IT HAD A "RIGHT" TO THE PROFITS IT MADE UNDER THE OLD LAW, WHICH EXCLUDED NEW COMPETITORS FROM THE MARKET IF THE CARTEL'S ARGUMENTS HAD PREVAILED, ANY TIME THE GOVERNMENT SOUGHT TO EASE ENTRY INTO AN OCCUPATION, IT WOULD BE FINANCIALLY LIABLE TO THOSE THAT PROFITED FROM THE ARTIFICIAL BARRIERS ONCE PROTECTING INDUSTRY INSIDERS THE CARTEL APPEALED TO THE U S SUPREME COURT, BUT ITS PETITION WAS DENIED, SO OUR VICTORY STANDS THE DECISION WILL RESONATE BEYOND MINNEAPOLIS AND GIVES US A STRONG POSITION TO CONTINUE ADVANCING THE BALL FOR ECONOMIC LIBERTY ACROSS THE COUNTRY CITY OF LONG BRANCH V BROWER, ET AL AFTER YEARS OF FIGHTING IN COURT AND THE COURT OF PUBLIC OPINION, HOMEOWNERS IN LONG BRANCH, NEW JERSEY'S "MTOTSA" NEIGHBORHOOD ARE FINALLY SAFE IN THEIR HOMES UNDER THE TERMS OF AN ORDER SIGNED IN COURT IN SEPTEMBER 2009 THAT WAS NEGOTIATED FOR MONTHS BY INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE ATTORNEYS, THE CITY MUST DISMISS THE EMINENT DOMAIN ACTIONS FILED AGAINST THE HOMEOWNERS THAT WOULD HAVE RAZED THEIR EXISTING, WELL-MAINTAINED HOMES TO MAKE WAY FOR LUXURY CONDOMINIUMS (MTOTSA IS AN ACRONYM FOR THE STREETS MARINE TERRACE, OCEAN TERRACE AND SEAVIEW AVENUETHE OCEANFRONT NEIGHBORHOOD TARGETED BY THE CITY) IN AUGUST 2008, IJ SECURED A RESOUNDING LEGAL VICTORY IN THE CASE WHEN A THREE-JUDGE PANEL OF THE NEW JERSEY APPELLATE DIVISION UNANIMOUSLY REVERSED THE 2006 DECISION OF SUPERIOR COURT JUDGE LAWRENCE LAWSON, WHICH HAD ALLOWED LONG BRANCH TO CONDEMN THE MTOTSA HOMES AFTER THE CASE WAS SENT BACK TO THE TRIAL COURT, THE CITY ANNOUNCED THAT IT WAS WILLING TO DROP THE EMINENT DOMAIN ACTIONS, SO THE PARTIES BEGAN DISCUSSING HOW TO RESOLVE THE REMAINING ISSUES IN THE CASE, LEADING TO THE AGREEMENT REACHED IN SEPTEMBER 2009 THIS IS A KEY VICTORY FOR HOMEOWNERS IN NEW JERSEY ALTHOUGH 43 OTHER STATES HAVE REFORMED THEIR EMINENT DOMAIN LAWS IN THE WAKE OF THE U S SUPREME COURT'S INFAMOUS DECISION IN KELO V CITY OF NEW LONDON, THE NEW JERSEY LEGISLATURE HAS YET TO ACT NEW JERSEY COURTS, HOWEVER, HAVE STARTED TO REIN IN EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE FOR PRIVATE GAIN AND WE'RE PROUD TO STAND SHOULDER-TO-SHOULDER WITH HOMEOWNERS IN THE STATE TO STRENGTHEN PROPERTY RIGHTS AS THE FOUNDERS INTENDED MCCOMISH V BENNETT IN ANOTHER CASE PRIMED TO GO ALL THE WAY TO THE U S SUPREME COURT, IJ IS CHALLENGING ARIZONA'S SO-CALLED "CLEAN ELECTIONS ACT " WE SEEK TO PROTECT THE RIGHTS OF INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS TO SPEAK FREELY DURING POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS ARIZONA'S SCHEME OF PUBLICLY FINANCING ELECTIONS THREATENS TO DROWN OUT THE VOICES OF INDIVIDUALS AND GROUPS WHO WISH TO SUPPORT PRIVATELY FINANCED CANDIDATES WHO RUN AGAINST TAXPAYER-FUNDED CANDIDATES IF A GROUP MAKES AN INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURE IN FAVOR OF A PRIVATELY FUNDED CANDIDATE, THE UNELECTED BUREAUCRATS AT THE CLEAN ELECTIONS COMMISSION DOLE OUT DOLLAR-FOR-DOLLAR "MATCHING FUNDS" TO THE PUBLICLY FUNDED CANDIDATE THAT MEANS THAT FOR EVERY DOLLAR AN INDIVIDUAL OR GROUP SPENDS TO SUPPORT THE CANDIDATE OF THEIR CHOICE, THE GOVERNMENT PAYS AN EQUAL AMOUNT OF MONEY TO THE POLITICAL COMPETITION THIS CHILLS POLITICAL SPEECH WE ORIGINALLY FILED THE LAWSUIT IN 2004 AND IN THE FALL OF 2008 TEAMED UP WITH THE PHOENIX-BASED GOLDWATER INSTITUTE TO REINVIGORATE OUR CHALLENGE IN JANUARY 2010 A DISTRICT JUDGE ISSUED AN ORDER STRIKING DOWN THE MATCHING FUNDS PROVISION THE STATE APPEALED TO THE NINTH CIRCUIT, AND ASKED THE COURT TO STOP THE DISTRICT COURT'S DECISION FROM TAKING EFFECT THE NINTH CIRCUIT GRANTED BOTH REQUESTS AND ISSUED A UNANIMOUS OPINION REVERSING THE DISTRICT COURT IN MAY 2010 BOTH IJ AND GOLDWATER WILL ASK THE U S SUPREME COURT TO REVIEW THE RULING IN ADDITION, BOTH IJ AND GOLDWATER ASKED THE SUPREME COURT TO PREVENT THE STATE FROM ISSUING MATCHING FUNDS IN THE 2010 ELECTION SEASON, AND, IN A VERY ENCOURAGING MOVE, THE COURT GRANTED THE STAY WE PLAN TO FILE OUR PETITION FOR REVIEW IN AUGUST 2010 OTHER FIRST AMENDMENT CASES SAMPSON V BUESCHER IT TURNS OUT THAT IN AMERICA, CITIZENS NEED MORE THAN JUST AN OPINION TO SPEAK OUT ABOUT POLITICS TODAY, THEY ALSO NEED A LAWYER THE RIGHT TO FREE SPEECH, INCLUDING THE RIGHT TO SPEAK OUT ABOUT WHO SHOULD BE ELECTED TO PUBLIC OFFICE, IS A FUNDAMENTAL AMERICAN RIGHT ESSENTIAL TO DEMOCRATIC DEBATE SO TOO IS THE RIGHT OF INDIVIDUALS TO BAND TOGETHER AND POOL THEIR RESOURCES TO MAKE THEIR ADVOCACY MORE EFFECTIVE SADLY, NEARLY EVERY STATE IN THE NATION STRICTLY REGULATES AND EVEN PUNISHES POLITICAL SPEECH WITH SO-CALLED CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAWS THAT ERECT NEEDLESS BARRIERS IN THIS CASE, WE REPRESENT SIX HOMEOWNERS IN THE DENVER SUBURB OF PARKER NORTH, WHO FIRST LEARNED ABOUT COLORADO'S CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAWS WHEN THEY ORGANIZED TO OPPOSE THE ANNEXATION OF THEIR NEIGHBORHOOD INTO THE ADJACENT TOWN OF PARKER THE GROUP TALKED TO NEIGHBORS, CIRCULATED POSTCARDS, AND PLANTED YARD SIGNS BUT IN COLORADO AND OTHER STATES, WHEN TWO OR MORE PEOPLE SPEND MORE THAN $200 TO SPEAK OUT ABOUT A BALLOT ISSUE, THEY MUST REGISTER WITH THE STATE AS AN "ISSUE COMMITTEE" AND COMPLY WITH RULES AND REGULATIONS THAT RIVAL THE TAX LAWS IN THEIR COMPLEXITY ISSUE COMMITTEES MUST APPOINT A REGISTERED AGENT, OPEN SEPARATE BANK ACCOUNTS, AND DISCLOSE ALL CONTRIBUTIONS AND EXPENDITURES OF MORE THAN $20 FOR SUCH THINGS AS YARD SIGNS AND FLIERS BECAUSE OUR CLIENTS FAILED TO REGISTER WITH THE GOVERNMENT BEFORE SPEAKING, THE PRINCIPAL PROPONENTS OF THE ANNEXATION USED COLORADO'S CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAWS TO SUE THEM

THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE FILED SUIT IN SEPTEMBER 2006 AGAINST THE COLORADO SECRETARY OF STATE, WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR ENFORCING THE STATE'S CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAWS IN SEPTEMBER 2008, THE TRIAL COURT ISSUED A MIXED DECISION THAT ESSENTIALLY AGREED WITH US THAT OUR CLIENTS' FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS WERE VIOLATED, BUT FAILED TO STRIKE DOWN THE LAWS WE CHALLENGED THE COURT CONCLUDED THAT THE STATE LAWS DO NOT APPLY TO ANNEXATION ELECTIONS UNTIL A NOTICE OF ELECTION IS PUBLISHED IJ APPEALED THE DECISION TO THE TENTH U S CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS ORAL ARGUMENT WAS HELD IN NOVEMBER 2009 AND WE ARE WAITING FOR THE DECISION

Identifier	Return Reference	Explanation
		INDEPENDENCE INSTITUTE V BUESCHER THIS CASE WAS ANOTHER FIRST AMENDMENT CHALLENGE TO CAMPAIGN FINANCE LAWS AS THEY APPLY TO BALLOT INITIATIVE CAMPAIGNS IN COLORADO SPECIFICALLY, THE CASE DEALT WITH WHETHER THE GOVERNMENT COULD FORCE NONPROFIT GROUPS THAT ONLY OCCASIONALLY COMMENT ON BALLOT ISSUES TO REGISTER WITH THE STATE AND REPORT AS "ISSUE COMMITTEES " UNFORTUNATELY, WE LOST AT BOTH THE STATE TRIAL COURT AND THE INTERMEDIATE COURT OF APPEALS THE COURT OF APPEALS ENTIRELY IGNORED A VERY FAVORABLE DECISION FROM THE FEDERAL COURT OF APPEALS, WHICH RULED THAT A SIMILAR DEFINITION OF "POLITICAL COMMITTEE," WHICH USED THE PHRASE "A MAJOR PURPOSE" RATHER THAN "THE MAJOR PURPOSE," WAS UNCONSTITUTIONALLY VAGUE AND OVERBROAD THE COLORADO SUPREME COURT DENIED OUR PETITION FOR CERTIORARI, SO IN AUGUST 2009 WE FILED A PETITION FOR CERTIORARI WITH THE U S SUPREME COURT THE SUPREME COURT DENIED THE PETITION, SO THIS CASE IS OVER HOWEVER, WE HAVE THE SAMPSON V BUESCHER CASE DESCRIBED ABOVE PENDING BEFORE THE TENTH CIRCUIT, AND A FAVORABLE RULING IN THAT CASE WOULD GIVE US ALL THE RELIEF WE SOUGHT IN THIS CASE AND MORE MANY CULTURES, ONE MESSAGE V CLEMENTS IN WASHINGTON STATE, WE REPRESENT TWO ORGANIZATIONS WITH DIVERSE POLICY CONCERNS-MANY CULTURES, ONE MESSAGE AND CONSERVATIVE ENTHUSIASTS-EACH FACING THE DILEMMA OF REGISTERING WITH THE GOVERNMENT OR HALTING THEIR EFFORTS TO URGE THEIR FELLOW WASHINGTONIANS INTO POLITICAL ACTION IF ONE OF OUR CLIENTS, PAT MURAKAMI, SPENDS ABOVE A SMALL, STATE-IMPOSED CAP TO URGE HER FELLOW CITIZENS TO CONTACT GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, SHE IS FORCED TO REGISTER WITH THE GOVERNMENT AND REPORT DETAILED PERSONAL INFORMATION ABOUT HERSELF, HER GROUP, AND THE PEOPLE WHO SUPPORT HER IN OTHER WORDS, IF OUR CLIENTS SPEAK TOO MUCH ABOUT POLITICS, THE GOVERNMENT WANTS TO KNOW ABOUT IT MOREOVER, THE STATE DOES NOT MERELY COLLECT THIS INFORMATION, IT MAKES IT AVAILABLE TO ANYONE WITH ACCESS TO THE INTERNET PEOPLES NAMES, ADDRESSES, BUSINESSES, AND OCCUPATIONS ARE PROVIDED TO THE WORLD BECAUSE THEY DARED TO EXERCISE THEIR FUNDAMENTAL FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS INCREASINGLY, AMERICANS IN THE 36 STATES THAT HAVE SIMILAR RULES DECIDE THE RISK AND BURDEN ARE TOO GREAT, AND THE SAFER THING TO DO IS AVOID SPEAKING ALTOGETHER THAT IS WHY PAT AND THE REST OF OUR CLIENTS JOINED WITH THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE TO FILE THIS LEGAL CHALLENGE IN APRIL 2010

SPEECHNOW ORG V FEC IJ AND THE CENTER FOR COMPETITIVE POLITICS CELEBRATED A MAJOR VICTORY THIS SPRING REINING IN FEDERAL CAMPAIGN FINANCE REGULATION IN SPEECHNOW ORG V FEC IN THIS CASE, WE REPRESENT INDIVIDUALS WHO FORMED SPEECHNOW ORG TO ADVOCATE FOR OR AGAINST THE ELECTION OF FEDERAL CANDIDATES BASED ON THE CANDIDATES' STAND ON POLITICAL SPEECH UNDER FEDERAL LAW, HOWEVER, SPEECHNOW ORG WAS REQUIRED TO REGISTER AS A "POLITICAL COMMITTEE", SUBJECT TO GOVERNMENT REGULATION AND LIMITS, SIMPLY TO SPEAK SUCH A LAW MAKES IT VIRTUALLY IMPOSSIBLE FOR OUTSIDERS TO HAVE A SAY IN POLITICS AT A TIME WHEN IT IS VITALLY IMPORTANT THESE VOICES ARE HEARD IN MARCH, THE COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE D C CIRCUIT STRUCK DOWN GOVERNMENT-IMPOSED RESTRICTIONS ON PARTICIPATION IN POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS, AND RULED-UNANIMOUSLY-THAT LIMITING THE AMOUNT OF MONEY SPEECHNOW ORG COULD RAISE FROM ITS DONORS VIOLATED THE FIRST AMENDMENT UNFORTUNATELY, THE COURT ALSO UPHELD THE REQUIREMENT THAT SPEECHNOW ORG BECOME A PAC IN ORDER TO OPERATE AND MAKE INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURES OUR CLIENTS AUTHORIZED US TO FILE A PETITION FOR REVIEW BY THE U S SUPREME COURT ON THE PORTION OF THE CASE THAT WE LOST IN THE D C CIRCUIT (THE CHALLENGE TO POLITICAL COMMITTEE REQUIREMENTS) WE WILL FILE THE PETITION IN EARLY JULY REGARDLESS, THE VICTORY WE ACHIEVED IN MARCH CLEARS THE WAY FOR COUNTLESS SIMILAR ORGANIZATIONS TO FORM AND SPEAK OUT IN THE 2010 ELECTIONS NEIGHBORHOOD ENTERPRISES V CITY OF ST LOUIS IN A DOUBLE BLOW TO FREE SPEECH AND PROPERTY RIGHTS, THE CITY OF ST LOUIS IS NOT ONLY THREATENING TO TAKE AN ENTIRE NEIGHBORHOOD FOR PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT, BUT IT WANTS TO CENSOR A POWERFUL AND HIGHLY VISIBLE MURAL THAT WAS PUT UP TO PROTEST THE CITY'S EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE AND BUILD SUPPORT FOR REFORM FED UP WITH EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE ACROSS MISSOURI-AND AGAINST PROPERTIES HE OWNS AND MANAGES-JIM ROOS FOUGHT BACK HE HAD A LARGE MURAL PAINTED ON HIS BUILDING AT 1806 S 13TH STREET, IN A NEIGHBORHOOD TARGETED FOR REDEVELOPMENT THE MURAL PROTESTS THE CITY'S ABUSE AND ADVOCATES FOR STATEWIDE EMINENT DOMAIN REFORM BUT THE CITY OF ST LOUIS WANTS THE MURAL TAKEN DOWN IJ ARGUES THAT IF THE FIRST AMENDMENT MEANS ANYTHING, IT MUST MEAN THAT CITIZENS LIKE JIM ROOS HAVE THE RIGHT TO EFFECTIVELY PROTEST GOVERNMENT ABUSE AND BUILD SUPPORT FOR MEANINGFUL REFORM-WITHOUT HAVING TO GET GOVERNMENT APPROVAL IN AUGUST 2008, A THREE-JUDGE PANEL OF THE EIGHTH U S CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS REJECTED THE AGENCY'S BIZARRE CLAIM THAT IT COULD NOT BE SUED FOR VIOLATING FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS BECAUSE IT HAD NO BUSINESS REGULATING SUCH SIGNS IN THE FIRST PLACE THE RULING CLEARED THE WAY FOR A FREE SPEECH LAWSUIT CHALLENGING THE ATTEMPTED CENSORSHIP TO PROCEED BEFORE THE U S DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, WHERE A SIMILAR CHALLENGE TO THE CITY'S EFFORT TO TAKE DOWN THE MURAL IS PENDING IN MARCH 2010, THE DISTRICT COURT GRANTED THE CITY AND BOARD'S REQUEST FOR "SUMMARY JUDGMENT" AND DENIED OURS WE HAVE APPEALED TO THE EIGHTH U S CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS AND FILED OUR OPENING BRIEF THIS MONTH ROYALL V MAIN, ET AL THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE REPRESENTS AUTHOR CARLA MAIN AND PUBLISHER ENCOUNTER FOR CULTURE AND EDUCATION IN THEIR DEFENSE OF A DEFAMATION ACTION FILED BY DALLAS-BASED DEVELOPER H WALKER ROYALL OVER THE CONTENTS OF MAIN'S BOOK, BULLDOZED "KELO," EMINENT DOMAIN, AND THE AMERICAN LUST FOR LAND MAIN WROTE BULLDOZED TO DOCUMENT A CASE OF EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE IN FREEPORT, TEXAS ROYALL WAS INVOLVED IN A DEAL WITH THE CITY TO TAKE LAND FROM THE GORE FAMILY, WHICH HAS OWNED A SHRIMP AND MARINE SUPPLY BUSINESS IN THE TOWN FOR GENERATIONS, AND GIVE IT TO ROYALL FOR A LUXURY MARINA DEVELOPMENT PROJECT ROYALL RESPONDED TO MAIN'S BOOK BY SUING HER AND HER PUBLISHER HE ALSO SUED LAW PROFESSOR RICHARD EPSTEIN OVER A BLURB ON THE BACK COVER IN MARCH 2009, WE WON THE DISMISSAL OF PROFESSOR EPSTEIN FROM THE LAWSUIT WE THEN FILED FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, WHICH WAS DENIED IN DECEMBER 2009 WE APPEALED THE DENIAL TWO MEMBERS FROM OUR NETWORK OF IJ-TRAINED PRO-BONO ATTORNEYS ARE WRITING AMICUS BRIEFS IN THE APPELLATE COURT-THE PURPOSE OF BOTH IS TO MOTIVATE THE APPELLATE COURT TO GRAPPLE WITH THE LEGAL ISSUES OF THE CASE APPELLATE BRIEFING WILL BE COMPLETED IN JULY 2010 AND WE EXPECT ORAL ARGUMENT IN THE FALL GILLILAND, ET AL V CITY OF DALLAS THIS IS A CHALLENGE TO THE CITY OF DALLAS' BAN ON VIRTUALLY ALL COMMERCIAL WINDOW SIGNAGE ANY SIGNS IN THE UPPER TWO-THIRDS OF ANY WINDOW, AND ALL SIGNS THAT COVER MORE THAN 15 PERCENT OF ANY WINDOW ARE FORBIDDEN THIS RESTRICTION HAS NO HEALTH OR SAFETY JUSTIFICATION, BUT UNNECESSARILY STIFLES THE ABILITY OF MANY SMALL BUSINESSES TO ATTRACT NEW AND EVEN RETURNING CUSTOMERS THIS CENSORSHIP FALLS HARDEST ON SMALL BUSINESSES FOR WHOM RETAIL SIGNS ARE THE MOST COST-EFFECTIVE WAY-AND OFTEN THE ONLY WAY-TO REACH CUSTOMERS WITH NEWS ABOUT PRODUCTS, SERVICES, AND SPECIALS SO THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE FILED A LAWSUIT IN NOVEMBER 2009 CHALLENGING THE ORDINANCE AS A VIOLATION OF BUSINESSES' FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO COMMUNICATE TRUTHFUL INFORMATION TO CONSUMERS IN ORDER TO KEEP UP THE MOMENTUM IN THE CASE, WE HELD AN ACTIVISM DAY IN FEBRUARY IN WHICH MORE THAN 200 LOCAL BUSINESSES DISPLAYED A PROTEST SIGN IN THEIR WINDOWS THE ONLY REASON THESE BUSINESSES WERE ALLOWED TO DISPLAY THE SIGN IS BECAUSE IT WAS POLITICAL SPEECH, NOT COMMERCIAL WE USED A 52-SECOND VIDEO (LOCATED HERE HTTP //WWW IJ ORG/3095) TO GENERATE INTEREST (THE VIDEO WAS THE #2 MOST-VIEWED VIDEO ON YOUTUBE IN THE NONPROFIT CATEGORY DURING ITS FIRST WEEK OF RELEASE) THE PROTEST WAS COVERED BY THE MAJOR TV AND PRINT OUTLETS IN DALLAS (FOX, NBC, ABC, UNIVISION, THE CW, DALLAS MORNING NEWS, DALLAS OBSERVER, KRLD AM RADIO) AS WELL AS NATIONAL OUTLETS LIKE REASON COM, BIGGOVERNMENT COM, AND INSTAPUNDIT IN MAY, THE CITY FILED A MOTION TO SEEK $1,000 PER DAY IN CIVIL PENALTIES AGAINST OUR CLIENTS WHILE THE CASE IS ONGOING THIS GAVE US THE JUSTIFICATION WE NEEDED TO SEEK A "PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION" RULING FROM THE COURT PROHIBITING ENFORCEMENT OF THE LAW WHILE THE CASE PROCEEDS BRIEFING ON THE PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION WILL BE COMPLETED NEXT MONTH KALISH V MILLIKEN IN LATE 2008, THE VIRGINIA AGENCY IN CHARGE OF HIGHER EDUCATION DECIDED THAT YOGA-TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS (COURSES THAT INSTRUCT STUDENTS ON HOW TO THEMSELVES TEACH YOGA CLASSES) FELL WITHIN ITS JURISDICTION THERE HAD BEEN NO COMPLAINTS OF FRAUD OR PHYSICAL INJURY, THE AGENCY SIMPLY REALIZED THAT IT COULD REGULATE THIS ACTIVITY UNDER ITS STATUTE, SO IT CHOSE TO ACT THE AGENCY SENT OUT A NUMBER OF LETTERS TELLING PROGRAMS THAT THEY HAD TO EITHER REGISTER WITH THE STATE OR SHUT DOWN REGISTRATION IS VERY EXPENSIVE AND TIME CONSUMING STUDIOS WOULD HAVE TO PAY AN INITIAL $2,500 APPLICATION FEE, ANNUAL DUES THAT RANGE FROM $500 TO $2,500, AND FILL OUT DOZENS OF HOURS OF PAPERWORK THE YOGA PROGRAMS WOULD ALSO NEED TO CONVINCE THE REGULATORS THAT THEIR CURRICULUM IS OF SUFFICIENT "QUALITY " IMPOSING THESE HIGH FEES AND HEAVY BURDENS WOULD FORCE MANY SCHOOLS TO SHUT DOWN, PARTICULARLY BECAUSE MOST OF THEM TEACH ONLY A FEW DOZEN STUDENTS EACH YEAR THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE CHALLENGED THESE REGULATIONS AS UNCONSTITUTIONAL RESTRICTIONS ON FREE SPEECH AND ECONOMIC LIBERTY THE THEORY BEHIND THE CASE IS SIMPLE TEACHING IS SPEECH BETWEEN AN INSTRUCTOR AND HER STUDENTS UNDER THE FIRST AMENDMENT, THE GOVERNMENT CAN NO MORE FORCE YOGA TEACHERS TO GET PERMISSION TO SPEAK THAN IT CAN REQUIRE WRITERS TO GET PERMISSION BEFORE PUBLISHING A BOOK OUR VIDEO DESCRIBING THE CASE (WWW IJ ORG/2997) HELPED US GENERATE SIGNIFICANT NATIONAL MEDIA ATTENTION INCLUDING EDITORIALS IN THE WASHINGTON POST, LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL, AND THE RICHMOND TIMES-DISPATCH, THE LARGEST PAPER IN VIRGINIA THIS VIDEO HAS BEEN SO SUCCESSFUL IT WON THREE HONORS ON YOUTUBE IN ITS FIRST WEEK IN RESPONSE TO OUR LAWSUIT AND THE ATTENTION IT GENERATED, IN THE SPRING OF 2010 THE VIRGINIA LEGISLATURE PASSED A LAW THAT EXEMPTS YOGA-INSTRUCTOR AND SIMILAR PROGRAMS FROM THE LAW WE VERIFIED THAT OUR CLIENTS WOULD BE PROTECTED UNTIL THE LAW CAME INTO EFFECT AND THEN VOLUNTARILY DISMISSED THE CASE TAIT V CITY OF PHILADELPHIA IN THIS CASE, IJ REPRESENTS THREE PHILADELPHIA TOUR GUIDES IN A CHALLENGE TO A CITY ORDINANCE THAT MAKES IT ILLEGAL TO GIVE TOURS OF THE CITY WITHOUT FIRST PASSING A TEST AND OBTAINING A LICENSE-IN OTHER WORDS, MAKING IT ILLEGAL TO TALK ABOUT THE LIBERTY BELL WITHOUT FIRST GETTING THE GOVERNMENT'S PERMISSION AT TRIAL, THE CITY MADE A STRENUOUS EFFORT TO PERSUADE THE JUDGE TO DISMISS THE CASE AS NO LONGER "RIPE" FOR ADJUDICATION, ON THE GROUNDS THAT THE CITY'S FINANCIAL-CRISIS-DRIVEN BUDGET PROBLEMS MEANT THAT IT WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO ENFORCE THE LAW ANYTIME IN THE NEAR FUTURE (EVEN THOUGH IT ABSOLUTELY INTENDS TO ENFORCE THE LAW AT SOME POINT) THE JUDGE AGREED WITH THEM, DISMISSING THE CASE IN AUGUST 2009 WE APPEALED THE DECISION AND COMPLETED BRIEFING IN MARCH 2010 WE EXPECT ORAL ARGUMENT BY EARLY 2011 OTHER PROPERTY RIGHTS CASES BRODY V PORT CHESTER AFTER NEARLY NINE YEARS, THIS CASE IS FINALLY FINISHED IN JUNE 2009, WE NEGOTIATED A FAVORABLE SETTLEMENT ON BEHALF OF OUR CLIENT, LOCAL BUSINESSMAN WILLIAM BRODY, WITH THE VILLAGE OF PORT CHESTER, NEW YORK, IN THE WAKE OF OUR 2008 FEDERAL COURT VICTORY BRODY AND IJ HAD BEEN ENGAGED IN THE NEARLY DECADE-LONG EMINENT DOMAIN BATTLE WITH THE VILLAGE, WHICH TOOK BRODY'S PROPERTY FOR A PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT PROJECT BRODY FILED A FEDERAL LAWSUIT CHALLENGING THE CONDEMNATION IN 2000, AND, FINALLY LAST YEAR, JUDGE HAROLD BAER, JR , OF THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK ISSUED AN OPINION FINDING THAT THE CONDEMNATION VIOLATED BRODY'S RIGHT TO DUE PROCESS UNFORTUNATELY, THAT DECISION CAME TOO LATE TO SAVE BRODY'S BUILDING, BUT IN CLASSIC IJ FASHION THE BRODY LITIGATION HAS HAD WIDE-RANGING EFFECTS AROUND THE COUNTRY COURTS IN BOTH NEW JERSEY AND HAWAII HAVE RELIED ON THE CASE TO REQUIRE GREATER PROTECTIONS FOR PROPERTY OWNERS WHO ARE THREATENED WITH EMINENT DOMAIN, INVALIDATING LEGAL REGIMES THAT MADE IT HARDER FOR PEOPLE TO PROTECT THEIR RIGHTS THE CASE HAS GENERATED OPINIONS THAT HAVE BEEN CITED IN CASES AND LEGAL TREATISES NATIONWIDE THROUGH THIS CASE, IJ DEMONSTRATED TIME AND TIME AGAIN THAT IF CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS ARE GOING TO MEAN ANYTHING, PEOPLE MUST HAVE A MEANINGFUL OPPORTUNITY TO CHALLENGE THE GOVERNMENT'S ACTIONS IN COURT PORT CHESTER NOW HAS SATISFIED EVERY CONDITION OF THE AGREEMENT, INCLUDING ISSUING A FULL PUBLIC APOLOGY TO BRODY FOR VIOLATING HIS RIGHTS AND RENAMING A NEARBY STREET CORNER "WILLIAM BRODY PLAZA" IN HONOR OF HIS LONG FIGHT TO PRESERVE HIS (AND OTHER PROPERTY OWNERS') CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS THE CASE IS NOW CLOSED COMMUNITY YOUTH CENTER V CITY OF NATIONAL CITY, ET AL IN THIS CASE, WE ARE SUING THE CITY OF NATIONAL CITY, CALIFORNIA, ON BEHALF OF THE COMMUNITY ATHLETIC CENTER (CYAC), A SAFE HAVEN THAT PROVIDES AFTER-SCHOOL BOXING LESSONS FOR AT-RISK CHILDREN THAT IS BEING THREATENED BY EMINENT DOMAIN ABUSE SO THAT A PRIVATE DEVELOPER CAN TEAR DOWN THE FACILITY TO MAKE WAY FOR LUXURY CONDOS CALIFORNIA REDEVELOPMENT AGENCIES ARE AMONG THE WORST ABUSERS OF EMINENT DOMAIN FOR PRIVATE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS A WIN FOR OUR CLIENTS WOULD BE AN ENORMOUS VICTORY FOR ALL CALIFORNIANS TRIAL IS SCHEDULED FOR NOVEMBER 4, 2010 MCCAUGHTRY V CITY OF RED WING (FORMERLY STEWART, ET AL V CITY OF RED WING) IN DECEMBER 2009, IJ'S CLIENTS AND ATTORNEYS CELEBRATED A VICTORY IN THE CITY OF RED WING, MINNESOTA, WHEN A STATE COURT DENIED THE CITY'S THIRD ATTEMPT TO RECEIVE JUDICIAL APPROVAL FOR ITS INSPECTION PROGRAM THAT REQUIRES LANDLORDS AND TENANTS TO OPEN THEIR DOORS AND SUBMIT TO INSPECTIONS OF THEIR PRIVATE PROPERTY IN ORDER FOR THE LANDLORD TO RECEIVE A LICENSE TO RENT THE PROPERTY THIS RULING VINDICATES WHAT WE'VE KNOWN ALL ALONGINSPECTION PROGRAMS LIKE RED WINGS THAT AUTHORIZE INVASIVE SEARCHES AND LACK BASIC MEANS OF ENSURING PEOPLES PRIVACY ARE UNCONSTITUTIONAL SINCE NOVEMBER 2006, THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE MINNESOTA CHAPTER HAS REPRESENTED TENANTS AND LANDLORDS IN LITIGATION AGAINST THE CITY OF RED WING IN BOTH STATE AND FEDERAL COURTS UNFORTUNATELY, THE COURT IN ITS RULING ALSO DISMISSED OUR LAWSUIT ON STANDING GROUNDS THE COURT CONCLUDED THAT THERE WAS NO "IMMINENT INJURY" OF AN INVASIVE SEARCH UNTIL A WARRANT WAS ACTUALLY GRANTED BECAUSE THE ADMINISTRATIVE WARRANT PROCESS ENSURES THAT SEARCHES WILL NOT BE UNCONSTITUTIONAL THE COURT DID STRONGLY IMPLY, HOWEVER, THAT, WERE IT ABLE TO REACH THE MERITS OF OUR CLAIMS, IT WOULD RULE IN OUR FAVOR WE APPEALED THE RULING, FULLY BRIEFED IT, AND INVITED THE MINNESOTA COURT OF APPEALS TO ADDRESS BOTH THE STANDING ISSUE AND THE MERITS OF OUR CONSTITUTIONAL CLAIMS THE COURT OF APPEALS WILL HEAR THE CASE ON JULY 21, 2010 METROPOLITAN DEVELOPMENT AND HOUSING AUTHORITY V JOY FORD IN JUNE 2008, NASHVILLE'S REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY ("MDHA" AS ABOVE) FILED AN EMINENT DOMAIN ACTION AGAINST JOY FORD TO OBTAIN HER ENTIRE PARCEL OF LAND, INCLUDING THE BUILDING HOUSING HER FAMILYS DECADES-OLD MUSIC BUSINESS, COUNTRY INTERNATIONAL RECORDS, SO THAT IT COULD BE GIVEN TO A HOUSTON-BASED PRIVATE DEVELOPER TO CONSTRUCT AN OFFICE BUILDING THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE CHALLENGED THE CONDEMNATION UNDER PRESSURE, MDHA DROPPED ITS EMINENT DOMAIN SUIT AGAINST FORDS BUILDING BUT DEMANDED THAT SHE SETTLE BY GIVING UP VIRTUALLY THE ENTIRE BACK PORTION OF HER LONG NARROW PARCEL OF PROPERTY FORD REJECTED THIS DEMAND, BUT CAME UP WITH AN ALTERNATIVE PROPOSAL SHE WOULD EXCHANGE A PORTION OF THE BACK OF HER PROPERTY FOR MORE ACCESSIBLE LAND ON THE EAST SIDE OF HER BUILDING THAT WAS OWNED BY THE DEVELOPER AFTER WEEKS OF INTENSE NEGOTIATIONS, THE DEVELOPER AGREED TO THE PROPOSAL THE AGREEMENT IS SOLELY A SWAP OF LAND, AND FORD WILL NOT ONLY GET BETTER AND MORE ACCESSIBLE LAND, BUT EVEN MORE SQUARE FEET OF LAND NEXT TO HER BUILDING NO MONEY WAS EXCHANGED AND THE GOVERNMENT DID NOT PARTICIPATE IN THE NEGOTIATIONS, DEMONSTRATING WHAT CAN HAPPEN IN DEVELOPMENT SITUATIONS WHEN GOVERNMENTS STAY OUT OF THE WAY FINAL PAPERWORK EFFECTUATING THE LAND SWAP WAS FINALIZED IN AUGUST 2009 JOY FORD IS ELATED WITH THE AGREEMENT AS SHE SAID FROM THE BEGINNING OF THIS CONTROVERSY, HER BATTLE WAS NEVER ABOUT MONEY IT WAS ABOUT PROTECTING HER RIGHTS AND KEEPING HER FAMILY'S LEGACY ON MUSIC ROW NOW JOY WILL HAVE A BETTER AND MORE ACCESSIBLE PARKING AREA FOR HER CLIENTS' CARS, TRUCKS, AND BUSES WHEN THEY VISIT COUNTRY INTERNATIONAL TEXAS CIVIL FORFEITURE THIS SPRING WE LAUNCHED A NEW NATIONWIDE CAMPAIGN TO REIN IN A GROWING THREAT TO PRIVATE PROPERTY RIGHTS IN THIS COUNTRY CIVIL ASSET FORFEITURE ABUSE CIVIL FORFEITURE LAWS ALLOW THE POLICE TO SEIZE ANY AMERICAN'S HOME, CAR, CASH, OR OTHER PROPERTY UPON THE MERE SUSPICION THAT IT HAS BEEN INVOLVED IN CRIMINAL ACTIVITY PERHAPS AN OFFICER THINKS THAT YOUR TRAVEL PATTERN IS "SUSPICIOUS" OR THAT YOU ARE CARRYING A LARGER-THAN-NORMAL AMOUNT OF CASH POLICE CAN ACCUSE YOU OF SELLING DRUGS OR LAUNDERING MONEY AND SEIZE YOUR PROPERTY-NO CONVICTION OR EVEN ARREST REQUIRED NOT SURPRISINGLY, ABUSE IS RAMPANT OUR FIRST LAWSUIT IS IN TEXAS, WHICH HAS SOME OF THE WORST CIVIL FORFEITURE LAWS IN THE COUNTRY OUR CLIENT IS HOUSTON SMALL BUSINESSMAN ZAHER EL-ALI, WHO SOLD A TRUCK TO A MAN WHO PAID HIM ON CREDIT, BUT ALI HELD THE TITLE TO THE CAR UNTIL HE WAS PAID IN FULL THE PURCHASER WAS FOUND GUILTY OF DRIVING WHILE INTOXICATED IN JULY 2009, AND TEXAS POLICE SEIZED THE CAR AND FILED A CIVIL FORFEITURE ACTION STATE OF TEXAS V ONE 2004 CHEVROLET SILVERADO EVEN THOUGH ALI STILL HOLDS THE TITLE TO THE CAR AND HAS NEVER BEEN ACCUSED OF BREAKING ANY LAWS, HE IS REQUIRED TO PETITION THE COURT TO GET HIS TRUCK BACK IN THE COURT PROCEEDINGS, THE BURDEN IS ON HIM, NOT THE GOVERNMENT, TO TRY TO GET HIS RIGHTFULLY OWNED PROPERTY BACK, BECAUSE WITH CIVIL FORFEITURE, YOUR PROPERTY IS GUILTY UNTIL YOU CAN PROVE IT INNOCENT WE FILED OUR LEGAL CHALLENGE IN APRIL 2010 AND CURRENTLY ARE NEGOTIATING WITH THE DISTRICT ATTORNEYS OFFICE ON A NEW SCHEDULING ORDER IN THE CASE

Identifier	Return Reference	Explanation
		OTHER ECONOMIC LIBERTY CASES BERGMANN V CITY OF LAKE ELMO IN THIS CASE, THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE IS CHALLENGING A BAN PREVENTING FARMERS IN LAKE ELMO, MINNESOTA, FROM SELLING AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS THAT ARE NOT GROWN IN LAKE ELMO IT HAS LONG BEEN UNDERSTOOD THAT A STATE OR LOCAL LAW THAT ALLOWS SALES OF LOCAL GOODS BUT FORBIDS OUT-OF-STATE OR OUT-OF-TOWN GOODS IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL THE CITY JUSTIFIES THE RESTRICTION BY ARGUING THAT THIS IS A LAND-USE ISSUE, NOT A CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUE OUR RESPONSE IS THAT DISCRIMINATION IS DISCRIMINATION, EVEN IF THE GOVERNMENT ATTEMPTS TO WRAP IT INSIDE A ZONING LAW OUR CLIENTS ARE THE BERGMANN FAMILY AND THREE OUT-OF-STATE FARMERS THE BERGMANNS HAVE SOLD NON-LAKE ELMO PUMPKINS AND CHRISTMAS TREES, INCLUDING PUMPKINS THEY GROW ON LAND THEY OWN IN WISCONSIN, FROM THEIR FARM FOR OVER 25 YEARS THE OUT-OF-STATE FARMERS ARE FROM NORTH CAROLINA, NEBRASKA, AND WISCONSIN THEY SELL THE BERGMANNS PUMPKINS AND CHRISTMAS TREES, WHICH ARE THEN RESOLD TO THE PUBLIC WE FILED THE CASE IN MAY 2010 AND RECEIVED A FLOOD OF MEDIA COVERAGE, INCLUDING OP-EDS AND NEWS STORIES IN THE MINNEAPOLIS STAR TRIBUNE AND ST PAUL PIONEER PRESS, A STORY IN THE MILWAUKEE JOURNAL SENTINEL, COVERAGE ON THE LOCAL NBC AND ABC AFFILIATES, AND POSTS ONLINE ON, AMONG OTHER OUTLETS, NATIONAL REVIEW'S "THE CORNER" AND REASON'S "HIT AND RUN " THE DISTRICT COURT HAS SET A HEARING FOR JULY 2010, DURING WHICH WE WILL ASK THE COURT TO FIND THAT WE LIKELY WILL PREVAIL ON OUR CLAIM THAT THE BAN ON SELLING NON-LAKE ELMO GOODS VIOLATES THE CONSTITUTION AND THAT OUR CLIENTS SHOULD BE ALLOWED TO SELL NON-LAKE ELMO PUMPKINS AND CHRISTMAS TREES WHILE THE CASE IS PENDING BHANDARI V NILSESTUEN IN THIS CASE, IJ SEEKS TO VINDICATE THE RIGHTS OF RAJ BHANDARI, A GAS STATION OWNER IN MERRILL, WISCONSIN, WHO FOUND HIMSELF FACING POSSIBLY THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS IN FINES FOR THE CRIME OF OFFERING DISCOUNTS ON GASOLINE-A VIOLATION OF THE STATE'S MINIMUM-MARKUP LAW, WHICH REQUIRES THAT RETAIL GASOLINE BE SOLD FOR AT LEAST 9 18 PERCENT OVER THE LOCAL AVERAGE WHOLESALE COST NOT LONG AFTER AN UNFAVORABLE DECISION FROM THE TRIAL COURT IN THIS CASE, A FEDERAL TRIAL COURT IN ANOTHER CASE ISSUED A VERY WELL-REASONED OPINION ENJOINING THE STATE FROM ENFORCING THE RELEVANT PROVISIONS OF THE LAW ON FEDERAL ANTITRUST GROUNDS WE HAVE FILED AN APPEAL OF THE STATE DECISION, BUT THAT APPEAL IS CURRENTLY STAYED WHILE WE SEE WHETHER THE FEDERAL INJUNCTION IS OVERTURNED BY A HIGHER COURT BROWN, ET AL V HOVATTER, ET AL IN THIS CASE WE CHALLENGED A MARYLAND LAW THAT ALLOWS ONLY STATE-LICENSED MORTICIANS TO OWN FUNERAL HOMES AND GENERALLY FORBIDS FUNERAL HOMES FROM BEING OWNED AS CORPORATIONS DESPITE A DISTRICT COURT RULING DESCRIBING IT AS THE "MOST BLATANTLY ANTI-COMPETITIVE STATE FUNERAL REGULATION IN THE NATION," THE FOURTH U S CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS REVERSED THE RULING THE U S SUPREME COURT DECLINED TO REVIEW THE FOURTH CIRCUIT'S RULING EVEN THOUGH IT WAS IN DIRECT CONFLICT WITH SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT AND WITH CASE LAW IN SEVERAL OTHER CIRCUITS WHILE THE CASE IS OVER, IT APPEARS THAT AT LEAST SOME OF OUR CLIENTS MAY TRY AGAIN TO PERSUADE THE STATE LEGISLATURE TO REPEAL THE LAW CLEMENS V MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF VETERINARY MEDICAL EXAMINERS IN JUNE 2008 THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE FILED SUIT ON BEHALF OF MERCEDES CLEMENS, A MARYLAND RESIDENT WHO PRACTICES MASSAGE ON BOTH HUMANS AND ANIMALS IN FEBRUARY 2008, CLEMENS WAS CONTACTED BY THE MARYLAND BOARD OF CHIROPRACTIC EXAMINERS-THE BOARD THAT LICENSES MASSAGE THERAPISTS WHO WORK ON HUMANS-AND THE MARYLAND STATE BOARD OF VETERINARY MEDICAL EXAMINERS ALTHOUGH CLEMENS HAS SPECIALIZED TRAINING IN ANIMAL MASSAGE AND IS A LICENSED MASSAGE THERAPIST, THESE BOARDS CONSIDER ANIMAL MASSAGE TO BE "THE PRACTICE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE " UNLESS CLEMENS RESTRICTS HER PRACTICE TO MASSAGING HUMANS, THE BOARDS THREATENED TO REVOKE HER MASSAGE-THERAPIST LICENSE AND CHARGE HER WITH THE UNLICENSED PRACTICE OF VETERINARY MEDICINE, WHICH COULD SUBJECT HER TO THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS IN FINES A LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE VETERINARY BOARD EVEN THREATENED NON-VETERINARIANS WHO PRACTICE ANIMAL MASSAGE WITH CRIMINAL PROSECUTION ANIMAL MASSAGE IS SAFE AND INVOLVES NO INVASIVE PROCEDURES OR MEDICATION THE HANDS-ON TRAINING REQUIRED TO LEARN THE OCCUPATION CAN BE ACQUIRED IN A SHORT TIME AT ONE OF THE MANY PRIVATE SCHOOLS THAT TEACH ANIMAL MASSAGE, WITHOUT ATTENDING FOUR YEARS OF VETERINARY SCHOOL AND TAKING ON APPROXIMATELY $150,000 IN EDUCATIONAL DEBT OUR SUIT CHALLENGES THESE REQUIREMENTS UNDER THE DUE PROCESS, EQUAL PROTECTION, AND ANTI-MONOPOLY PROVISIONS OF THE MARYLAND CONSTITUTION AT ORAL ARGUMENT ON JULY 30, 2009, JUDGE DAVID BOYNTON OF THE MONTGOMERY COUNTY CIRCUIT COURT RULED THAT THE CHIROPRACTIC BOARD HAD NO AUTHORITY OVER THE PRACTICE OF ANIMAL MASSAGE AND HAD ACTED ILLEGALLY IN SHUTTING DOWN MS CLEMENS' BUSINESS THANKS TO THIS RULING, MS CLEMENS HAS BEGUN REBUILDING HER PRACTICE AND RECONNECTING WITH HER FORMER CLIENTS

CHAUVIN V STRAIN IN PERHAPS THE MOST ARBITRARY EXAMPLE OF OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING, THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE THIS YEAR DISMANTLED LOUISIANA'S ONLY-IN-THE-NATION LAW REQUIRING LICENSURE OF FLORISTS PRIOR TO IJ'S INVOLVEMENT, THE STATE REQUIRED ASPIRING FLORISTS TO PASS BOTH A WRITTEN EXAM AND A HIGHLY SUBJECTIVE DEMONSTRATION EXAM GRADED BY THE APPLICANTS' FUTURE COMPETITION THE LAW NOT ONLY MADE IT DIFFICULT FOR NEW ENTREPRENEURS TO WORK AS RETAIL FLORISTS, IT ALSO GAVE EXISTING FLORISTS THE POWER TO PROTECT THEMSELVES FROM NEW COMPETITION THERE WERE NO PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY JUSTIFICATIONS FOR TESTING FLORISTS THERE ALSO WERE NO VALID "CONSUMER PROTECTION" OR "INDUSTRY ENHANCEMENT" RATIONALES LOUISIANA'S FLORAL LICENSING REGIME WAS ECONOMIC PROTECTIONISM FOR EXISTING FLORISTS, PLAIN AND SIMPLE SO WE FILED A LAWSUIT IN MARCH TO STRIKE DOWN THE LAW THE FOLLOWING WEEK, OUR CLIENTS WERE ON JOHN STOSSEL'S PROGRAM ON FOX BUSINESS CHANNEL AND ALSO WERE PROFILED IN A FEATURE PIECE IN USA TODAY THANKS TO THE PRESSURE IJ EXERTED IN COURT AND THE COURT OF PUBLIC OPINION, THE LEGISLATURE THE LOUISIANA LEGISLATURE PASSED A LAW THAT ENSURES THAT BUREAUCRATS NO LONGER HAVE THE POWER TO ARBITRARILY CHOOSE WHO MAY OR MAY NOT BECOME A FLORIST THE GOVERNOR IS EXPECTED TO SIGN THE BILL INTO LAW NEXT MONTH FRANCO V SAN JUAN COUNTY IN SEPTEMBER 2009, WE FILED A WASHINGTON STATE CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLENGE TO A NEWLY ADOPTED SAN JUAN COUNTY VENDING ORDINANCE ON BEHALF OF GARY FRANCO, A LONGTIME PRODUCE VENDOR THE ORDINANCE, ADOPTED AT THE URGING OF BRICK-AND-MORTAR BUSINESSES, REQUIRED CERTAIN VENDORS TO OBTAIN A PERMIT AND PAY THE GOVERNMENT $50 PER DAY IN ORDER TO VEND IN PUBLIC PLACES TO OBTAIN THE PERMIT, A VENDOR HAD TO RECEIVE THE WRITTEN CONSENT OF ALL BUSINESS OWNERS WITHIN A CERTAIN RADIUS OF WHERE HE INTENDED TO SELL AT THE SAME TIME, THE ORDINANCE EXEMPTED A NUMBER OF VENDING ACTIVITIES THAT THE COUNTY LIKED, SUCH AS VENDING BY CHARITABLE AND CIVIC GROUPS (INCLUDING, SPECIFICALLY, THE LIONS CLUB, GIRL SCOUTS, AND KIWANIS), VENDING BY FARMERS WHO SOLD THEIR OWN PRODUCE, AND VENDING BY ICE CREAM TRUCKS NON-EXEMPT VENDORS WHO SOLD WITHOUT A PERMIT WERE SUBJECT TO A $250 PER HOUR FINE WHILE WE WERE CONDUCTING DISCOVERY, THE COUNTY REPEALED THE VENDING ORDINANCE AND ADOPTED A NEW ONE IN ITS PLACE IT TOOK EFFECT ON APRIL 9, 2010 RATHER THAN IMPOSING A BURDENSOME AND COSTLY PERMIT REQUIREMENT, THE NEW ORDINANCE SIMPLY BANS VENDING ON THE STREETS AND SIDEWALKS, BUT IT INCLUDES MOST OF THE SAME EXEMPTIONS THAT APPEARED IN THE ORIGINAL ORDINANCE WE CURRENTLY ARE ANALYZING OUR OPTIONS TO DETERMINE WHETHER WE SHOULD VOLUNTARILY DISMISS THE CURRENT LAWSUIT AND FILE ANOTHER ONE TO CHALLENGE THE NEW ORDINANCE OR, INSTEAD, AMEND THE CURRENT COMPLAINT TO CHALLENGE THE NEW ORDINANCE LOCKE V SHORE AFTER SUCCESSFUL LAWSUITS CHALLENGING OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING OF INTERIOR DESIGNERS IN NEW MEXICO, TEXAS, CONNECTICUT, AND OKLAHOMA, WE FILED SUIT IN FLORIDA, THE STATE WITH BY FAR THE MOST RESTRICTIVE AND AGGRESSIVELY ENFORCED LAW IN THE COUNTRY ONLY THREE OTHER STATES REGULATE THE ACTUAL PRACTICE OF INTERIOR DESIGN (AS OPPOSED TO SIMPLY REGULATING WHO CAN CALL THEMSELVES INTERIOR DESIGNERS) THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE CHALLENGES LICENSING LAWS LIKE THESE BECAUSE, RATHER THAN PROTECTING PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY AS SUCH LAWS ARE INTENDED TO DO, THEY SIMPLY PROTECT INDUSTRY INSIDERS FROM COMPETITION THE RESULT IS HIGHER PRICES AND LESS CHOICE FOR CONSUMERS, WHILE KEEPING NEWCOMERS OUT USING OUR STRATEGIC COMBINATION OF LITIGATION, MEDIA, ACTIVISM, AND STRATEGIC RESEARCH, WE WON A FIRST-ROUND VICTORY IN FEBRUARY 2010, AND ARE ON APPEAL TO THE 11TH U S CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS TO FULLY VINDICATE OUR CLIENTS' RIGHTS

Identifier	Return Reference	Explanation
		MITZ V TEXAS STATE BOARD OF VETERINARY MEDICAL EXAMINERS THIS IS A CHALLENGE TO A DECISION BY THE TEXAS BOARD OF VETERINARY MEDICAL EXAMINERS TO OUTLAW HORSE TEETH FLOATING BY NON-VETERINARIANS IN TEXAS, DESPITE HAVING SPECIFICALLY RECOGNIZED AND APPROVED THE PRACTICE FOR MANY YEARS "FLOATING" IS THE TERM FOR FILING HORSES' TEETH TO ENSURE PROPER LENGTH AND ALIGNMENT UNLIKE MOST ANIMALS, HORSES' TEETH GROW THROUGHOUT THEIR LIVES THEIR TEETH MUST BE FILED DOWN EVERY 6-12 MONTHS TO PREVENT THEIR MOLARS FROM DEVELOPING LONG ENAMEL "POINTS" THAT CAN PREVENT THEM FROM CHEWING FOOD PROPERLY FOR CENTURIES, THE PRACTICE HAS BEEN PERFORMED BY SPECIALIZED "TEETH FLOATERS," WHOSE KNOWLEDGE OF EQUINE DENTISTRY OFTEN FAR EXCEEDS THAT OF VETERINARIANS FLOATERS PLAY A VITAL ROLE IN TEXAS' HORSE INDUSTRY AND THROUGHOUT MOST OF ITS HISTORY, THE TEXAS VET BOARD SPECIFICALLY APPROVED THE PRACTICE OF "ABOVE-THE-GUMLINE" HORSE TEETH FLOATING BY NON-VETERINARIANS AND ESSENTIALLY TURNED A BLIND EYE TO NON-LICENSEES PERFORMING OTHER EQUINE DENTAL SERVICES, PRESUMABLY BECAUSE THE BOARD RECOGNIZED THAT THERE ARE NOT NEARLY ENOUGH LARGE ANIMAL VETERINARIANS WITH THE TRAINING OR EQUIPMENT TO PROPERLY ADDRESS THE NEEDS OF THE STATES NEARLY ONE MILLION HORSES IN LATE 2006, HOWEVER, THE STATE VETERINARY ASSOCIATION DEMANDED THAT THE VET BOARD TAKE ACTION AGAINST NON-VETERINARIAN EQUINE DENTAL PRACTITIONERS, WHICH THE BOARD DID IN A SERIES OF CEASE-AND-DESIST LETTERS BEGINNING IN FEBRUARY 2007 IJ FILED SUIT AGAINST THE BOARD'S NEW POLICY IN AUGUST 2007 AS THE CASE WENDS ITS WAY THROUGH THE LEGAL PROCESS, IJ IS MAKING DISCERNABLE PROGRESS, REPEATEDLY THWARTING THE VET BOARD'S ATTEMPTS TO BRING THE MATTER TO A QUICK AND UNJUST END, AND OUR CLIENTS-ALONG WITH MOST OTHER NON-VETERINARIAN EQUINE DENTAL PRACTITIONERS IN TEXAS-CONTINUE DOING THEIR WORK, NEARLY FOUR YEARS AFTER THE BOARD FIRST CAME AFTER THEM NAUTICAL TOURS IN THE SUMMER OF 2007, THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE SUCCESSFULLY SECURED A JITNEY LICENSE FROM CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS, FOR THE OWNER OF AN AMPHIBIOUS VEHICLE TOUR COMPANY DESPITE SECURING THE LICENSE, THE CITY OF BOSTON REFUSED TO ALLOW OUR CLIENT ON THE STREETS OF BOSTON WITHOUT A MUNICIPAL SIGHTSEEING LICENSE, WHICH BOSTON WAS NOT ISSUING THEN DUE TO A "MORATORIUM" ON SUCH LICENSES WHILE THE "BIG DIG" CONSTRUCTION PROJECT WAS UNDERWAY WE FILED A FEDERAL LAWSUIT AGAINST BOSTON IN FEBRUARY 2009 AND SURVIVED THE CITY'S ATTEMPTS TO DISMISS THE CASE IN THE SUMMER OF 2009 AS WE PROCEEDED THROUGH DISCOVERY, BOSTON BEGAN LIFTING THE MORATORIUM IN STAGES, EVENTUALLY ACCEPTING NEW LICENSE APPLICATIONS AS OF MARCH 1, 2010 OUR CLIENT WAS NO LONGER IN A POSITION TO PURSUE A LICENSE, SO OUR REPRESENTATION TERMINATED RIFE V TEXAS PRIVATE SECURITY BOARD THIS CASE CHALLENGED A STATE OF TEXAS REQUIREMENT THAT EVERY COMPUTER REPAIR TECHNICIAN IN THE ENTIRE STATE ACQUIRE A PRIVATE INVESTIGATOR'S LICENSE TO REPAIR A COMPUTER IF YOU PERFORM CERTAIN REPAIRS WITHOUT A PRIVATE INVESTIGATOR'S LICENSE, OR IF YOU AS A CONSUMER HAVE YOUR COMPUTER REPAIRED BY SOMEONE WITHOUT A LICENSE, YOU CAN BE PUNISHED BY A $4,000 FINE AND ONE YEAR IN JAIL AS WELL AS A $10,000 CIVIL PENALTY TO OBTAIN AN INVESTIGATOR'S LICENSE, AN INDIVIDUAL MUST COMPLETE EITHER A CRIMINAL JUSTICE DEGREE OR A THREE-YEAR APPRENTICESHIP UNDER A LICENSED INVESTIGATOR THEREFORE, COMPUTER REPAIR COMPANIES MUST EITHER CLOSE FOR THREE YEARS TO COMPLETE THE APPRENTICESHIP, OR RISK SEVERE CRIMINAL AND CIVIL SANCTIONS IF THEY CONTINUE WORKING LEGISLATION INTRODUCED FOLLOWING THE FILING OF OUR LAWSUIT EFFECTIVELY ADDRESSES THE KEY CONCERNS IN OUR LITIGATION, SO WE ARE IN THE PROCESS OF WINDING DOWN THE CASE

TEXAS EYEBROW THREADING IN DECEMBER 2009, WE FILED THIS CHALLENGE TO TEXAS' ATTEMPTS TO REGULATE AS COSMETOLOGY THE PRACTICE OF EYEBROW THREADING-AN ALL-NATURAL AND ANCIENT GROOMING TECHNIQUE WHEREIN COTTON THREAD IS USED TO REMOVE UNWANTED FACIAL HAIR THE GOVERNMENT'S POSITION WOULD REQUIRE EYEBROW THREADERS, PREDOMINANTLY INDIAN IMMIGRANTS, TO OBTAIN BETWEEN 750 AND 1,500 HOURS OF WESTERN-STYLE COSMETOLOGY TRAINING (NONE OF IT RELEVANT TO THREADING) AT A COST OF APPROXIMATELY $15,000 AS WITH MOST LICENSING LAWS, THIS ONE HAS NOTHING TO DO WITH PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY AND EVERYTHING TO DO WITH PROTECTING INSIDERS FROM COMPETITION OUR CLIENTS INCLUDE SMALL BUSINESS OWNERS AND EYEBROW THREADERS WHO HAVE BEEN FINED $2,000 AND TOLD THAT THEY MUST STOP WORKING UNTIL THEY OBTAIN COSMETOLOGY LICENSES DISCOVERY IS ONGOING, AND WE HOPE TO MOVE FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT SOMETIME IN AUGUST 2010 OTHER SCHOOL CHOICE CASES DEBOOM V BERGESON IN WASHINGTON STATE THIS PAST FALL, WE SCORED A VICTORY FOR SPECIAL NEEDS CHILDREN AND THEIR PARENTS WHEN, IN RESPONSE TO A LAWSUIT BY IJ'S WASHINGTON CHAPTER, THE STATE ADOPTED NEW REGULATIONS REPEALING THE STATE'S BAN ON CERTAIN SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES AT RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS UNDER THE FEDERAL INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT (IDEA), FEDERAL FUNDS ARE DISTRIBUTED TO STATES IN ORDER TO PROVIDE SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES TO CHILDREN ENROLLED IN BOTH PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS WASHINGTON ALLOWED SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO PROVIDE THESE SERVICES ON PUBLIC AND NON-RELIGIOUS PRIVATE SCHOOL CAMPUSES, BUT NOT AT RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS THIS POLICY FORCED AN IMPOSSIBLE CHOICE FOR PARENTS LIKE SHARI AND DERRICK DEBOOM, WHOSE SON MICHAEL SUFFERS FROM ATTENTION-DEFICIT, ANXIETY, AND MOTOR-SKILLS PROBLEMS THAT HINDER HIS ABILITY TO LEARN MICHAEL WAS ELIGIBLE FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION SERVICES UNDER IDEA, INCLUDING A SPECIALLY EQUIPPED LAPTOP FOR NOTE-TAKING BUT BECAUSE HIS PARENTS PLACED HIM IN A RELIGIOUS SCHOOL, THE STATE INSISTED HE TRAVEL TO A "NONSECTARIAN" LOCATION TO ACCESS THE SERVICES THAT RENDERED THE LAPTOP, WHICH MICHAEL NEEDED IN HIS CLASSROOM, UTTERLY USELESS THANKS TO IJ'S LAWSUIT, OUR ENSUING LEGISLATIVE COUNSELING, AND A STRATEGICALLY TIMED OP-ED IN THE SEATTLE TIMES BY THE LEAD IJ ATTORNEY IN THE CASE, IN OCTOBER 2009 THE STATE REPEALED THE DISCRIMINATORY BAN AND NOW SCHOOL DISTRICTS ARE FREE TO PROVIDE SERVICES TO MICHAEL AND HIS FELLOW STUDENTS AT THE SCHOOLS THEIR PARENTS CHOOSE FOR THEM ACCORDINGLY, WE VOLUNTARILY DISMISSED THE LAWSUIT GREEN V GARRIOTT IN OCTOBER 2009, IJ SCORED A FINAL VICTORY IN THIS CASE DEFENDING ARIZONA'S CORPORATE TAX CREDIT PROGRAM THAT PROVIDES SCHOLARSHIPS FOR LOW- AND MODERATE-INCOME FAMILIES TO SEND THEIR CHILDREN TO SCHOOLS OF THE PARENTS' CHOOSING THE LAWSUIT WAS AN ATTEMPT BY SCHOOL CHOICE OPPONENTS TO OVERRULE KOTTERMAN V KILLIAN, THE ARIZONA SUPREME COURT'S LANDMARK 1999 DECISION UPHOLDING ARIZONA'S INNOVATIVE INDIVIDUAL TAX CREDIT PROGRAM FROM ATTACKS UNDER BOTH THE ARIZONA AND FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONS THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE INTERVENED IN THE LAWSUIT ON BEHALF OF THE ARIZONA SCHOOL CHOICE TRUST, A NONPROFIT SCHOOL TUITION ORGANIZATION THAT RECEIVES CORPORATE CONTRIBUTIONS TO FUND PRIVATE SCHOOL SCHOLARSHIPS, AND PARENTS WHO DESPERATELY WANTED TO TRANSFER THEIR CHILDREN FROM PUBLIC TO PRIVATE SCHOOL BUT LACKED THE FINANCIAL MEANS IN MARCH 2009, THE STATE COURT OF APPEALS RULED IN FAVOR OF PARENTS' RIGHT TO CHOOSE THE BEST EDUCATION FOR THEIR CHILDREN, AND IN OCTOBER, THE ARIZONA SUPREME COURT DECLINED TO REVIEW THE COURT OF APPEALS' DECISION, THUS ENDING THE LEGAL CHALLENGE TO THIS PROGRAM AND PRESERVING OUR VICTORY IN THIS CASE MISCELLANEOUS FLYNN V HOLDER IN A CASE TRULY DEALING WITH LIFE AND DEATH, WE REPRESENT DOREEN FLYNN WHO HAS THREE DAUGHTERS WITH A DEADLY BLOOD DISEASE WHO WILL MOST LIKELY NEED BONE MARROW TRANSPLANTS IN THEIR TEENS LIKE COUNTLESS THOUSANDS OF OTHERS, DOREEN'S KIDS' LIVES DEPEND ON FINDING A COMPATIBLE BONE-MARROW DONOR-A ONE-IN-A-MILLION GENETIC MATCH MORE THAN A THOUSAND PEOPLE DIE EACH YEAR BECAUSE THEY CAN'T FIND A MATCHED DONOR, BUT, INCREDIBLY, UNDER THE NATIONAL ORGAN TRANSPLANT ACT OF 1984, FEDERAL LAW MAKES IT ILLEGAL TO DO THE ONE THING THAT WOULD MAKE IT EASIER TO RECRUIT DONORS COMPENSATE THEM FLYNN, ALONG WITH CANCER PATIENTS AND THEIR FAMILIES, A RENOWNED BONE MARROW DOCTOR, AND THE CALIFORNIA NONPROFIT MOREMARROWDONORS ORG, JOINED WITH THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE IN OCTOBER 2009 TO SUE THE U S ATTORNEY GENERAL TO STRIKE DOWN THE LAW WE CURRENTLY ARE ON APPEAL TO THE NINTH U S CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS A VICTORY WILL PUSH COURTS TO LOOK AT LAWS WITH A PRESUMPTION IN FAVOR OF INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY, WHICH IS RELEVANT TO CASES IN ALL OF IJ'S FOUR PILLARS OF LITIGATION AMICUS IN ADDITION TO THE ABOVE-NAMED CASES, THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE ALSO FILED AMICUS BRIEFS IN THE FOLLOWING CASES BETWEEN JULY 1, 2009 AND JUNE 30, 2010 ALVAREZ V SMITH CITIZENS UNITED V FEC CITY OF KANSAS CITY V KU CONNOR V CITY OF SEATTLE DOE V REED EAGAN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY V U-HAUL COMPANY OF MINNESOTA ET AL GOLDSTEIN V NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION GREEN V GARFIELD KAUR V NEW YORK STATE URBAN DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION MCALISTER V CITY OF FAIRWAY MCDONALD V CITY OF CHICAGO PARENTS INVOLVED IN COMMUNITY SCHOOLS V SEATTLE SCHOOL DISTRICT NO 1 SIOBHAN REYNOLDS GRAND-JURY SUBPOENA VFW V REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF MILWAUKEE WHITE SMILE USA V ALABAMA BOARD OF DENTAL EXAMINERS

Additional Data

Software ID:
Software Version:
EIN: 52-1744337
Name: INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Form 990, Part VII - Compensation of Officers, Directors,Trustees, Key Employees, Highest Compensated Employees, and Independent Contractors

(A) Name and Title	(B) Average hours per week	(C) Position (check all that apply)						(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			
WILLIAM H MELLOR PRES & GENERAL COUNSEL	40 00	X		X				439,475	0	62,829
DAVID B KENNEDY DIRECTOR & CHAIRMAN	1 00	X						0	0	0
ROBERT A LEVY DIRECTOR	1 00	X						0	0	0
JAMES LINTOTT DIRECTOR	1 00	X						0	0	0
ABIGAIL THERNSTROM DIRECTOR	1 00	X						0	0	0
ARTHUR DANTCHIK DIRECTOR	1 00	X						0	0	0
MARK BABUNOVIC DIRECTOR	1 00	X						0	0	0
STEPHEN W MODZELEWSKI DIRECTOR	1 00	X						0	0	0
ROBERT GELFOND DIRECTOR	1 00	X						0	0	0
WILLIAM DUNN DIRECTOR	1 00	X						0	0	0
DEBORAH SIMPSON MANAGING VP & SECRETARY	40 00			X				173,410	0	23,847
STEVEN ANDERSON CFO & TREASURER	40 00			X				123,828	0	21,310
JOHN KRAMER VP FOR COMMUNICATIONS	40 00				X			214,963	0	41,829
BETH STEVENS VP FOR DEVELOPMENT	40 00				X			161,660	0	28,543
SCOTT BULLOCK SR ATTORNEY	40 00					X		172,745	0	29,077
DANA BERLINER SR ATTORNEY	40 00					X		176,015	0	29,780
CLARK NEILY SR ATTORNEY	40 00					X		163,953	0	27,624
STEVE SIMPSON SR ATTORNEY	40 00					X		172,544	0	37,633
ROBERT GALL SR ATTORNEY	40 00					X		127,412	0	23,582