efile GRAPHIC print - DO NOT PROCESS | As Filed Data - | DLN: 93493048007331

Form **990**

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Return of Organization Exempt From Income Tax

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

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

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

OMB No. 1545-0047

2019

Open to Public Inspection

A For the 2019 calendar year, or tax year beginning 07-01-2019 , and ending 06-30-2020

B Check if applicable:
☐ Address change
☐ Name change
☐ Initial return
☐ Final return/terminated
☐ Amended return
☐ Application pending

C Name of organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Doing business as

Number and street (or P.O. box if mail is not delivered to street address) | Room/suite
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD STE 900

City or town, state or province, country, and ZIP or foreign postal code
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

D Employer identification number
52-1744337

E Telephone number
(703) 682-9320

G Gross receipts $ 83,969,192

F Name and address of principal officer:
SCOTT G BULLOCK
901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD STE 900
ARLINGTON, VA 22203

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

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

H(c) Group exemption number ▶

I Tax-exempt status: ☑ 501(c)(3) ☐ 501(c) ( ) ◀ (insert no.) ☐ 4947(a)(1) or ☐ 527

J Website: ▶ WWW.IJ.ORG

K Form of organization: ☑ Corporation ☐ Trust ☐ Association ☐ Other ▶

L Year of formation: 1991

M State of legal domicile: DC

Part I Summary

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**	9
4	Number of independent voting members of the governing body (Part VI, line 1b)	**4**	7
5	Total number of individuals employed in calendar year 2019 (Part V, line 2a)	**5**	168
6	Total number of volunteers (estimate if necessary)	**6**	30
7a	Total unrelated business revenue from Part VIII, column (C), line 12	**7a**	0
b	Net unrelated business taxable income from Form 990-T, line 39	**7b**	0

		Prior Year	Current Year
8	Contributions and grants (Part VIII, line 1h)	21,267,811	27,138,233
9	Program service revenue (Part VIII, line 2g)	1,059,927	454,873
10	Investment income (Part VIII, column (A), lines 3, 4, and 7d)	1,784,859	7,579,986
11	Other revenue (Part VIII, column (A), lines 5, 6d, 8c, 9c, 10c, and 11e)	51,980	42,235
12	Total revenue—add lines 8 through 11 (must equal Part VIII, column (A), line 12)	24,164,577	35,215,327
13	Grants and similar amounts paid (Part IX, column (A), lines 1–3)	134,695	88,227
14	Benefits paid to or for members (Part IX, column (A), line 4)	0	0
15	Salaries, other compensation, employee benefits (Part IX, column (A), lines 5–10)	16,495,714	19,382,886
16a	Professional fundraising fees (Part IX, column (A), line 11e)	0	0
b	Total fundraising expenses (Part IX, column (D), line 25) ▶1,835,995		
17	Other expenses (Part IX, column (A), lines 11a–11d, 11f–24e)	6,841,942	6,862,146
18	Total expenses. Add lines 13–17 (must equal Part IX, column (A), line 25)	23,472,351	26,333,259
19	Revenue less expenses. Subtract line 18 from line 12	692,226	8,882,068

		Beginning of Current Year	End of Year
20	Total assets (Part X, line 16)	96,341,010	104,919,956
21	Total liabilities (Part X, line 26)	5,468,203	8,720,628
22	Net assets or fund balances. Subtract line 21 from line 20	90,872,807	96,199,328

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

****** 2021-02-16
Signature of officer Date

SCOTT G BULLOCK PRESIDENT
Type or print name and title

Paid Preparer Use Only

Print/Type preparer's name	Preparer's signature	Date	Check ☐ if self-employed	PTIN
		2021-01-22		P00957510

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

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

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

Part III Statement of Program Service Accomplishments

Check if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part III . . . . . ☑

1 Briefly describe the organization's mission:

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

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

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

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

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

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

4a (Code:) (Expenses $ 21,179,611 including grants of $ 88,227) (Revenue $ 454,873)

See Additional Data

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** ▶ 21,179,611

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* (see instructions)?	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, or have a section 501(h) election in effect during the tax year? *If "Yes," complete Schedule C, Part II*	4	Yes	
5	Is the organization a section 501(c)(4), 501(c)(5), or 501(c)(6) organization that receives membership dues, assessments, or similar amounts as defined in Revenue Procedure 98-19? *If "Yes," complete Schedule C, Part III*	5		No
6	Did the organization maintain any donor advised funds or any similar funds or accounts for which donors have the right to provide advice on the distribution or investment of amounts in such funds or accounts? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D,* Part I	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 for escrow or custodial account liability; serve as a custodian for amounts not listed in Part X; or provide credit counseling, debt management, credit repair, or debt negotiation services? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part IV*	9		No
10	Did the organization, directly or through a related organization, hold assets in temporarily restricted endowments, permanent endowments, or quasi endowments? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part V*	10	Yes	
11	If the organization's answer to any of the following questions is "Yes," then complete Schedule D, Parts VI, VII, VIII, IX, or X as applicable.			
a	Did the organization report an amount for land, buildings, and equipment in Part X, line 10? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D,* Part VI.	11a	Yes	
b	Did the organization report an amount for investments—other securities in Part X, line 12 that is 5% or more of its total assets reported in Part X, line 16? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part VII*	11b	Yes	
c	Did the organization report an amount for investments—program related in Part X, line 13 that is 5% or more of its total assets reported in Part X, line 16? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part VIII*	11c		No
d	Did the organization report an amount for other assets in Part X, line 15 that is 5% or more of its total assets reported in Part X, line 16? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part IX*	11d		No
e	Did the organization report an amount for other liabilities in Part X, line 25? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part X*	11e	Yes	
f	Did the organization's separate or consolidated financial statements for the tax year include a footnote that addresses the organization's liability for uncertain tax positions under FIN 48 (ASC 740)? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Part X*	11f	Yes	
12a	Did the organization obtain separate, independent audited financial statements for the tax year? *If "Yes," complete Schedule D, Parts XI and XII*	12a	Yes	
b	Was the organization included in consolidated, independent audited financial statements for the tax year? *If "Yes," and if the organization answered "No" to line 12a, then completing Schedule D, Parts XI and XII is optional*	12b		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, investment, and program service activities outside the United States, or aggregate foreign investments valued at $100,000 or more? *If "Yes," complete Schedule F, Parts I and IV*	14b	Yes	
15	Did the organization report on Part IX, column (A), line 3, more than $5,000 of grants or other assistance to or for any foreign organization? *If "Yes," complete Schedule F, Parts II and IV*	15		No
16	Did the organization report on Part IX, column (A), line 3, more than $5,000 of aggregate grants or other assistance to or for foreign individuals? *If "Yes," complete Schedule F, Parts III and IV*	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* (see instructions)	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
20a	Did the organization operate one or more hospital facilities? *If "Yes," complete Schedule H*	20a		No
b	If "Yes" to line 20a, did the organization attach a copy of its audited financial statements to this return?	20b		
21	Did the organization report more than $5,000 of grants or other assistance to any domestic organization or domestic government on Part IX, column (A), line 1? *If "Yes," complete Schedule I, Parts I and II*	21	Yes	

Part IV Checklist of Required Schedules *(continued)*

			Yes	No
22	Did the organization report more than $5,000 of grants or other assistance to or for domestic individuals on Part IX, column (A), line 2? *If "Yes," complete Schedule I, Parts I and III*	22		No
23	Did the organization answer "Yes" to Part VII, Section A, line 3, 4, or 5 about compensation of the organization's current and former officers, directors, trustees, key employees, and highest compensated employees? *If "Yes," complete Schedule J*	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 lines 24b through 24d and complete Schedule K. If "No," go to line 25a*	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), 501(c)(4), and 501(c)(29) organizations.** Did the organization engage in an excess benefit transaction with a disqualified person during the year? *If "Yes," complete Schedule L,* Part I	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	Did the organization report any amount on Part X, line 5 or 22 for receivables from or payables to any current or former officer, director, trustee, key employee, creator or founder, substantial contributor, or 35% controlled entity or family member of any of these persons? *If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part II*	26		No
27	Did the organization provide a grant or other assistance to any current or former officer, director, trustee, key employee, creator or founder, substantial contributor, or employee thereof, a grant selection committee member, or to a 35% controlled entity (including an employee thereof) or family member of any of these persons? *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, key employee, creator or founder, or substantial contributor? *If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part IV*	28a		No
b	A family member of any individual described in line 28a? *If "Yes," complete Schedule L, Part IV*	28b		No
c	A 35% controlled entity of one or more individuals and/or organizations described in lines 28a or 28b? *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, Part II, III, or IV, and Part V, line 1*	34		No
35a	Did the organization have a controlled entity within the meaning of section 512(b)(13)?	35a		No
b	If 'Yes' to line 35a, did the organization receive any payment from or engage in any transaction with a controlled entity within the meaning of section 512(b)(13)? *If "Yes," complete Schedule R, Part V, line 2*	35b		
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 11b 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

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

				Yes	No
1a	Enter the number reported in Box 3 of Form 1096. Enter -0- if not applicable	1a	82		
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	

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

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** 168				
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 (see instructions)	**2b**	Yes		
3a	Did the organization have unrelated business gross income of $1,000 or more during the year? . . .	**3a**		No	
b	If "Yes," has it filed a Form 990-T for this year? *If "No" to line 3b, provide an explanation in Schedule O* . . .	**3b**			
4a	At any time during the calendar year, did the organization have an interest in, or a signature or other authority over, a financial account in a foreign country (such as a bank account, securities account, or other financial account)? . .	**4a**	Yes		
b	If "Yes," enter the name of the foreign country: ▶CJ See instructions for filing requirements for FinCEN Form 114, Report of Foreign Bank and Financial Accounts (FBAR).				
5a	Was the organization a party to a prohibited tax shelter transaction at any time during the tax year? . .	**5a**		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?	**5c**			
6a	Does the organization have annual gross receipts that are normally greater than $100,000, and did the organization solicit any contributions that were not tax deductible as charitable contributions? . . .	**6a**		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**		No	
b	If "Yes," did the organization notify the donor of the value of the goods or services provided?	**7b**			
c	Did the organization sell, exchange, or otherwise dispose of tangible personal property for which it was required to file Form 8282?	**7c**		No	
d	If "Yes," indicate the number of Forms 8282 filed during the year **7d**				
e	Did the organization receive any funds, directly or indirectly, to pay premiums on a personal benefit contract?	**7e**		No	
f	Did the organization, during the year, pay premiums, directly or indirectly, on a personal benefit contract? . .	**7f**		No	
g	If the organization received a contribution of qualified intellectual property, did the organization file Form 8899 as required?	**7g**			
h	If the organization received a contribution of cars, boats, airplanes, or other vehicles, did the organization file a Form 1098-C?	**7h**			
8	**Sponsoring organizations maintaining donor advised funds.** Did a donor advised fund maintained by the sponsoring organization have excess business holdings at any time during the year?	**8**			
9	**Sponsoring organizations maintaining donor advised funds.**				
a	Did the sponsoring organization make any taxable distributions under section 4966?	**9a**			
b	Did the sponsoring organization make a distribution to a donor, donor advisor, or related person? . . .	**9b**			
10	**Section 501(c)(7) organizations.** Enter:				
a	Initiation fees and capital contributions included on Part VIII, line 12 . . . **10a**				
b	Gross receipts, included on Form 990, Part VIII, line 12, for public use of club facilities **10b**				
11	**Section 501(c)(12) organizations.** Enter:				
a	Gross income from members or shareholders **11a**				
b	Gross income from other sources (Do not net amounts due or paid to other sources against amounts due or received from them.) **11b**				
12a	**Section 4947(a)(1) non-exempt charitable trusts.** Is the organization filing Form 990 in lieu of Form 1041?	**12a**			
b	If "Yes," enter the amount of tax-exempt interest received or accrued during the year. **12b**				
13	**Section 501(c)(29) qualified nonprofit health insurance issuers.**				
a	Is the organization licensed to issue qualified health plans in more than one state? . . . . . **Note.** See the instructions for additional information the organization must report on Schedule O.	**13a**			
b	Enter the amount of reserves the organization is required to maintain by the states in which the organization is licensed to issue qualified health plans **13b**				
c	Enter the amount of reserves on hand **13c**				
14a	Did the organization receive any payments for indoor tanning services during the tax year?	**14a**		No	
b	If "Yes," has it filed a Form 720 to report these payments? *If "No," provide an explanation in Schedule O* . .	**14b**			
15	Is the organization subject to the section 4960 tax on payment(s) of more than $1,000,000 in remuneration or excess parachute payment(s) during the year? . . . . . If "Yes," see instructions and file Form 4720, Schedule N.	**15**		No	
16	Is the organization an educational institution subject to the section 4968 excise tax on net investment income? . . If "Yes," complete Form 4720, Schedule O.	**16**		No	

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

Section A. Governing Body and Management

				Yes	No
1a	Enter the number of voting members of the governing body at the end of the tax year	**1a**	9		
	If there are material differences in voting rights among members of the governing body, or if the governing body delegated broad authority to an executive committee or similar committee, explain in Schedule O.				
b	Enter the number of voting members included in line 1a, above, who are independent	**1b**	7		
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 governing documents since the prior Form 990 was filed?			**4**		No
5	Did the organization become aware during the year of a significant diversion of the organization's assets?			**5**		No
6	Did the organization have members or stockholders?			**6**		No
7a	Did the organization have members, stockholders, or other persons who had the power to elect or appoint one or more members of the governing body?			**7a**		No
b	Are any governance decisions of the organization reserved to (or subject to approval by) members, stockholders, or persons other than the governing body?			**7b**		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	Did the organization have local chapters, branches, or affiliates?	**10a**	Yes	
b	If "Yes," did the organization have written policies and procedures governing the activities of such chapters, affiliates, and branches to ensure their operations are consistent with the organization's exempt purposes?	**10b**	Yes	
11a	Has the organization provided a complete copy of this Form 990 to all members of its governing body before filing the form?	**11a**	Yes	
b	Describe in Schedule O the process, if any, used by the organization to review this Form 990.			
12a	Did the organization have a written conflict of interest policy? *If "No," go to line 13*	**12a**	Yes	
b	Were officers, directors, or trustees, and key employees required to disclose annually interests that could give rise to conflicts?	**12b**	Yes	
c	Did the organization regularly and consistently monitor and enforce compliance with the policy? *If "Yes," describe in Schedule O how this was done*	**12c**	Yes	
13	Did the organization have a written whistleblower policy?	**13**	Yes	
14	Did 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 15a or 15b, describe the process in Schedule O (see instructions).			
16a	Did the organization invest in, contribute assets to, or participate in a joint venture or similar arrangement with a taxable entity during the year?	**16a**		No
b	If "Yes," did the organization follow a written policy or procedure requiring the organization to evaluate its participation in joint venture arrangements under applicable federal tax law, and take steps to safeguard the organization's exempt status with respect to such arrangements?	**16b**		

Section C. Disclosure

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

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

☑ Own website ☐ Another's website ☑ Upon request ☐ Other (explain in Schedule O)

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

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

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

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

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.

- List all of the organization's **current** officers, directors, trustees (whether individuals or organizations), regardless of amount of compensation. Enter -0- in columns (D), (E), and (F) if no compensation was paid.
- List all of the organization's **current** key employees, if any. See instructions for definition of "key employee."
- List the organization's five **current** highest compensated employees (other than an officer, director, trustee or key employee) who received 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.

See instructions for the order in which to list the persons above.

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

(A) Name and title	(B) Average hours per week (list any hours for related organizations below dotted line)	(C) Position (do not check more than one box, unless person is both an officer and a director/trustee)						(D) Reportable compensation from the organization (W-2/1099-MISC)	(E) Reportable compensation from related organizations (W-2/1099-MISC)	(F) Estimated amount of other compensation from the organization and related organizations
		Individual trustee or director	Institutional Trustee	Officer	Key employee	Highest compensated employee	Former			
(1) SCOTT G BULLOCK PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL	40.00	X		X				469,475	0	47,505
(2) WILLIAM MELLOR CHAIRMAN & FOUNDING GENERAL COUNSEL	40.00	X		X				356,453	0	22,011
(3) ARTHUR DANTCHIK DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0	0	0
(4) BOB GELFOND DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0	0	0
(5) KENNETH N LEVY DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0	0	0
(6) ROBERT A LEVY DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0	0	0
(7) JIM LINTOTT DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0	0	0
(8) STEPHEN MODZELEWSKI DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0	0	0
(9) MARY E STIEFEL DIRECTOR	1.00	X						0	0	0
(10) ABIGAIL THERNSTROM DIRECTOR (UNTIL APRIL 2020)	1.00	X						0	0	0
(11) DANIEL KNEPPER MANAGING VP-CFO/SECRETARY & TREAS.	40.00			X				373,648	0	44,035
(12) DANA BERLINER SENIOR VP AND LITIGATION DIRECTOR	40.00				X			441,045	0	50,904
(13) JOHN KRAMER VP FOR COMMUNICATIONS	40.00				X			372,208	0	69,536
(14) DEBORAH SIMPSON CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER	40.00				X			332,961	0	68,224
(15) BETH STEVENS VP FOR DEVELOPMENT	40.00				X			277,475	0	48,431
(16) ROBERT MCNAMARA SENIOR ATTORNEY	40.00					X		293,629	0	50,624
(17) JEFFREY ROWES SENIOR ATTORNEY	40.00					X		234,793	0	65,725

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

(A) Name and title	(B) Average hours per week (list any hours for related organizations below dotted line)	(C) Position (do not check more than one box, unless person is both an officer and a director/trustee)						(D) Reportable compensation from the organization (W-2/1099-MISC)	(E) Reportable compensation from related organizations (W-2/1099-MISC)	(F) Estimated amount of other compensation from the organization and related organizations
		Individual trustee or director	Institutional Trustee	Officer	Key employee	Highest compensated employee	Former			
(18) ROBERT GALL MANAGING VP AND SENIOR ATTORNEY	40.00					X		233,719	0	62,829
(19) MELANIE HILDRETH VP FOR EXTERNAL RELATIONS	40.00					X		219,939	0	50,411
(20) MICHAEL BINDAS SENIOR ATTORNEY	40.00					X		205,347	0	50,162
1b Sub-Total ▶										
c Total from continuation sheets to Part VII, Section A ▶										
d Total (add lines 1b and 1c) ▶								3,810,692	0	630,397

2 Total number of individuals (including but not limited to those listed above) who received more than $100,000 of reportable compensation from the organization ▶ 54

			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 or individual 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. Report compensation for the calendar year ending with or within the organization's tax year.

(A) Name and business address	(B) Description of services	(C) Compensation
DOYLE PRINTING & OFFSET CO 5206 46TH AVENUE HYATTSVILLE, MD 20781	PRINTING AND MAILING SHOP	175,055
HBW CONSTRUCTION 1055 FIRST STREET SUITE 200 ROCKVILLE, MD 20850	CONSTRUCTION CONTRACTORS	132,693
ENDGAME STRATEGIES 1717 K ST NW SUITE 900 WASHINGTON, DC 20006	POLICY CONSULTANT	120,000
ANSWERWARE 200 N GLEBE RD SUITE 1050 ARLINGTON, VA 22203	IT CONTRACTORS	117,088
THE RESORT AT PELICAN HILL 22701 PELICAN HILL ROAD SOUTH NEWPORT COAST, CA 92657	EVENT SERVICES	110,000

2 Total number of independent contractors (including but not limited to those listed above) who received more than $100,000 of compensation from the organization ▶ 5

Part VIII Statement of Revenue

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

		(A) Total revenue	(B) Related or exempt function revenue	(C) Unrelated business revenue	(D) Revenue excluded from tax under sections 512 - 514
Contributions, Gifts, Grants and Other Similar Amounts					
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	27,138,233			
g Noncash contributions included in lines 1a - 1f: $	1g	1,485,115			
h **Total.** Add lines 1a-1f		27,138,233			
Program Service Revenue	Business Code				
2a ATTORNEY FEES	541100	453,435	453,435		
b HONORARIA	900099	1,438	1,438		
c					
d					
e					
f All other program service revenue.					
g **Total.** Add lines 2a–2f	454,873				
3 Investment income (including dividends, interest, and other similar amounts)		1,622,922			1,622,922
4 Income from investment of tax-exempt bond proceeds					
5 Royalties					

		(i) Real	(ii) Personal				
6a Gross rents	6a						
b Less: rental expenses	6b						
c Rental income or (loss)	6c						
d Net rental income or (loss)							

		(i) Securities	(ii) Other				
7a Gross amount from sales of assets other than inventory	7a	54,710,929					
b Less: cost or other basis and sales expenses	7b	48,753,845	20				
c Gain or (loss)	7c	5,957,084	-20				
d Net gain or (loss)				5,957,064			5,957,064
Other Revenue							
8a Gross income from fundraising events (not including $ _____ of contributions reported on line 1c). See Part IV, line 18	8a						
b Less: direct expenses	8b						
c Net income or (loss) from fundraising events							
9a Gross income from gaming activities. See Part IV, line 19	9a						
b Less: direct expenses	9b						
c Net income or (loss) from gaming activities							
10a Gross sales of inventory, less returns and allowances	10a						
b Less: cost of goods sold	10b						
c Net income or (loss) from sales of inventory							

Miscellaneous Revenue	Business Code				
11a OTHER INCOME	541110	42,235			42,235
b					
c					
d All other revenue					
e **Total.** Add lines 11a–11d		42,235			
12 **Total revenue.** See instructions		35,215,327	454,873	0	7,622,221

Part IX Statement of Functional Expenses

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

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

Do not include amounts reported on lines 6b, 7b, 8b, 9b, and 10b of Part VIII.	(A) Total expenses	(B) Program service expenses	(C) Management and general expenses	(D) Fundraising expenses
1 Grants and other assistance to domestic organizations and domestic governments. See Part IV, line 21	88,227	88,227		
2 Grants and other assistance to domestic individuals. See Part IV, line 22				
3 Grants and other assistance to foreign organizations, foreign governments, and foreign individuals. See Part IV, lines 15 and 16.				
4 Benefits paid to or for members				
5 Compensation of current officers, directors, trustees, and key employees	2,753,261	2,295,835	276,803	180,623
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	13,325,845	11,111,892	1,339,734	874,219
8 Pension plan accruals and contributions (include section 401 (k) and 403(b) employer contributions)	1,149,625	958,627	115,579	75,419
9 Other employee benefits	1,169,383	975,102	117,566	76,715
10 Payroll taxes	984,772	821,162	99,006	64,604
11 Fees for services (non-employees):				
a Management				
b Legal	115,361	66,135	46,373	2,853
c Accounting	42,600		42,600	
d Lobbying	147,529	147,529		
e Professional fundraising services. See Part IV, line 17				
f Investment management fees	7,173			7,173
g Other (If line 11g amount exceeds 10% of line 25, column (A) amount, list line 11g expenses on Schedule O)	966,215	758,903	164,439	42,873
12 Advertising and promotion	124,123	104,738	220	19,165
13 Office expenses	833,169	475,876	77,719	279,574
14 Information technology	571,475	86,008	464,198	21,269
15 Royalties				
16 Occupancy	1,948,188	1,624,029	196,435	127,724
17 Travel	719,708	709,279	7,117	3,312
18 Payments of travel or entertainment expenses for any federal, state, or local public officials				
19 Conferences, conventions, and meetings	177,633	171,569	6,064	
20 Interest	5,455		5,455	
21 Payments to affiliates				
22 Depreciation, depletion, and amortization	368,483	307,263	37,046	24,174
23 Insurance	124,150	56,406	67,744	
24 Other expenses. Itemize expenses not covered above (List miscellaneous expenses in line 24e. If line 24e amount exceeds 10% of line 25, column (A) amount, list line 24e expenses on Schedule O.)				
a RESEARCH TOOLS	339,715	297,465	17,062	25,188
b FILING AND COURT FEES	61,503	61,503		
c				
d				
e All other expenses	309,666	62,063	236,493	11,110
25 **Total functional expenses.** Add lines 1 through 24e	26,333,259	21,179,611	3,317,653	1,835,995
26 **Joint costs.** Complete this line only if the organization reported in column (B) joint costs from a combined educational campaign and fundraising solicitation. Check here ▶ ☐ if following SOP 98-2 (ASC 958-720).				

Part X Balance Sheet

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

				(A) Beginning of year		(B) End of year
Assets	1	Cash–non-interest-bearing		4,699,784	1	5,558,922
	2	Savings and temporary cash investments		1,027,429	2	1,254
	3	Pledges and grants receivable, net		990,119	3	2,504,592
	4	Accounts receivable, net		65,100	4	101,630
	5	Loans and other payables to any current or former officer, director, trustee, key employee, creator or founder, substantial contributor, or 35% controlled entity or family member of any of these persons			5	
	6	Loans and other receivables from other disqualified persons (as defined under section 4958(f)(1)), and persons described in section 4958(c)(3)(B)			6	
	7	Notes and loans receivable, net			7	
	8	Inventories for sale or use			8	
	9	Prepaid expenses and deferred charges		352,256	9	347,034
	10a	Land, buildings, and equipment: cost or other basis. Complete Part VI of Schedule D	10a 5,718,505			
	b	Less: accumulated depreciation	10b 3,993,505	919,242	10c	1,725,000
	11	Investments—publicly traded securities		81,118,030	11	87,143,465
	12	Investments—other securities. See Part IV, line 11		7,011,229	12	7,247,238
	13	Investments—program-related. See Part IV, line 11			13	
	14	Intangible assets			14	
	15	Other assets. See Part IV, line 11		157,821	15	290,821
	16	**Total assets.** Add lines 1 through 15 (must equal line 34)		96,341,010	16	104,919,956
Liabilities	17	Accounts payable and accrued expenses		1,925,496	17	2,118,412
	18	Grants payable			18	
	19	Deferred revenue		1,112,227	19	3,723,353
	20	Tax-exempt bond liabilities			20	
	21	Escrow or custodial account liability. Complete Part IV of Schedule D			21	
	22	Loans and other payables to any current or former officer, director, trustee, key employee, creator or founder, substantial contributor, or 35% controlled entity or family member of any of these persons			22	
	23	Secured mortgages and notes payable to unrelated third parties			23	
	24	Unsecured notes and loans payable to unrelated third parties			24	
	25	Other liabilities (including federal income tax, payables to related third parties, and other liabilities not included on lines 17 - 24). Complete Part X of Schedule D		2,430,480	25	2,878,863
	26	**Total liabilities.** Add lines 17 through 25		5,468,203	26	8,720,628
Net Assets or Fund Balances		**Organizations that follow FASB ASC 958, check here ▶ ☑ and complete lines 27, 28, 32, and 33.**				
	27	Net assets without donor restrictions		87,530,816	27	91,445,951
	28	Net assets with donor restrictions		3,341,991	28	4,753,377
		Organizations that do not follow FASB ASC 958, check here ▶ ☐ and complete lines 29 through 33.				
	29	Capital stock or trust principal, or current funds			29	
	30	Paid-in or capital surplus, or land, building or equipment fund			30	
	31	Retained earnings, endowment, accumulated income, or other funds			31	
	32	Total net assets or fund balances		90,872,807	32	96,199,328
	33	Total liabilities and net assets/fund balances		96,341,010	33	104,919,956

Part XI Reconcilliation of Net Assets

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

1	Total revenue (must equal Part VIII, column (A), line 12)	1	35,215,327
2	Total expenses (must equal Part IX, column (A), line 25)	2	26,333,259
3	Revenue less expenses. Subtract line 2 from line 1	3	8,882,068
4	Net assets or fund balances at beginning of year (must equal Part X, line 33, column (A))	4	90,872,807
5	Net unrealized gains (losses) on investments	5	-3,555,547
6	Donated services and use of facilities	6	
7	Investment expenses	7	
8	Prior period adjustments	8	
9	Other changes in net assets or fund balances (explain in Schedule O)	9	0
10	Net assets or fund balances at end of year. Combine lines 3 through 9 (must equal Part X, line 33, column (B))	10	96,199,328

Part XII Financial Statements and Reporting

Check if Schedule O contains a response or note to any line in this Part XII . . . . . ☑

			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
	If 'Yes,' check a box below to indicate whether the financial statements for the year were compiled or reviewed on a separate basis, consolidated basis, or both: ☐ Separate basis ☐ Consolidated basis ☐ Both consolidated and separate basis			
b	Were the organization's financial statements audited by an independent accountant?	2b	Yes	
	If 'Yes,' check a box below to indicate whether the financial statements for the year were audited on a separate basis, consolidated basis, or both: ☑ Separate basis ☐ Consolidated basis ☐ Both consolidated and separate basis			
c	If "Yes," to line 2a or 2b, does the organization have a committee that assumes responsibility for oversight of the audit, review, or compilation of its financial statements and selection of an independent accountant?	2c	Yes	
	If the organization changed either its oversight process or selection process during the tax year, explain in Schedule O.			
3a	As a result of a federal award, was the organization required to undergo an audit or audits as set forth in the Single Audit Act and OMB Circular A-133?	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		

Additional Data

Software ID:

Software Version:

EIN: 52-1744337

Name: INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Form 990 (2019)

Form 990, Part III, Line 4a:

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

efile GRAPHIC print - DO NOT PROCESS | As Filed Data - | DLN: 93493048007331

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.**

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

OMB No. 1545-0047

2019

Open to Public Inspection

Name of the organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

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

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

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

2 ☐ A school described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(ii).** (Attach Schedule E (Form 990 or 990-EZ).)

3 ☐ A hospital or a cooperative hospital service organization described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(iii).**

4 ☐ A medical research organization operated in conjunction with a hospital described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(iii).** Enter the hospital's name, city, and state:

5 ☐ An organization operated for the benefit of a college or university owned or operated by a governmental unit described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(iv).** (Complete Part II.)

6 ☐ A federal, state, or local government or governmental unit described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(v).**

7 ☑ An organization that normally receives a substantial part of its support from a governmental unit or from the general public described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(vi).** (Complete Part II.)

8 ☐ A community trust described in **section 170(b)(1)(A)(vi)**. (Complete Part II.)

9 ☐ An agricultural research organization described in **170(b)(1)(A)(ix)** operated in conjunction with a land-grant college or university or a non-land grant college of agriculture. See instructions. Enter the name, city, and state of the college or university:

10 ☐ An organization that normally receives: (1) more than 331/3% 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 331/3% of its support from gross investment income and unrelated business taxable income (less section 511 tax) from businesses acquired by the organization after June 30, 1975. See **section 509(a)(2).** (Complete Part III.)

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

12 ☐ An organization organized and operated exclusively for the benefit of, to perform the functions of, or to carry out the purposes of one or more publicly supported organizations described in **section 509(a)(1)** or **section 509(a)(2).** See **section 509(a)(3).** Check the box in lines 12a through 12d that describes the type of supporting organization and complete lines 12e, 12f, and 12g.

a ☐ **Type I.** A supporting organization operated, supervised, or controlled by its supported organization(s), typically by giving the supported organization(s) the power to regularly appoint or elect a majority of the directors or trustees of the supporting organization. **You must complete Part IV, Sections A and B.**

b ☐ **Type II.** A supporting organization supervised or controlled in connection with its supported organization(s), by having control or management of the supporting organization vested in the same persons that control or manage the supported organization(s). **You must complete Part IV, Sections A and C.**

c ☐ **Type III functionally integrated.** A supporting organization operated in connection with, and functionally integrated with, its supported organization(s) (see instructions). **You must complete Part IV, Sections A, D, and E.**

d ☐ **Type III non-functionally integrated.** A supporting organization operated in connection with its supported organization(s) that is not functionally integrated. The organization generally must satisfy a distribution requirement and an attentiveness requirement (see instructions). **You must complete Part IV, Sections A and D, and Part V.**

e ☐ Check this box if the organization received a written determination from the IRS that it is a Type I, Type II, Type III functionally integrated, or Type III non-functionally integrated supporting organization.

f Enter the number of supported organizations . . . . . _____

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

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

Part II **Support Schedule for Organizations Described in Sections 170(b)(1)(A)(iv) and 170(b)(1)(A)(vi)**
(Complete only if you checked the box on line 5, 7, or 8 of Part I or if the organization failed to qualify under Part III. If the organization failed to qualify under the tests listed below, please complete Part III.)

Section A. Public Support

Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in) ▶	(a) 2015	(b) 2016	(c) 2017	(d) 2018	(e) 2019	(f) Total
1 Gifts, grants, contributions, and membership fees received. (Do not include any "unusual grant.") . .	26,553,699	23,931,523	23,793,166	21,267,811	27,138,233	122,684,432
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	26,553,699	23,931,523	23,793,166	21,267,811	27,138,233	122,684,432
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). .						16,806,890
6 **Public support.** Subtract line 5 from line 4.						105,877,542

Section B. Total Support

Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in) ▶	(a) 2015	(b) 2016	(c) 2017	(d) 2018	(e) 2019	(f) Total
7 Amounts from line 4. .	26,553,699	23,931,523	23,793,166	21,267,811	27,138,233	122,684,432
8 Gross income from interest, dividends, payments received on securities loans, rents, royalties and income from similar sources . . .	626,413	823,607	1,103,004	1,577,636	1,622,922	5,753,582
9 Net income from unrelated business activities, whether or not the business is regularly carried on . .						
10 Other income. Do not include gain or loss from the sale of capital assets (Explain in Part VI.). .						
11 **Total support.** Add lines 7 through 10						128,438,014

12 Gross receipts from related activities, etc. (see instructions) **12** 3,607,250

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

Section C. Computation of Public Support Percentage

14 Public support percentage for 2019 (line 6, column (f) divided by line 11, column (f)) . . . . . **14** 82.430 %

15 Public support percentage for 2018 Schedule A, Part II, line 14 . . . . . **15** 84.350 %

16a **33 1/3% support test—2019.** 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—2018.** If the organization did not check a box on line 13 or 16a, and line 15 is 33 1/3% or more, check this box and **stop here.** The organization qualifies as a publicly supported organization . . . . . ▶ ☐

17a **10%-facts-and-circumstances test—2019.** If the organization did not check a box on line 13, 16a, or 16b, and line 14 is 10% or more, and if the organization meets the "facts-and-circumstances" test, check this box and **stop here.** Explain in Part VI how the organization meets the "facts-and-circumstances" test. The organization qualifies as a publicly supported organization . . . . . ▶ ☐

b **10%-facts-and-circumstances test—2018.** If the organization did not check a box on line 13, 16a, 16b, or 17a, and line 15 is 10% or more, and if the organization meets the "facts-and-circumstances" test, check this box and **stop here.** Explain in Part VI how the organization meets the "facts-and-circumstances" test. The organization qualifies as a publicly supported organization . . . . . ▶ ☐

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 Section 509(a)(2)**
(Complete only if you checked the box on line 10 of Part I or if the organization failed to qualify under Part II. If the organization fails to qualify under the tests listed below, please complete Part II.)

Section A. Public Support

Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in) ▶	(a) 2015	(b) 2016	(c) 2017	(d) 2018	(e) 2019	(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) 2015	(b) 2016	(c) 2017	(d) 2018	(e) 2019	(f) Total
9 Amounts from line 6. . .						
10a Gross income from interest, dividends, payments received on securities loans, rents, royalties and income from similar sources. .						
b Unrelated business taxable income (less section 511 taxes) from businesses acquired after June 30, 1975.						
c Add lines 10a and 10b.						
11 Net income from unrelated business activities not included in line 10b, whether or not the business is regularly carried on.						
12 Other income. Do not include gain or loss from the sale of capital assets (Explain in Part VI.) . .						
13 **Total support.** (Add lines 9, 10c, 11, and 12.). .						

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

Section C. Computation of Public Support Percentage

15	Public support percentage for 2019 (line 8, column (f) divided by line 13, column (f))	15	
16	Public support percentage from 2018 Schedule A, Part III, line 15	16	

Section D. Computation of Investment Income Percentage

17	Investment income percentage for **2019** (line 10c, column (f) divided by line 13, column (f))	17	
18	Investment income percentage from **2018** Schedule A, Part III, line 17	18	

19a **33 1/3% support tests—2019.** 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—2018.** If the organization did not check a box on line 14 or line 19a, and line 16 is more than 33 1/3% and line 18 is not more than 33 1/3%, check this box and **stop here.** The organization qualifies as a publicly supported organization . . . . ▶ ☐

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

Part IV Supporting Organizations

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

Section A. All Supporting Organizations

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

Part IV Supporting Organizations (continued)

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

Section B. Type I Supporting Organizations

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

Section C. Type II Supporting Organizations

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

Section D. All Type III Supporting Organizations

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

Section E. Type III Functionally-Integrated Supporting Organizations

1 Check the box next to the method that the organization used to satisfy the Integral Part Test during the year **(see instructions)**:

- **a** ☐ The organization satisfied the Activities Test. Complete **line 2** below.
- **b** ☐ The organization is the parent of each of its supported organizations. Complete **line 3** below.
- **c** ☐ The organization supported a governmental entity. Describe in **Part VI** how you supported a government entity (see instructions)

2 Activities Test. **Answer (a) and (b) below.**

			Yes	No
a	Did substantially all of the organization's activities during the tax year directly further the exempt purposes of the supported organization(s) to which the organization was responsive? *If "Yes," then in* ***Part VI identify those supported organizations and explain*** *how these activities directly furthered their exempt purposes, how the organization was responsive to those supported organizations, and how the organization determined that these activities constituted substantially all of its activities.*	**2a**		
b	Did the activities described in (a) constitute activities that, but for the organization's involvement, one or more of the organization's supported organization(s) would have been engaged in? *If "Yes," explain in* ***Part VI*** *the reasons for the organization's position that its supported organization(s) would have engaged in these activities but for the organization's involvement.*	**2b**		

3 Parent of Supported Organizations. **Answer (a) and (b) below.**

a	Did the organization have the power to regularly appoint or elect a majority of the officers, directors, or trustees of each of the supported organizations? *Provide details in* ***Part VI.***	**3a**		
b	Did the organization exercise a substantial degree of direction over the policies, programs and activities of each of its supported organizations? *If "Yes," describe in* ***Part VI.*** *the role played by the organization in this regard.*	**3b**		

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

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

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

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

	Section C - Distributable Amount			Current Year
1	Adjusted net income for prior year (from Section A, line 8, Column A)	1		
2	Enter 85% of line 1	2		
3	Minimum asset amount for prior year (from Section B, line 8, Column A)	3		
4	Enter greater of line 2 or line 3	4		
5	Income tax imposed in prior year	5		
6	**Distributable Amount.** Subtract line 5 from line 4, unless subject to emergency temporary reduction (see instructions)	6		

7 ☐ Check here if the current year is the organization's first as a non-functionally-integrated Type III supporting organization (see instructions)

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

Section D - Distributions	**Current Year**
1 Amounts paid to supported organizations to accomplish exempt purposes	
2 Amounts paid to perform activity that directly furthers exempt purposes of supported organizations, in excess of income from activity	
3 Administrative expenses paid to accomplish exempt purposes of supported organizations	
4 Amounts paid to acquire exempt-use assets	
5 Qualified set-aside amounts (prior IRS approval required)	
6 Other distributions (describe in **Part VI**). See instructions	
7 **Total annual distributions.** Add lines 1 through 6.	
8 Distributions to attentive supported organizations to which the organization is responsive (provide details in **Part VI**). See instructions	
9 Distributable amount for 2019 from Section C, line 6	
10 Line 8 amount divided by Line 9 amount	

Section E - Distribution Allocations (see instructions)	**(i) Excess Distributions**	**(ii) Underdistributions Pre-2019**	**(iii) Distributable Amount for 2019**
1 Distributable amount for 2019 from Section C, line 6			
2 Underdistributions, if any, for years prior to 2019 (reasonable cause required-- explain in **Part VI**). See instructions.			
3 Excess distributions carryover, if any, to 2019:			
a From 2014.			
b From 2015.			
c From 2016.			
d From 2017.			
e From 2018.			
f **Total** of lines 3a through e			
g Applied to underdistributions of prior years			
h Applied to 2019 distributable amount			
i Carryover from 2014 not applied (see instructions)			
j Remainder. Subtract lines 3g, 3h, and 3i from 3f.			
4 Distributions for 2019 from Section D, line 7: $			
a Applied to underdistributions of prior years			
b Applied to 2019 distributable amount			
c Remainder. Subtract lines 4a and 4b from 4.			
5 Remaining underdistributions for years prior to 2019, if any. Subtract lines 3g and 4a from line 2. If the amount is greater than zero, explain in **Part VI**. See instructions.			
6 Remaining underdistributions for 2019. Subtract lines 3h and 4b from line 1. If the amount is greater than zero, explain in **Part VI**. See instructions.			
7 **Excess distributions carryover to 2020.** Add lines 3j and 4c.			
8 Breakdown of line 7:			
a Excess from 2015.			
b Excess from 2016.			
c Excess from 2017.			
d Excess from 2018.			
e Excess from 2019.			

Additional Data

Software ID:

Software Version:

EIN: 52-1744337

Name: INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

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

Facts And Circumstances Test

efile GRAPHIC print - DO NOT PROCESS | As Filed Data - | DLN: 93493048007331

SCHEDULE C (Form 990 or 990-EZ)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Political Campaign and Lobbying Activities

For Organizations Exempt From Income Tax Under section 501(c) and section 527

▶**Complete if the organization is described below.** ▶**Attach to Form 990 or Form 990-EZ.**
▶**Go to *www.irs.gov/Form990* for instructions and the latest information.**

OMB No. 1545-0047

2019

Open to Public Inspection

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

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

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

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

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

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

Name of 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 (see instructions for definition of "political campaign activities")

2 Political campaign activity expenditures (see instructions) ▶ $

3 Volunteer hours for political campaign activities (see instructions)

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

1 Enter the amount of any excise tax incurred by the organization under section 4955 ▶ $

2 Enter the amount of any excise tax incurred by organization managers under section 4955 ▶ $

3 If the organization incurred a section 4955 tax, did it file Form 4720 for this year? ☐ Yes ☐ No

4a Was a correction made? ☐ Yes ☐ No

b If "Yes," describe in Part IV.

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

1 Enter the amount directly expended by the filing organization for section 527 exempt function activities ▶ $

2 Enter the amount of the filing organization's funds contributed to other organizations for section 527 exempt function activities ▶ $

3 Total exempt function expenditures. Add lines 1 and 2. Enter here and on Form 1120-POL, line 17b ▶ $

4 Did the filing organization file **Form 1120-POL** for this year? ☐ Yes ☐ No

5 Enter the names, addresses and employer identification number (EIN) of all section 527 political organizations to which the filing organization made payments. For each organization listed, enter the amount paid from the filing organization's funds. Also enter the amount of political contributions received that were promptly and directly delivered to a separate political organization, such as a separate segregated fund or a political action committee (PAC). If additional space is needed, provide information in Part IV.

	(a) Name	(b) Address	(c) EIN	(d) Amount paid from filing organization's funds. If none, enter -0-.	(e) Amount of political contributions received and promptly and directly delivered to a separate political organization. If none, enter -0-.
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					

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

A Check ▶ ☐ if the filing organization belongs to an affiliated group (and list in Part IV each affiliated group member's name, address, EIN, expenses, and share of excess lobbying expenditures).

B Check ▶ ☐ if the filing organization checked box A and "limited control" provisions apply.

Limits on Lobbying Expenditures (The term "expenditures" means amounts paid or incurred.)	**(a)** Filing organization's totals	**(b)** Affiliated group totals
1a Total lobbying expenditures to influence public opinion (grass roots lobbying)	42,160	
b Total lobbying expenditures to influence a legislative body (direct lobbying)	267,609	
c Total lobbying expenditures (add lines 1a and 1b)	309,769	
d Other exempt purpose expenditures	26,023,490	
e Total exempt purpose expenditures (add lines 1c and 1d)	26,333,259	
f Lobbying nontaxable amount. Enter the amount from the following table in both columns.	1,000,000	

If the amount on line 1e, column (a) or (b) is:	**The lobbying nontaxable amount is:**
Not over $500,000	20% of the amount on line 1e.
Over $500,000 but not over $1,000,000	$100,000 plus 15% of the excess over $500,000.
Over $1,000,000 but not over $1,500,000	$175,000 plus 10% of the excess over $1,000,000.
Over $1,500,000 but not over $17,000,000	$225,000 plus 5% of the excess over $1,500,000.
Over $17,000,000	$1,000,000.

g Grassroots nontaxable amount (enter 25% of line 1f)	250,000	
h Subtract line 1g from line 1a. If zero or less, enter -0-.	0	
i Subtract line 1f from line 1c. If zero or less, enter -0-.	0	

j If there is an amount other than zero on either line 1h or line 1i, did the organization file Form 4720 reporting section 4911 tax for this year? ☐ **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 separate instructions for lines 2a through 2f.)

Lobbying Expenditures During 4-Year Averaging Period

Calendar year (or fiscal year beginning in)	**(a)** 2016	**(b)** 2017	**(c)** 2018	**(d)** 2019	**(e)** Total
2a Lobbying nontaxable amount	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	4,000,000
b Lobbying ceiling amount (150% of line 2a, column(e))					6,000,000
c Total lobbying expenditures	221,964	306,469	323,049	309,769	1,161,251
d Grassroots nontaxable amount	250,000	250,000	250,000	250,000	1,000,000
e Grassroots ceiling amount (150% of line 2d, column (e))					1,500,000
f Grassroots lobbying expenditures	47,395	35,565	33,382	42,160	158,502

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)).

For each "Yes" response on lines 1a through 1i below, provide in Part IV a detailed description of the lobbying activity.		(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?			
j	Total. Add 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 carry over 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) and if either (a) BOTH Part III-A, lines 1 and 2, are answered "No" OR (b) Part III-A, line 3, is answered "Yes."

1	Dues, assessments and similar amounts from members	1	
2	Section 162(e) nondeductible 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

Provide the descriptions required for Part I-A, line 1; Part I-B, line 4; Part I-C, line 5; Part II-A (affiliated group list); Part II-A, lines 1 and 2 (see instructions), and Part II-B, line 1. Also, complete this part for any additional information.

Return Reference	Explanation	

efile GRAPHIC print - DO NOT PROCESS | As Filed Data - | DLN: 93493048007331

SCHEDULE D (Form 990)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Supplemental Financial Statements

▶ Complete if the organization answered "Yes," on Form 990, Part IV, line 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11a, 11b, 11c, 11d, 11e, 11f, 12a, or 12b.
▶ Attach to Form 990.
▶ Go to www.irs.gov/Form990 for instructions and the latest information.

OMB No. 1545-0047

2019

Open to Public Inspection

Name of the organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

Part I Organizations Maintaining Donor Advised Funds or Other Similar Funds or Accounts.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 6.

		(a) Donor advised funds	(b) Funds and other accounts
1	Total number at end of year		
2	Aggregate value of contributions to (during year)		
3	Aggregate value of grants from (during year)		
4	Aggregate value at end of year		

5 Did the organization inform all donors and donor advisors in writing that the assets held in donor advised funds are the organization's property, subject to the organization's exclusive legal control? ☐ Yes ☐ No

6 Did the organization inform all grantees, donors, and donor advisors in writing that grant funds can be used only for charitable purposes and not for the benefit of the donor or donor advisor, or for any other purpose conferring impermissible private benefit? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Part II Conservation Easements.

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

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

☐ Preservation of land for public use (e.g., recreation or education)
☐ Preservation of an historically important land area
☐ Protection of natural habitat
☐ Preservation of a certified historic structure
☐ Preservation of open space

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

a ☐ Public exhibition

b ☐ Scholarly research

c ☐ Preservation for future generations

d ☐ Loan or exchange programs

e ☐ Other .....

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

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

Part IV Escrow and Custodial Arrangements.

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

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

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

		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, for escrow or custodial account liability? . . . ☐ Yes ☐ No

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

Part V Endowment Funds.

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

	(a) Current year	(b) Prior year	(c) Two years back	(d) Three years back	(e) Four years back
1a Beginning of year balance	115,680	111,025	105,874	99,259	99,417
b Contributions					
c Net investment earnings, gains, and losses	3,484	7,282	7,496	6,615	-158
d Grants or scholarships					
e Other expenditures for facilities and programs	2,472	2,627	2,345		
f Administrative expenses					
g End of year balance	116,692	115,680	111,025	105,874	99,259

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

a Board designated or quasi-endowment ▶ 0 %

b Permanent endowment ▶ 100.000 %

c Temporarily restricted endowment ▶ 0 %

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

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

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

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

Part VI Land, Buildings, and Equipment.

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

Description of property	(a) Cost or other basis (investment)	(b) Cost or other basis (other)	(c) Accumulated depreciation	(d) Book value
1a Land				
b Buildings				
c Leasehold improvements		2,724,282	1,977,973	746,309
d Equipment		2,416,871	2,015,532	401,339
e Other		577,352		577,352
Total. Add lines 1a through 1e. *(Column (d) must equal Form 990, Part X, column (B), line 10(c).)* ▶				1,725,000

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

(a) Description of security or category (including name of security)	(b) Book value	(c) Method of valuation: Cost or end-of-year market value
(1) Financial derivatives		
(2) Closely-held equity interests		
(3) Other		
(A) HEDGE FUND	7,247,238	F
(B)		
(C)		
(D)		
(E)		
(F)		
(G)		
(H)		
Total. *(Column (b) must equal Form 990, Part X, col. (B) line 12.)* ▶	7,247,238	

Part VIII Investments—Program Related.
Complete if the organization answered 'Yes' on Form 990, Part IV, line 11c. See Form 990, Part X, line 13.

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

Part IX Other Assets.
Complete if the organization answered 'Yes' on Form 990, Part IV, line 11d. See Form 990, Part X, line 15.

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

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

1. (a) Description of liability	(b) Book value
(1) Federal income taxes	
(4)	
(5)	
(6)	
(7)	
(8)	
(9)	
Total. *(Column (b) must equal Form 990, Part X, col.(B) line 25.)* ▶	2,878,863

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

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

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

1	Total revenue, gains, and other support per audited financial statements			1	31,740,814
2	Amounts included on line 1 but not on Form 990, Part VIII, line 12:				
a	Net unrealized gains (losses) on investments	2a	-3,555,547		
b	Donated services and use of facilities	2b	81,014		
c	Recoveries of prior year grants	2c			
d	Other (Describe in Part XIII.)	2d			
e	Add lines **2a** through **2d**			2e	-3,474,533
3	Subtract line **2e** from line **1**			3	35,215,347
4	Amounts included on Form 990, Part VIII, line 12, but not on line **1**:				
a	Investment expenses not included on Form 990, Part VIII, line 7b	4a			
b	Other (Describe in Part XIII.)	4b	-20		
c	Add lines **4a** and **4b**			4c	-20
5	Total revenue. Add lines **3** and **4c.** (This must equal Form 990, Part I, line 12.)			5	35,215,327

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

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

1	Total expenses and losses per audited financial statements			1	26,414,293
2	Amounts included on line 1 but not on Form 990, Part IX, line 25:				
a	Donated services and use of facilities	2a	81,014		
b	Prior year adjustments	2b			
c	Other losses	2c			
d	Other (Describe in Part XIII.)	2d	20		
e	Add lines **2a** through **2d**			2e	81,034
3	Subtract line **2e** from line **1**			3	26,333,259
4	Amounts included on Form 990, Part IX, line 25, but not on line **1:**				
a	Investment expenses not included on Form 990, Part VIII, line 7b	4a			
b	Other (Describe in Part XIII.)	4b			
c	Add lines **4a** and **4b**			4c	0
5	Total expenses. Add lines **3** and **4c.** (This must equal Form 990, Part I, line 18.)			5	26,333,259

Part XIII Supplemental Information

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

Return Reference	Explanation
See Additional Data Table	

Part XIII Supplemental Information *(continued)*

Return Reference	Explanation

Additional Data

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

Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
PART V, LINE 4:	ENDOWMENT FUNDS ARE MAINTAINED TO PROVIDE A PERMANENT SOURCE OF INCOME TO SUPPORT THE INST ITUTE'S OVERALL MISSION. ENDOWMENT ASSETS ARE HELD IN PERPETUITY AS DONOR-RESTRICTED GIFTS , WHILE INCOME GENERATED BY THE ENDOWMENTS IS UTILIZED BY THE INSTITUTE FOR ITS GENERAL CH ARITABLE PURPOSE, IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE TERMS OF THE GIFT INSTRUMENT.

Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
PART X, LINE 2:	MANAGEMENT HAS DETERMINED THERE ARE NO UNCERTAIN TAX POSITIONS THAT ARE MATERIAL TO THE FI NANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2020 AND 2019. THE INSTITUTE RECOGNIZES IN TEREST EXPENSE AND PENALTIES ON INCOME TAXES RELATED TO UNCERTAIN TAX POSITIONS IN MANAGEM ENT EXPENSES IN THE STATEMENTS OF ACTIVITIES AND CHANGE IN NET ASSETS. THERE IS NO PROVISI ON IN THESE FINANCIAL STATEMENTS FOR PENALTIES AND INTEREST RELATED TO INCOME TAXES ON UNC ERTAIN TAX POSITIONS FOR THE YEARS ENDED JUNE 30, 2020 AND 2019. TAX YEARS PRIOR TO 2016 A RE NO LONGER SUBJECT TO EXAMINATION BY THE INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE ("IRS") OR THE TAX JUR ISDICTION OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
PART XI, LINE 4B - OTHER ADJUSTMENTS:	LOSS ON DISPOSAL OF FIXED ASSETS -20.

Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
PART XII, LINE 2D - OTHER ADJUSTMENTS:	LOSS ON DISPOSAL OF FIXED ASSETS 20.

efile GRAPHIC print - DO NOT PROCESS | As Filed Data - | DLN: 93493048007331

SCHEDULE F (Form 990)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Statement of Activities Outside the United States

► Complete if the organization answered "Yes" to Form 990, Part IV, line 14b, 15, or 16.
► Attach to Form 990.
► Go to *www.irs.gov/Form990* for instructions and the latest information.

OMB No. 1545-0047

2019

Open to Public Inspection

Name of the organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

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

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

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

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

(a) Region	**(b)** Number of offices in the region	**(c)** Number of employees, agents, and independent contractors in the region	**(d)** Activities conducted in region (by type) (such as, fundraising, program services, investments, grants to recipients located in the region)	**(e)** If activity listed in (d) is a program service, describe specific type of service(s) in the region	**(f)** Total expenditures for and investments in the region
CENTRAL AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN	0	0	INVESTMENTS		7,247,238
3a Sub-total	0	0			7,247,238
b Total from continuation sheets to Part I . . .	0	0			0
c Totals (add lines 3a and 3b)	0	0			7,247,238

Part II **Grants and Other Assistance to Organizations or Entities Outside the United States.** Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 15, for any recipient who received more than $5,000. Part II can be duplicated if additional space is needed.

1 (a) Name of organization	(b) IRS code section and EIN (if applicable)	(c) Region	(d) Purpose of grant	(e) Amount of cash grant	(f) Manner of cash disbursement	(g) Amount of noncash assistance	(h) Description of noncash assistance	(i) Method of valuation (book, FMV, appraisal, other)

2 Enter total number of recipient organizations listed above that are recognized as charities by the foreign country, recognized as tax-exempt by the IRS, or for which the grantee or counsel has provided a section 501(c)(3) equivalency letter . . . . . ▶ _____

3 Enter total number of other organizations or entities . . . . . ▶

Part III **Grants and Other Assistance to Individuals Outside the United States.** Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 16. Part III can be duplicated if additional space is needed.

(a) Type of grant or assistance	(b) Region	(c) Number of recipients	(d) Amount of cash grant	(e) Manner of cash disbursement	(f) Amount of noncash assistance	(g) Description of noncash assistance	(h) Method of valuation (book, FMV, appraisal, other)

Part IV Foreign Forms

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

Part V **Supplemental Information**

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

990 Schedule F, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
PART III ACCOUNTING METHOD:	

efile GRAPHIC print - DO NOT PROCESS | As Filed Data - | DLN: 93493048007331

Note: To capture the full content of this document, please select landscape mode (11" x 8.5") when printing.

Schedule I (Form 990)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

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

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

▶ **Attach to Form 990.**

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

OMB No. 1545-0047

2019

Open to Public Inspection

Name of the organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

Part I General Information on Grants and Assistance

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

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

Part II Grants and Other Assistance to Domestic Organizations and Domestic Governments.

Complete if the organization answered "Yes" on Form 990, Part IV, line 21, for any recipient that received more than $5,000. Part II can be duplicated if additional space is needed.

(a) Name and address of organization or government	(b) EIN	(c) IRC section (if applicable)	(d) Amount of cash grant	(e) Amount of non-cash assistance	(f) Method of valuation (book, FMV, appraisal, other)	(g) Description of noncash assistance	(h) Purpose of grant or assistance
(1) See Additional Data							
(2)							
(3)							
(4)							
(5)							
(6)							
(7)							
(8)							
(9)							
(10)							
(11)							
(12)							

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

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

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

(a) Type of grant or assistance	(b) Number of recipients	(c) Amount of cash grant	(d) Amount of noncash assistance	(e) Method of valuation (book, FMV, appraisal, other)	(f) Description of noncash assistance
(1)					
(2)					
(3)					
(4)					
(5)					
(6)					
(7)					

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

Return Reference	Explanation
PART I, LINE 2:	PURSUANT TO A GRANT AGREEMENT, GRANTEE DELIVERS REGULAR STATUS REPORTS TO IJ DURING THE TERM OF THE GRANT. IJ REVIEWS THESE GRANT REPORTS AND MONITORS PERFORMANCE AND COMPLIANCE WITH THE TERMS OF THE AGREEMENT.

Additional Data

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

Form 990,Schedule I, Part II, Grants and Other Assistance to Domestic Organizations and Domestic Governments.

(a) Name and address of organization or government	**(b)** EIN	**(c)** IRC section if applicable	**(d)** Amount of cash grant	**(e)** Amount of non-cash assistance	**(f)** Method of valuation (book, FMV, appraisal, other)	**(g)** Description of non-cash assistance	**(h)** Purpose of grant or assistance
STATE POLICY NETWORK 1655 NORTH FORT MYER DRIVE 360 ARLINGTON, VA 22209	57-0952531	501(C)(3)	20,000				2020 SPN CONFERENCE SPONSORSHIP
SERVING OUR CHILDREN INC 1615 L STREET NW SUITE 750 WASHINGTON, DC 20036	20-8874570	501(C)(3)	32,629				GRANT TO ASSIST PARENTS APPLYING TO DC SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM

Form 990,Schedule I, Part II, Grants and Other Assistance to Domestic Organizations and Domestic Governments.

(a) Name and address of organization or government	**(b)** EIN	**(c)** IRC section if applicable	**(d)** Amount of cash grant	**(e)** Amount of non-cash assistance	**(f)** Method of valuation (book, FMV, appraisal, other)	**(g)** Description of non-cash assistance	**(h)** Purpose of grant or assistance
AMERICAN LEGISLATIVE EXCHANGE COUNCIL (ALEC) 2900 CRYSTAL DRIVE 6TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22202	52-0140979	501(C)(3)	17,000				2019 MEMBERSHIP CONTRIBUTION

efile GRAPHIC print - DO NOT PROCESS | As Filed Data - | DLN: 93493048007331

Schedule J (Form 990)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Compensation Information

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

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

▶ **Attach to Form 990.**

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

OMB No. 1545-0047

2019

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 on Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a. Complete Part III to provide any relevant information regarding these items.			
	☐ First-class or charter travel	☐ 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 on Line 1a are checked, did the organization follow a written policy regarding payment or reimbursement or provision of all of the expenses described above? If "No," complete Part III to explain	**1b**		
2	Did the organization require substantiation prior to reimbursing or allowing expenses incurred by all directors, trustees, officers, including the CEO/Executive Director, regarding the items checked on Line 1a?	**2**		
3	Indicate which, if any, of the following the filing organization used to establish the compensation of the organization's CEO/Executive Director. Check all that apply. Do not check any boxes for methods used by a related organization to establish compensation of the CEO/Executive Director, but explain in Part III.			
	☑ Compensation committee	☐ 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 on Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a, with respect to the filing organization or a related organization:			
a	Receive a severance payment or change-of-control payment?	**4a**		No
b	Participate in, or receive payment from, a supplemental nonqualified retirement plan?	**4b**	Yes	
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), 501(c)(4), and 501(c)(29) organizations must complete lines 5-9.			
5	For persons listed on Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a, did the organization pay or accrue any compensation contingent on the revenues of:			
a	The organization?	**5a**		No
b	Any related organization?	**5b**		No
	If "Yes," on line 5a or 5b, describe in Part III.			
6	For persons listed on Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a, did the organization pay or accrue any compensation contingent on the net earnings of:			
a	The organization?	**6a**		No
b	Any related organization?	**6b**		No
	If "Yes," on line 6a or 6b, describe in Part III.			
7	For persons listed on Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a, did the organization provide any nonfixed payments not described in lines 5 and 6? If "Yes," describe in Part III	**7**	Yes	
8	Were any amounts reported on Form 990, Part VII, paid or accured pursuant to a contract that was subject to the initial contract exception described in Regulations section 53.4958-4(a)(3)? If "Yes," describe in Part III	**8**		No
9	If "Yes" on 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 duplicate copies if additional space is needed.

For each individual whose compensation must be reported on Schedule J, report compensation from the organization on row (i) and from related organizations, described 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) for each listed individual must equal the total amount of Form 990, Part VII, Section A, line 1a, applicable column (D) and (E) amounts for that individual.

(A) Name and Title	**(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 in column (B) reported as deferred on prior Form 990
	(i) Base compensation	**(ii)** Bonus & incentive compensation	**(iii)** Other reportable compensation				
See Additional Data Table							

Part III Supplemental Information

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

Return Reference	Explanation
PART I, LINE 4B	FOUNDING GENERAL COUNSEL WILLIAM MELLOR PARTICIPATED IN A SECTION 457(F) PLAN. THERE WERE NO CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE PLAN FOR THE YEAR ENDED JUNE 30, 2020. THE FINAL $317,458 OF DEFERRED COMPENSATION IN THE PLAN WAS PAID TO MR. MELLOR IN DECEMBER 2019.
PART I, LINE 7	THE COMPENSATION COMMITTEE DETERMINES, ON AN ANNUAL BASIS, THE BONUSES TO BE AWARDED TO SIX SENIOR IJ EMPLOYEES: (I) PRESIDENT/GENERAL COUNSEL, (II) SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR LITIGATION, (III) CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER, (IV) MANAGING VP AND SENIOR ATTORNEY, (V) VICE PRESIDENT FOR COMMUNICATIONS, AND (VI) THE MANAGING VP-CFO/SECRETARY AND TREASURER. FOR ALL OTHERS, BONUSES ARE DETERMINED BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE INSTITUTE ON AN ANNUAL BASIS. ALL BONUSES ARE BASED ON A BOARD APPROVED BUDGET.

Additional Data

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

Form 990, Schedule J, Part II - Officers, Directors, Trustees, Key Employees, and Highest Compensated Employees

(A) Name and Title		(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 in column (B) reported as deferred on prior Form 990
		(i) Base Compensation	(ii) Bonus & incentive compensation	(iii) Other reportable compensation				
1SCOTT G BULLOCK PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL	(i)	409,403	60,000	72	38,500	9,005	516,980	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
1WILLIAM MELLOR CHAIRMAN & FOUNDING GENERAL COUNSEL	(i)	38,614	0	317,839	4,000	18,011	378,464	317,458
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2DANIEL KNEPPER MANAGING VP-CFO/SECRETARY & TREAS.	(i)	328,617	45,000	31	33,666	10,369	417,683	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3DANA BERLINER SENIOR VP AND LITIGATION DIRECTOR	(i)	380,973	60,000	72	38,500	12,404	491,949	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4JOHN KRAMER VP FOR COMMUNICATIONS	(i)	337,136	35,000	72	38,500	31,036	441,744	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5DEBORAH SIMPSON CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER	(i)	297,889	35,000	72	38,038	30,186	401,185	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6BETH STEVENS VP FOR DEVELOPMENT	(i)	265,403	12,000	72	36,676	11,755	325,906	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7ROBERT MCNAMARA SENIOR ATTORNEY	(i)	278,601	15,000	28	37,500	13,124	344,253	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8JEFFREY ROWES SENIOR ATTORNEY	(i)	214,746	20,000	47	34,433	31,292	300,518	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9ROBERT GALL MANAGING VP AND SENIOR ATTORNEY	(i)	233,674	0	45	35,006	27,823	296,548	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10MELANIE HILDRETH VP FOR EXTERNAL RELATIONS	(i)	204,911	15,000	28	33,206	17,205	270,350	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11MICHAEL BINDAS SENIOR ATTORNEY	(i)	185,300	20,000	47	20,682	29,480	255,509	0
	(ii)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

efile GRAPHIC print - DO NOT PROCESS | As Filed Data - | DLN: 93493048007331

SCHEDULE M (Form 990)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Noncash Contributions

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

OMB No. 1545-0047

2019

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 or items contributed	(c) Noncash contribution amounts reported on Form 990, Part VIII, line 1g	(d) Method of determining noncash contribution amounts
1	Art—Works of art				
2	Art—Historical treasures				
3	Art—Fractional interests				
4	Books and publications				
5	Clothing and household goods				
6	Cars and other vehicles	X	3	1,010	FMV
7	Boats and planes				
8	Intellectual property				
9	Securities—Publicly traded	X	40	1,477,933	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 ▶ (BITCOIN)	X	8	6,172	FMV
26	Other ▶ ( )				
27	Other ▶ ( )				
28	Other ▶ ( )				

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

			Yes	No
30a	During the year, did the organization receive by contribution any property reported in Part I, lines 1 through 28, that it must hold for at least three years from the date of the initial contribution, and which isn't required to be used for exempt purposes for the entire holding period?	30a		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 nonstandard contributions?	31	Yes	
32a	Does the organization hire or use third parties or related organizations to solicit, process, or sell noncash contributions?	32a	Yes	
b	If "Yes," describe in Part II.			
33	If the organization didn't report an amount in column (c) for a type of property for which column (a) is checked, describe in Part II.			

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

Return Reference	Explanation
PART I, COLUMN (B):	THE CONTRIBUTIONS REPORTED IN COLUMN B OF PART I ABOVE REPRESENT THE NUMBER OF CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED.
PART I, LINE 32B:	THE INSTITUTE UTILIZES A BROKERAGE FIRM TO SELL DONATED SECURITIES AND OTHER INVESTMENT VEHICLES.

efile GRAPHIC print - DO NOT PROCESS | As Filed Data - | DLN: 93493048007331

SCHEDULE O (Form 990 or 990-EZ)

Department of the Treasury
Internal Revenue Service

Supplemental Information to Form 990 or 990-EZ

Complete to provide information for responses to specific questions on Form 990 or 990-EZ or to provide any additional information.
▶ Attach to Form 990 or 990-EZ.
▶ Go to *www.irs.gov/Form990* for the latest information.

OMB No. 1545-0047

2019

Open to Public Inspection

Name of the organization
INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE

Employer identification number
52-1744337

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
FORM 990, PART VI, SECTION B, LINE 11B	THE FORM 990 WAS REVIEWED BY THE INSTITUTE'S AUDIT COMMITTEE IN CONSULTATION WITH THE INSTITUTE'S INDEPENDENT AUDITORS, AS NECESSARY. AFTER REVIEW BY THE AUDIT COMMITTEE, THE FORM 990 WAS DISTRIBUTED TO THE FULL BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
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.

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
FORM 990, PART VI, SECTION B, LINE 15	AT THE FALL BOARD MEETING, THE BOARD DETERMINES THE COMPENSATION OF SIX EMPLOYEES: THE PRESIDENT/GENERAL COUNSEL, THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT FOR LITIGATION, THE CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER, THE MANAGING VICE PRESIDENT AND SENIOR ATTORNEY, THE VICE PRESIDENT FOR COMMUNICATIONS, AND THE MANAGING VICE PRESIDENT-CFO/SECRETARY AND TREASURER. IJ PROVIDES THE BOARD'S COMPENSATION COMMITTEE WITH PRESENT AND PAST COMPENSATION AMOUNTS FOR THESE POSITIONS, AS WELL AS COMPARABLE DATA FROM THE MOST RECENTLY AVAILABLE FORM 990 FOR SIMILARLY SITUATED NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATIONS. IJ ALSO ANNUALLY ENGAGES AN OUTSIDE VENDOR TO PROVIDE AN INDEPENDENT COMPENSATION SURVEY. THE COMPENSATION COMMITTEE MAKES A RECOMMENDATION ON COMPENSATION TO THE FULL BOARD (EXCEPT FOR THE PRESIDENT/GENERAL COUNSEL, WHO IS RECUSED), AND THE FULL BOARD THEN VOTES TO DETERMINE COMPENSATION, WHICH DECISION IS CONTEMPORANEOUSLY RECORDED AND COMMUNICATED TO THE CFO BY THE CHAIRMAN AND PLACED IN THE APPLICABLE CONFIDENTIAL EMPLOYMENT FILES. DURING THE SUMMER BOARD MEETING, THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS AUTHORIZES FORECASTED COMPENSATION INCREASES FOR OTHER OFFICERS AND KEY EMPLOYEES THROUGH ITS APPROVAL OF THE NEXT FISCAL YEAR'S BUDGET.

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
FORM 990, PART VI, SECTION C, LINE 19	IJ'S 990 AND FINANCIAL STATEMENTS ARE AVAILABLE ON ITS AND OTHER WEBSITES. IJ'S 990, FINANCIAL STATEMENTS, AND OTHER IRS DOCUMENTATION, GOVERNING DOCUMENTS AND CERTAIN OTHER POLICIES ARE AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC UPON REQUEST.

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
FORM 990, PART XII, 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.

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
CASES IN LITIGATION	ESPINOZA V. MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE (IJ) SECURED A LANDMAR K VICTORY FOR EDUCATIONAL CHOICE AT THE U.S. SUPREME COURT WHEN THE COURT RULED THAT BARRI NG RELIGIOUS OPTIONS IN SCHOOL CHOICE PROGRAMS VIOLATES THE FIRST AMENDMENT'S PROTECTIONS FOR RELIGIOUS LIBERTY. PROGRAMS MUST BE NEUTRAL REGARDING RELIGION AND ALLOW FAMILIES TO C HOOSE THE SCHOOL THAT WORKS BEST FOR THEM. IN 2015, IJ FILED SUIT ON BEHALF OF THREE MONTA NA FAMILIES TO DEFEND A TAX-CREDIT SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM FROM AN ATTACK BY THE MONTANA STATE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE, WHICH ATTEMPTED TO LIMIT THESE SCHOLARSHIPS TO NONRELIGIOUS PRIVAT E SCHOOLS. WHEN THE MONTANA SUPREME COURT STRUCK DOWN THE ENTIRE PROGRAM FOR INCLUDING REL IGIOUSLY AFFILIATED SCHOOLS, IJ APPEALED THE CASE TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT, AND WE WON. I J WILL USE THIS VICTORY TO EXPAND EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES FOR THOUSANDS OF FAMILIES ACRO SS AMERICA. TIMBS V. STATE OF INDIANA SEVEN YEARS AND ONE LANDMARK U.S. SUPREME COURT VICT ORY LATER, IJ CLIENT TYSON TIMBS FINALLY HAS HIS CAR BACK. IN APRIL 2020, A TRIAL COURT JU DGE RULED THAT THE CIVIL FORFEITURE OF TYSON'S $35,000 LAND ROVER VIOLATED THE EIGHTH AMEN DMENT'S BAN ON GOVERNMENTS IMPOSING EXCESSIVE FINES AND FEES AND ORDERED THE STATE OF INDI ANA TO RETURN HIS CAR IMMEDIATELY. TYSON'S JOURNEY BEGAN WHEN LAW ENFORCEMENT USED FORFEIT URE TO SEIZE HIS VEHICLE AFTER HE WAS CONVICTED OF SELLING $225 WORTH OF DRUGS. AFTER THE INDIANA SUPREME COURT RULED THAT THE EIGHTH AMENDMENT PROVIDES NO PROTECTION AGAINST FINES AND FORFEITURES IMPOSED BY THE STATES, IJ CHALLENGED THIS DECISION AT THE U.S. SUPREME CO URT - AND RESOUNDINGLY WON. THE U.S. SUPREME COURT HELD THAT THE BAN ON EXCESSIVE FINES AN D FEES APPLIES TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AS WELL AS THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT, A DECISIO N WHICH PROTECTS AMERICANS FROM ABUSE OF THEIR PROPERTY RIGHTS BY ALL LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT . THE HIGH COURT SENT TYSON'S CASE BACK TO THE INDIANA SUPREME COURT, WHICH IN TURN SENT T HE CASE BACK TO THE TRIAL COURT, WHICH RULED FOR TYSON. AMAZINGLY, THE INDIANA ATTORNEY GE NERAL HAS APPEALED THE DECISION, PLACING TYSON'S CASE BEFORE THE INDIANA SUPREME COURT FOR A THIRD TIME. IJ WILL KEEP FIGHTING ON BEHALF OF TYSON AND ALL VICTIMS OF CIVIL FORFEITUR E. SOUTH MOUNTAIN CREAMERY, LLC, V. FDA, ET AL. DAIRY FARMERS ACROSS AMERICA CAN SELL, AND THEIR CUSTOMERS CAN ENJOY, TRUTHFULLY LABELED SKIM MILK THANKS TO AN IJ VICTORY FOR FREE SPEECH. RANDY SOWERS IS THE FOUNDER OF SOUTH MOUNTAIN CREAMERY IN MIDDLETOWN, MARYLAND. TH E SKIM MILK HE SELLS IS 100% PURE, WITH NO ADDITIVES; IT'S SAFE TO DRINK AND LEGAL TO SELL . BUT WHEN RANDY WANTED TO SELL HIS SKIM MILK ACROSS STATE LINES, HE LEARNED THAT FDA REGU LATIONS REQUIRED HE LABEL HIS ALL-NATURAL MILK AS "IMITATION SKIM MILK OR "IMITATION MILK PRODUCT" BECAUSE HE DIDN'T ADD TWO ARTIFICIAL VITAMINS TO IT. IF HE VIOLATED THIS REGULATI ON, HE COULD FACE FINES OR EVEN JAIL. THERE'S NOTHING IMITATION ABOUT RANDY'S MILK, AND TH E FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTS HIS

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
CASES IN LITIGATION	RIGHT TO TELL THE TRUTH. SO, RANDY AND IJ FILED A FEDERAL LAWSUIT AGAINST THE FDA'S BAN O N TRUTHFUL ADVERTISING. IN RESPONSE, THE FDA AGREED IN APRIL 2020 NOT TO ENFORCE THE LABEL ING REQUIREMENT AND POSTED AN EXPLANATION ON ITS WEBSITE THAT OTHER SKIM MILK PRODUCERS CA N TRUTHFULLY LABEL THEIR PRODUCT "SKIM MILK." LADD, ET AL. V. REAL ESTATE COMMISSION OF PE NNSYLVANIA IN A VICTORY FOR ECONOMIC LIBERTY, THE PENNSYLVANIA SUPREME COURT HELD THAT VAC ATION RENTAL MANAGER SALLY LADD'S CONSTITUTIONAL LAWSUIT AGAINST THE PENNSYLVANIA REAL EST ATE COMMISSION CAN MOVE FORWARD, REVERSING AN EARLIER DECISION BY THE PENNSYLVANIA COMMONW EALTH COURT DISMISSING THE CASE. THE DECISION VINDICATES THE RIGHT TO EARN AN HONEST LIVIN G ENSHRINED IN THE PENNSYLVANIA CONSTITUTION. THIS MEANS PENNSYLVANIANS CAN NOW LEVERAGE T HE "MORE RESTRICTIVE" PROTECTIONS OF THE STATE CONSTITUTION WHEN CHALLENGING ECONOMIC LIBE RTY RESTRICTIONS IN COURT. SALLY LADD IS AN ENTREPRENEUR WHO MANAGED VARIOUS VACATION PROP ERTIES IN PENNSYLVANIA'S POCONO MOUNTAINS. THOUGH SHE IS NOT A REAL ESTATE BROKER, SALLY R ECEIVED A CALL FROM THE PENNSYLVANIA DEPARTMENT OF STATE INFORMING HER THAT SHE WAS UNDER INVESTIGATION FOR THE UNLICENSED PRACTICE OF REAL ESTATE. TO CONTINUE TO OPERATE LEGALLY, SHE WOULD HAVE TO SPEND THREE YEARS WORKING FOR AN ESTABLISHED BROKER, PASS TWO EXAMS, AND SET UP HER OWN BRICK-AND-MORTAR OFFICE IN PENNSYLVANIA. FORCED TO SHUT DOWN HER BUSINESS, SALLY TEAMED UP WITH IJ IN JULY 2017 TO CHALLENGE THIS HEAVY-HANDED LICENSING SCHEME AND VINDICATE THE RIGHTS OF ENTREPRENEURS THROUGHOUT PENNSYLVANIA. BROWNBACK V. KING IN JANUAR Y, IJ LAUNCHED OUR PROJECT ON IMMUNITY AND ACCOUNTABILITY, AN INITIATIVE TO TEAR DOWN THE LEGAL DOCTRINES THAT SHIELD GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS FROM BEING HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR EVEN THE MOST OUTRAGEOUS ABUSES OF PEOPLE'S RIGHTS. TWO MONTHS LATER, IJ LEARNED THAT WE WILL BE HE ADING TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT TO ARGUE A CASE THAT WILL DETERMINE WHETHER THE GOVERNMENT CAN INVENT YET ANOTHER LEGAL PROTECTION FOR THEMSELVES. IN 2014, TWO PLAINCLOTHES OFFICIA LS - A MICHIGAN POLICE OFFICER AND AN FBI AGENT - SAVAGELY BEAT IJ CLIENT JAMES KING AFTER MISTAKING THE THEN-COLLEGE STUDENT FOR A PETTY THIEF HE BARELY RESEMBLED. SINCE THEN, THE GOVERNMENT REPEATEDLY DENIED JAMES JUSTICE. NOW IT IS GOING EVEN FURTHER, SEEKING TO CREA TE AN ENTIRELY NEW WAY OF PREVENTING PEOPLE FROM HOLDING ACCOUNTABLE FEDERAL OFFICERS WHO BREAK THE LAW. IJ WILL FIGHT FOR JAMES' RIGHTS AND TO CONVINCE THE HIGH COURT TO STOP THIS EXPANSION OF GOVERNMENT IMMUNITY. HOHENBERG AND HANSON V. SHELBY COUNTY, TENNESSEE, ET AL . WHEN A COURT PROCEEDING MAY RESULT IN A PERSON LOSING THEIR HOME, THE U.S. CONSTITUTION DEMANDS A FAIR PROCESS WITH RIGOROUS SAFEGUARDS. FOR DEFENDANTS IN MEMPHIS' ENVIRONMENTAL COURT, THE PROCESS IS ANYTHING BUT FAIR. SARAH HOHENBERG AND JOSEPH HANSON BOTH ENDED UP I N ENVIRONMENTAL COURT AFTER TREES FELL ON THEIR HOUSES. BOTH ENDED UP LOSING THEIR HOMES A FTER A YEARS-LONG PROCESS IN A

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
CASES IN LITIGATION	COURT WHERE WITNESSES ARE NOT SWORN IN, EVIDENCE IS NOT AUTHENTICATED, AND PROCEEDINGS AR E NOT RECORDED, MAKING DECISIONS ALL BUT IMPOSSIBLE TO APPEAL. SARAH AND JOSEPH HAVE PARTN ERED WITH IJ FOR A LAWSUIT TO ENSURE THAT THE ENVIRONMENTAL COURT, AND SIMILAR HOUSING COU RTS ACROSS THE COUNTRY, PROVIDE THE DUE PROCESS THAT THE CONSTITUTION REQUIRES, SO THAT NO ONE LOSES THEIR HOME TO A COURT WITHOUT PROPER SAFEGUARDS. THEY ARE ASKING THAT THE COURT BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE FOR MAKING BOTH OF THEM HOMELESS. RAINWATERS AND HOLLINGSWORTH V. TEN NESSEE WILDLIFE RESOURCES AGENCY, ET AL. TERRY RAINWATERS AND HUNTER HOLLINGSWORTH OWN RUR AL PROPERTIES IN TENNESSEE. THEIR PROPERTIES ARE THEIR SANCTUARIES, BUT OFFICERS FROM THE TENNESSEE WILDLIFE RESOURCES AGENCY (TWRA) ROUTINELY ENTER PRIVATE LAND ON A WHIM TO SEARC H FOR POTENTIAL HUNTING VIOLATIONS WITHOUT A WARRANT. THEY TRESPASS, TAKE PHOTOS AND VIDEO S, AND EVEN INSTALL CAMERAS TO RECORD 24/7. TWRA THINKS IT CAN GET AWAY WITH SUCH CREEPY S URVEILLANCE BECAUSE THE U.S. SUPREME COURT WRONGLY HELD THAT THE U.S. CONSTITUTION'S PROTE CTIONS AGAINST UNREASONABLE SEARCHES DON'T APPLY TO "OPEN FIELDS." BUT THE TENNESSEE CONST ITUTION PROHIBITS STATE OFFICIALS FROM BARGING IN WHENEVER THEY WISH. THAT'S WHY TERRY AND HUNTER HAVE TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO SUE TWRA IN TENNESSEE STATE COURT AND VINDICATE THE RIGH T OF ALL TENNESSEANS TO BE FREE FROM UNCONSTITUTIONAL SEARCHES. MEADE AND SOOKRAM V. BONIN AND ETOH MONITORING, LLC THE U.S. CONSTITUTION REQUIRES JUDGES TO BE OBJECTIVE WHEN DECID ING WHETHER TO DEPRIVE A PERSON OF HER LIBERTY OR PROPERTY. WHEN JUDGES HAVE A PERSONAL, P OLITICAL, OR FINANCIAL INTEREST IN A CASE, THEY VIOLATE THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT'S GUARANT EE OF DUE PROCESS. HAKEEM MEADE, MARSHALL SOOKRAM, AND TOO MANY OTHERS IN NEW ORLEANS KNOW THIS ALL TOO WELL - THEY WERE ORDERED TO SUBMIT TO ANKLE MONITORING BY A JUDGE WHO HAS PE RSONAL, POLITICAL, AND FINANCIAL TIES TO THE COMPANY THAT PROVIDED AND CHARGED FOR THIS SE RVICE. NOW, HAKEEM AND MARSHALL ARE FIGHTING TO ENSURE THAT ANKLE MONITORING DECISIONS IN ORLEANS PARISH AND ELSEWHERE ARE MADE WITHOUT BIAS OR THE APPEARANCE OF BIAS. IN MAY 2020, THEY TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO FILE A CIVIL RIGHTS CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT SEEKING AN ORDER DECLA RING THAT JUDICIAL DECISIONS INFLUENCED BY A JUDGE'S TIES TO A PRIVATE PARTY VIOLATE THE C ONSTITUTION, AND REQUIRING THE COMPANY TO DISGORGE THE FEES IT HAS COLLECTED FROM DEFENDAN TS APPEARING BEFORE JUDGE BONIN AND CANCEL ANY REMAINING FEES.

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
INGRAM, ET AL. V. WAYNE COUNTY	FOR DECADES, RESIDENTS OF DETROIT AND WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN, HAVE LIVED UNDER CONSTANT TH REAT OF HAVING THEIR CARS TAKEN AWAY AND RANSOMED BACK TO THEM FOR $1,000 OR MORE - THAT I S, IF THE CAR IS EVER RECOVERED. THE PERPETRATORS ARE POLICE AND PROSECUTORS WHO USE CIVIL FORFEITURE TO SEIZE HUNDREDS OF CARS EACH YEAR. DETROITERS MELISA INGRAM AND ROBERT REEVE S BOTH LOST THEIR CARS (AND OTHER PERSONAL PROPERTY INSIDE) WHEN WAYNE COUNTY SEIZED THEM BASED ON OTHER PEOPLE'S ALLEGED MISBEHAVIOR. MELISA AND ROBERT HAVE PARTNERED WITH THE INS TITUTE FOR JUSTICE TO FILE A MAJOR FEDERAL CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT CHALLENGING THE CONSTITUTI ONALITY OF WAYNE COUNTY'S FORFEITURE PROGRAM. THE LAWSUIT ASKS THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN TO ENFORCE THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO DUE PROCE SS AND THE RIGHTS TO BE FREE FROM UNREASONABLE SEIZURES AND EXCESSIVE FINES. BROWN AND ROL IN V. TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ADMINISTRATION, ET AL. RETIRED RAILROAD ENGINEER TERRY ROLIN 'S LIFE SAVINGS OF $82,373 WERE SEIZED BY THE GOVERNMENT, BUT HE HASN'T BEEN CHARGED WITH ANY CRIME. TERRY SAVED UP CASH AND KEPT IT IN HIS PITTSBURGH HOME OVER MANY YEARS. HE ASKE D HIS DAUGHTER, REBECCA BROWN, TO TAKE THE MONEY HOME WITH HER TO BOSTON AND DEPOSIT IT IN TO A NEW JOINT BANK ACCOUNT. REBECCA CHECKED ONLINE AND FOUND OUT THAT FLYING DOMESTICALLY WITH ANY AMOUNT OF CASH IS COMPLETELY LEGAL. BUT AT THE AIRPORT, THE TSA HELD HER BAGS AS SHE WENT THROUGH SECURITY SCREENING, THEN A DEA AGENT TOOK THE MONEY WITHOUT CHARGING REB ECCA WITH A CRIME OR ARRESTING HER. MONTHS LATER, THE GOVERNMENT SAID IT WAS KEEPING THE M ONEY FOR GOOD. SO, TERRY AND REBECCA JOINED WITH IJ IN JANUARY 2020 TO FILE A CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT AGAINST THE DEA AND TSA FOR PRACTICES THAT VIOLATE THE CONSTITUTION AND ARE OUTSI DE THE TSA'S LEGAL AUTHORITY. IN RESPONSE TO THE LAWSUIT, THE GOVERNMENT RETURNED TERRY'S MONEY. BUT BECAUSE TERRY AND REBECCA'S SUIT INCLUDES CLASS ACTION CLAIMS TO VINDICATE THE RIGHTS OF OTHER TRAVELERS, WE WILL CONTINUE TO LITIGATE IT IN FEDERAL COURT. LECH V. CITY OF GREENWOOD VILLAGE SHOCKINGLY, THE 10TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS HELD IN 2019 THAT AS LONG AS THE GOVERNMENT USES ITS "POLICE POWER" TO DESTROY PROPERTY, IT CANNOT BE REQUIR ED TO PROVIDE COMPENSATION FOR THAT PROPERTY UNDER THE U.S. CONSTITUTION'S TAKINGS CLAUSE. THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE FILED A PETITION ASKING U.S. SUPREME COURT TO TELL THE 10TH CIR CUIT THAT THERE IS NO "POLICE POWER" EXCEPTION TO THE TAKINGS CLAUSE. THE CASE WAS BROUGHT BY LEO, ALFONSINA, AND JOHN LECH, SEEKING COMPENSATION FOR THE DESTRUCTION OF A HOME LEO AND ALFONSINA OWNED (AND IN WHICH THEIR SON JOHN LIVED WITH HIS OWN FAMILY) IN GREENWOOD V ILLAGE, COLORADO. IN 2015, AN ARMED SHOPLIFTER FLED INTO THE HOME (APPARENTLY AT RANDOM). AFTER TAKING GUNFIRE FROM THE SHOPLIFTER, THE POLICE USED EXPLOSIVES, HIGH-CALIBER AMMUNIT ION, AND A BATTERING RAM. THE FUGITIVE WAS APPREHENDED, BUT THE HOME WAS TOTALED. UNFORTUN ATELY, IN JUNE OF 2020, THE SU

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
INGRAM, ET AL. V. WAYNE COUNTY	PREME COURT DENIED THE LECHS' PETITION FOR REVIEW. IJ REMAINS COMMITTED TO GETTING THIS PR ECEDENT OVERTURNED IN A FUTURE CASE. SALGADO V. UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN MAY 2015, MILA DIS SALGADO RETURNED HOME TO FIND POLICE HAD RAIDED HER HOME AND TAKEN HER LIFE SAVINGS OF $15,000 BASED ON A FALSE TIP THAT HER ESTRANGED HUSBAND WAS DEALING DRUGS. THE DRUG ENFOR CEMENT AGENCY (DEA) ATTEMPTED TO KEEP MILADIS' MONEY FOREVER, BUT SHE WENT TO COURT TO GET HER MONEY BACK. RIGHT BEFORE THE COURT WAS ABOUT TO RULE, THE DEA SUDDENLY AGREED TO GIVE THE MONEY BACK AND CLAIMED THIS MEANT MILADIS HAD NOT WON HER CASE AND THEREFORE SHOULD N OT RECEIVE AN AWARD OF ATTORNEYS' FEES. MILADIS' LAWYER OBJECTED, BUT THE COURT AGREED WIT H THE GOVERNMENT. THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE TEAMED UP WITH MILADIS TO BRING HER PETITION F OR ATTORNEYS' FEES TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT. THE GOVERNMENT SHOULD NOT BE ABLE TAKE YOUR PROPERTY, KEEP IT FOR YEARS, AND THEN SUDDENLY GIVE IT BACK AND PRETEND LIKE NOTHING HAPPE NED. UNFORTUNATELY, IN APRIL 2020, THE SUPREME COURT DECLINED TO HEAR THE CASE. WOODCREST HOMES, INC. V. CAROUSEL FARMS METRO. DISTRICT IN 2006, WOODCREST HOMES BEGAN PLANNING A HO USING DEVELOPMENT IN COLORADO. YEARS LATER, CENTURY COMMUNITIES, A COMPETING DEVELOPER, PU RCHASED LAND SURROUNDING WOODCREST, THEN CREATED A SO-CALLED "MUNICIPAL DISTRICT" - A PSEU DO-GOVERNMENTAL BODY PERMITTED IN COLORADO - COMPRISING THEIR AND WOODCREST'S LAND AND STA FFED BY CENTURY'S OWN EMPLOYEES. THE DISTRICT THEN "VOTED" TO USE EMINENT DOMAIN TO TAKE A WAY WOODCREST'S LAND. WOODCREST CHALLENGED THE TAKING IN COURT, BUT THE COLORADO SUPREME C OURT HELD THAT ALL THAT MATTERED WAS WHAT WOODCREST WANTED TO PUT ON THE LAND (ROADS AND U TILITIES), NOT WHETHER THE PROCESS HAD BEEN CAPTURED BY A PRIVATE DEVELOPER SERVING ITS OW N ENDS. THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE PARTNERED WITH WOODCREST TO FORMALLY PETITION THE U.S. S UPREME COURT TO REVIEW THE CASE. UNFORTUNATELY, ON MARCH 23, 2020, THE SUPREME COURT DECID ED NOT TO HEAR THIS CASE, WHICH MEANS THAT THE COLORADO SUPREME COURT'S DECISION UPHOLDING THIS LAND GRAB REMAINS THE LAW OF THE LAND IN THAT STATE. CAMERON V. CITY OF RICHLAND LIN DA CAMERON HAD BEEN LIVING IN THE SAME RICHLAND, WASHINGTON, HOME FOR MORE THAN 40 YEARS W HEN SHE DECIDED TO TURN HER OUTDATED CARPORT INTO A GARAGE AND ADD A SECOND BEDROOM AND BA THROOM. ALTHOUGH THE CITY BUILDING PERMIT AND INSPECTION OFFICE WAS PREPARED TO APPROVE TH E PERMIT, THE RICHLAND PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT, WHICH ALSO REVIEWED LINDA'S APPLICATION, I NFORMED HER THAT BECAUSE HER RENOVATIONS WERE SLATED TO COST MORE THAN $50,000, SHE'D HAVE TO "RENOVATE" THE CITY STREET ADJOINING THE BACK OF HER PROPERTY. ALL TOLD, THE MANDATORY STREET "IMPROVEMENTS" ADDED ROUGHLY $60,000 TO THE COST OF LINDA'S RENOVATION. THESE FEES AMOUNT TO AN UNCONSTITUTIONAL CONDITION ON A PROPERTY OWNER'S RIGHT TO USE HER OWN PROPER TY. THAT'S WHY LINDA PARTNERED WITH THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE TO CHALLENGE RICHLAND'S UNCO NSTITUTIONAL LAW IN FEDERAL CO

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
INGRAM, ET AL. V. WAYNE COUNTY	URT. FOLLOWING LINDA'S CHALLENGE, RICHLAND CHANGED ITS LAW AND GRANTED LINDA'S PERMIT, ALL OWING HER TO MAKE HER RENOVATIONS. IJ RECEIVED FROM THE GOVERNMENT $10,000 IN ATTORNEY'S F EES IN THIS CASE. LOZANO, ET AL. V. ZION THE CITY OF ZION, ILLINOIS, REQUIRES LANDLORDS TO FORCE TENANTS TO OPEN THE DOORS OF THEIR HOMES TO CITY INSPECTORS WITHOUT A WARRANT. IF A TENANT REFUSES TO CONSENT TO AN INSPECTION, THE CITY THREATENS THEIR LANDLORD WITH RUINOU S FINES. THE CITY REFUSES TO ACQUIRE SEARCH WARRANTS IN RESPONSE TO TENANT OBJECTIONS, AND IT IS APPARENT THAT THE PRACTICE IS PART OF A BROADER PLAN TO DISCOURAGE RENTERS FROM LIV ING IN ZION AT ALL. IN SEPTEMBER 2019, JOSEFINA LOZANO AND THREE OF HER TENANTS JOINED WIT H IJ TO FILE A FEDERAL LAWSUIT TO SHUT DOWN ZION'S WARRANTLESS INSPECTION PROGRAM, BECAUSE YOUR HOME IS YOUR CASTLE, WHETHER YOU RENT OR OWN. WEST V. WINFIELD SHANIZ WEST'S NIGHTMA RE STARTED WHEN SHE STOPPED HOME ONE AFTERNOON IN 2014 TO FIND HER HOUSE SURROUNDED BY FIV E LOCAL POLICE OFFICERS. THEY TOLD HER THEY WERE LOOKING FOR HER EX-BOYFRIEND; SHE SAID HE WASN'T THERE AND GAVE THEM A KEY SO THEY COULD SEE FOR THEMSELVES. INSTEAD, THEY CALLED I N THE LOCAL SWAT TEAM AND BOMBARDED IT FROM THE OUTSIDE WITH TEAR-GAS GRENADES. SHANIZ'S H OME AND POSSESSIONS WERE DESTROYED, AND THE EX-BOYFRIEND WAS NOWHERE TO BE FOUND. SHANIZ S UED TO CHALLENGE THE WARRANTLESS DESTRUCTION OF HER HOME AND PROPERTY. THE 9TH U.S. CIRCUI T COURT OF APPEALS DID NOT FIND THAT IT WAS EITHER RIGHT OR WRONG FOR OFFICERS TO DESTROY HER HOUSE AND EVERYTHING IN IT. RATHER, IT SIMPLY SAID THAT NO CASE IN THE CIRCUIT HAD CLE ARLY ESTABLISHED WHAT THE OFFICERS DID WAS ILLEGAL, SO SHANIZ LOST. THE REASON IS A CONTRO VERSIAL LEGAL DOCTRINE CALLED "QUALIFIED IMMUNITY," WHICH MAKES IT ALMOST IMPOSSIBLE TO HO LD GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS ACCOUNTABLE UNLESS A COURT HAS PREVIOUSLY RULED THAT EXACTLY WHAT THEY DID IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL. THAT IS WHY SHANIZ JOINED FORCES WITH IJ TO ASK THE SUPREME COURT TO HEAR HER CASE AND ESTABLISH ONCE AND FOR ALL THAT QUALIFIED IMMUNITY CANNOT BE US ED TO ALLOW GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS TO VIOLATE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS WITH IMPUNITY. UNFORTUNA TELY, THE SUPREME COURT DECLINED TO HEAR SHANIZ'S CASE AT THE END OF ITS 2019 TERM, ALONG WITH EVERY OTHER QUALIFIED IMMUNITY CASE THAT SOUGHT SUPREME COURT REVIEW.

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
FICKEN V. CITY OF DUNEDIN, FLORIDA, ET AL.	IJ JOINED WITH JIM FICKEN OF DUNEDIN, FLORIDA, TO CHALLENGE THE CITY'S ATTEMPT TO FORECLOS E HIS HOME SIMPLY BECAUSE HIS GRASS WAS TOO LONG. WHILE JIM WAS OUT OF TOWN TENDING TO HIS LATE MOTHER'S ESTATE, CITY CODE ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS BEGAN FINING HIM FOR HIS LONG GRASS, TO THE TUNE OF $500 PER DAY. BY THE TIME HE GOT BACK AND BECAME AWARE THAT HE WAS BEING F INED, THEY HAD ALREADY ACCRUED TO NEARLY $30,000. THE CITY TOLD JIM HE HAD 15 DAYS TO PAY, OR THEY WOULD GET THEIR MONEY BY FORECLOSING ON HIS HOME. AND THAT IS JUST WHAT THE CITY VOTED TO DO. BUT JIM AND IJ WON ROUND ONE WHEN A JUDGE IN THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF FLORIDA D ENIED THE CITY'S MOTION TO DISMISS JIM'S LAWSUIT. THIS CASE IS ABOUT MORE THAN JUST SAVING JIM'S HOME; IT IS ABOUT ENSURING - FOR EVERYONE - THAT ABUSIVE GOVERNMENTS CANNOT TRUMP T HE CONSTITUTION. DAVIS, ET AL. V. CITY OF CHICAGO IN APRIL 2019, IJ FILED A CLASS ACTION L AWSUIT CHALLENGING CHICAGO'S MASSIVE AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL VEHICLE IMPOUND PROGRAM. IN A CI TY THAT RUNS A CHRONIC BUDGET DEFICIT OF MORE THAN $100 MILLION, IMPOUNDING VEHICLES HAS B ECOME AN EASY - AND SIGNIFICANT - SOURCE OF CASH. THE LEAD PLAINTIFFS IN OUR CLASS ACTION ARE INNOCENT OWNERS JEROME DAVIS AND VERONICA WALKER-DAVIS. THE CITY IMPOUNDED THEIR CAR A FTER AN AUTO-SHOP EMPLOYEE TOOK IT FOR A JOY RIDE WHILE IT WAS IN THE SHOP FOR REPAIRS. AF TER FIGHTING THE CITY FOR NEARLY A YEAR AND BEING CHARGED THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS IN FINES AN D FEES, THE DAVISES ARRIVED TO PICK UP THEIR VEHICLE - ONLY TO FIND THAT CITY HAD ALREADY DESTROYED IT. A VICTORY IN THIS CASE HAS THE POTENTIAL TO CREATE BROAD, SYSTEMIC CHANGE IN AN AREA WHERE ABUSE IS RAMPANT. IN JUNE 2020, THE MAYOR OF CHICAGO PROPOSED REFORMS TO TH E IMPOUND PROGRAM THAT WOULD FIX SOME OF THE GLARING CONSTITUTIONAL PROBLEMS. WHILE A GOOD FIRST STEP, OUR LAWSUIT WILL NOT STOP UNTIL EVERYONE IS PROTECTED FROM HAVING THEIR CARS UNJUSTLY IMPOUNDED. BRUMIT V. CITY OF GRANITE CITY NO ONE SHOULD BE PUNISHED FOR A CRIME S OMEONE ELSE COMMITTED. BUT TRY TELLING THAT TO GRANITE CITY, ILLINOIS, WHERE CITY OFFICIAL S ARE TRYING TO KICK ANDY SIMPSON AND DEBI BRUMIT (ALONG WITH DEBI'S GRANDCHILDREN) OUT OF THEIR HOME AS PUNISHMENT FOR A CRIME EVERYONE AGREES THEY DID NOT COMMIT. WHY? BECAUSE DE BI'S DAUGHTER (WHO DOES NOT LIVE WITH HER) STOLE A VAN ELSEWHERE IN TOWN. GRANITE CITY HAS WHAT IT CALLS A "CRIME-FREE" HOUSING ORDINANCE THAT AMOUNTS TO A COMPULSORY EVICTION LAW. UNDER THE LAW, IF ANY MEMBER OF YOUR "HOUSEHOLD OR EVEN A GUEST COMMITS A CRIME ANYWHERE IN THE CITY THEN YOUR LANDLORD IS REQUIRED TO EVICT YOU. BUT DEBI AND ANDY'S LANDLORD DOES N'T WANT TO EVICT THEM. THAT IS WHY DEBI AND ANDY HAVE TEAMED UP WITH THE INSTITUTE FOR JU STICE TO SUE GRANITE CITY TO AFFIRM THE BASIC PRINCIPLE THAT AMERICANS CANNOT BE RENDERED HOMELESS AS PUNISHMENT FOR OTHER PEOPLE'S CRIMES. IN OCTOBER 2019, A FEDERAL JUDGE AGREED, ENTERING A RESTRAINING ORDER THAT WILL KEEP DEBI AND ANDY SAFELY IN THEIR HOME WHILE THEI R LAWSUIT PROCEEDS. CITY OF NO

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
FICKEN V. CITY OF DUNEDIN, FLORIDA, ET AL.	RCO V. MUGAR THREE YEARS AGO, NORCO, CALIFORNIA, RESIDENT RON MUGAR RECEIVED A NOTICE INDI CATING THAT HE HAD VIOLATED THE CITY'S HOUSING CODE. HE ADMITTEDLY ALLOWED HIS HOME AND BA CKYARD TO BECOME CLUTTERED WITH HOBBY MACHINERY. BUT INSTEAD OF FINING HIM OR ASKING HIM T O BRING HIS PROPERTY UP TO CODE, THE CITY'S PRIVATE, FOR-PROFIT PROSECUTORS DECLARED THEY WERE GOING TO TAKE OVER OWNERSHIP OF HIS HOUSE USING A LEGAL PROCESS KNOWN AS "RECEIVERSHI P." TRADITIONALLY, RECEIVERSHIPS ALLOW A CITY TO TAKE TEMPORARY OWNERSHIP OF A PROPERTY TO FIX AN IMMINENT DANGER TO A COMMUNITY, SUCH AS A STRUCTURALLY UNSOUND BUILDING. UNFORTUNA TELY, RECEIVERSHIPS ARE NOW BEING USED IN CALIFORNIA TO ADDRESS EVEN MINOR CODE VIOLATIONS . RON BROUGHT HIS HOME AND YARD UP TO CODE AND FOUGHT THE RECEIVERSHIP IN COURT - AND WON. BUT JUST WHEN RON THOUGHT HE COULD RELAX, HE RECEIVED A BILL FROM THE CITY PROSECUTOR'S O FFICE FOR THE $60,798.94 IT SPENT LOSING RON'S CASE. RON IS EFFECTIVELY BEING PUNISHED FOR SUCCESSFULLY DEFENDING HIS PROPERTY RIGHTS AGAINST GOVERNMENT OVERREACH. UNDER BOTH THE U .S. AND CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTIONS, PROSECUTORS CANNOT HAVE A DIRECT FINANCIAL INTEREST IN T HE OUTCOME OF THEIR CASES. IJ JOINED RON IN APRIL 2019 TO VINDICATE HIS RIGHT TO DUE PROCE SS AND TO PROTECT ALL CALIFORNIA PROPERTY OWNERS FROM FALLING VICTIM TO ABUSIVE CODE ENFOR CEMENT SCHEMES. THE HOMELESS CHARITY, ET AL. V. AKRON BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS; THE HOMELES S CHARITY, ET AL. V. CITY OF AKRON AKRON, OHIO, HAS A SOARING HOMELESS POPULATION, AND GOV ERNMENT POLICY IS AT LEAST PARTLY TO BLAME FOR THIS CRISIS, DRIVING UP EXISTING HOUSING PR ICES AND MAKING IT DIFFICULT TO BUILD LOW-COST ALTERNATIVES. SAGE LEWIS STEPPED UP TO PROV IDE REAL SUPPORT TO THOSE IN NEED BY ALLOWING A FEW HOMELESS MEN AND WOMEN TO PITCH THEIR TENTS IN THE BACK LOT OF HIS BUILDING AND KEEP WARM IN THE BASEMENT WHEN NEEDED. THIS INFO RMAL ARRANGEMENT EVOLVED INTO A COMMUNITY DESIGNED TO HELP HOMELESS MEN AND WOMEN TRANSITI ON BACK TO INDEPENDENCE. BUT WHILE AKRON OFFICIALS DO NOT OFFER ADEQUATE SOLUTIONS TO THE CITY'S HOMELESS PROBLEM, THEY ARE ALL TOO QUICK TO USE ZONING LAWS TO SHUT DOWN SECOND CHA NCE VILLAGE. IJ JOINED WITH SAGE IN OCTOBER 2018 TO VINDICATE THE RIGHT TO CARRY ON THIS N OBLE WORK BY KEEPING VULNERABLE PEOPLE OFF THE STREETS. UNFORTUNATELY, A DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS DISMISSED SAGE'S CASE AGAINST THE CITY ON A TECHNICALITY, BUT OUR SUIT AGAINST TH E AKRON BOARD OF ZONING APPEALS CONTINUES. BEAN, ET AL. V. SEATTLE, ET AL. WHEN IT COMES T O RESPECTING THE PROPERTY AND PRIVACY RIGHTS OF ITS RESIDENTS, THE CITY OF SEATTLE TREATS ITS RENTAL TENANTS AS SECOND-CLASS CITIZENS BY FORCING THEM TO ALLOW GOVERNMENT-MANDATED I NSPECTORS INTO THEIR HOMES WITHOUT FIRST GETTING A WARRANT. RENTERS MATTHEW BENTLEY, WESLE Y WILLIAMS, AND JOSEPH BRIERE FOUND THAT OUT FIRSTHAND WHEN THE CITY INFORMED THEIR LANDLO RD THAT THEIR HOME NEEDED TO BE INSPECTED BY A GOVERNMENT-MANDATED HOUSING INSPECTOR. BENT LEY, WILLIAMS, AND BRIERE, ALO

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
FICKEN V. CITY OF DUNEDIN, FLORIDA, ET AL.	NG WITH THEIR RESPECTIVE ROOMMATES, ALL VALUE THEIR PRIVACY AND INFORMED THE CITY THAT THE Y DID NOT WANT THEIR HOME INSPECTED. THEIR LANDLORDS AGREED, AND TOLD THE CITY THEIR TENAN TS REFUSED TO ALLOW AN INSPECTOR TO ENTER AND INSPECT THEIR APARTMENT. THE CITY RESPONDED BY THREATENING FINES UPWARDS OF $500 PER DAY IF THE LANDLORDS DID NOT SOMEHOW COERCE THEIR TENANTS TO ALLOW THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL INSPECTION. THIS IS WHY BENTLEY, WILLIAMS, AND BRIE RE, ALONG WITH THEIR LANDLORDS AND A GROUP OF OTHER RENTERS, PARTNERED TOGETHER WITH IJ IN DECEMBER 2018 TO FILE A CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT AGAINST SEATTLE ASKING THE COURTS TO UPHOLD RENTERS' PRIVACY RIGHTS BY SHUTTING DOWN SEATTLE'S WARRANTLESS INSPECTIONS PROGRAM. UNFORT UNATELY, THE TRIAL COURT DISMISSED THE CASE, AND IJ HAS TAKEN IT TO THE WASHINGTON COURT O F APPEALS. VALANCOURT BOOKS, LLC V. CLAGGETT, ET AL. VALANCOURT IS A SMALL PUBLISHING COMP ANY OPERATED OUT OF THE RICHMOND, VIRGINIA, HOME OF JAMES JENKINS, A FORMER LAWYER WHO FOU ND HIS LIFE'S CALLING REVIVING AND POPULARIZING RARE, NEGLECTED, AND OUT-OF-PRINT FICTION. VALANCOURT HAS PUBLISHED MORE THAN 300 BOOKS, ALL OF WHICH THEY HAVE PERMISSION TO REPRIN T. BUT IN JUNE 2018, JAMES RECEIVED AN EMAIL FROM THE U.S. COPYRIGHT OFFICE DEMANDING THAT HE PROVIDE IT WITH COPIES OF EVERY SINGLE BOOK IN VALANCOURT'S CATALOG AND THREATENING HI M WITH FINES THAT COULD REACH HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS IF HE FAILED TO COMPLY. A L ITTLE-KNOWN PROVISION OF FEDERAL LAW MAKES IT ILLEGAL TO PUBLISH A NEW BOOK IN THE UNITED STATES WITHOUT PROVIDING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT WITH TWO FREE COPIES. VALANCOURT BOOKS JOI NED WITH THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE IN AUGUST 2018 TO FILE A FEDERAL LAWSUIT AGAINST THE CO PYRIGHT OFFICE AND THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, CLAIMING THAT THE BOOK-DEPOSIT MANDATE IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL BECAUSE IT VIOLATES THE TAKINGS CLAUSE OF THE FIFTH AMENDMENT AND OPER ATES AS A PENALTY ON PEOPLE WHO PUBLISH PHYSICAL BOOKS WITHOUT TURNING OVER A COPY. BUT TH E GOVERNMENT CAN'T PUNISH PEOPLE SIMPLY FOR PUBLISHING A BOOK, AND THE NOTION THAT A PRIVA TE CITIZEN OWES THE GOVERNMENT A DEBT SIMPLY FOR ENGAGING IN A CERTAIN KIND OF SPEECH IS A NTITHETICAL TO THE CONSTITUTION.

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
KAZAZI V. U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION	IN OCTOBER OF 2017, RUSTEM KAZAZI, A FORMER POLICE OFFICER FROM ALBANIA, WAS STOPPED IN SE CURITY AT THE CLEVELAND AIRPORT AND HAD $58,100 IN CASH SEIZED BY U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTIONS (CBP) - EVEN THOUGH HE HAD DONE NOTHING ILLEGAL. RUSTEM WAS FLYING TO NEW JERS EY AND THEN RETURNING TO HIS NATIVE COUNTRY WITH 12 YEARS' WORTH OF FAMILY SAVINGS TO FIND A PROPERTY HE AND HIS WIFE COULD ENJOY IN RETIREMENT. ADDING INSULT TO INJURY, CBP CLAIME D LATER THAT THEY ONLY TOOK $57,330 - $770 LESS THAN HE WAS ACTUALLY CARRYING. SOON AFTER IJ GOT INVOLVED, THE GOVERNMENT AGREED TO RETURN $57,115. IN NOVEMBER 2018, THE GOVERNMENT AGREED TO RETURN A FURTHER $385. IJ RECEIVED FROM THE GOVERNMENT $43,280 IN FEES IN JULY 2019. BRUCKER V. CITY OF DORAVILLE EACH YEAR, THE CITY OF DORAVILLE, GEORGIA, BUDGETS BETW EEN 17% AND 30% OF ITS OVERALL ANTICIPATED REVENUE TO COME FROM FINES AND FEES ISSUED BY I TS POLICE OFFICERS AND CODE INSPECTORS. BY PUTTING FINE REVENUE INTO ITS ANNUAL BUDGET, DO RAVILLE CREATES A PERVERSE INCENTIVE FOR POLICE, PROSECUTORS, AND EVEN ITS MUNICIPAL COURT TO POLICE FOR PROFIT, RATHER THAN SEEK JUSTICE AND PROTECT THE HEALTH AND SAFETY OF THE C ITY. DORAVILLE HOMEOWNER HILDA BRUCKER WAS FINED AND SENTENCED TO SIX MONTHS OF PROBATION FOR THE "CRIME" OF HAVING CRACKS IN HER DRIVEWAY. HILDA'S NEIGHBOR JEFF THORNTON WAS FINED $1,000 FOR THE CRIME OF HAVING A STACK OF FIREWOOD IN HIS BACKYARD. THAT IS WHY IN MAY 20 18, HILDA, JEFF, AND TWO OTHERS PARTNERED WITH THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE TO STOP DORAVILLE 'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL RELIANCE ON FINES AND FEES INCOME, AND TO FORCE THE CITY TO NOT USE TH E CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM TO BALANCE ITS BUDGET. AFTER A FIRST-ROUND VICTORY IN APRIL 2019 AND A SECOND WIN THAT JULY, IJ IS CONTINUING TO FIGHT IN COURT TO END DORAVILLE'S ILLEGAL CASH GRAB. SERRANO V. U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION WHILE GERARDO SERRANO WAS CROSSI NG THE BORDER INTO MEXICO AT EAGLE PASS, TEXAS, U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION (CBP) U SED CIVIL FORFEITURE TO SEIZE HIS TRUCK. AGENTS HAD FOUND FIVE LOW-CALIBER BULLETS IN HIS CENTER CONSOLE WHICH, ACCORDING TO CBP, CONSTITUTED TRANSPORTING "MUNITIONS OF WAR," MAKIN G THE TRUCK SUBJECT TO CIVIL FORFEITURE. FOR OVER TWO YEARS, THE AGENCY HELD GERARDO'S TRU CK WITHOUT EVER TAKING ITS CASE BEFORE A JUDGE - ALL WHILE GERARDO CONTINUED TO MAKE HIS M ONTHLY CAR PAYMENTS. DONE WAITING, GERARDO JOINED WITH THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE TO SUE TO GET HIS PROPERTY BACK, AND IN OCTOBER 2017, THE GOVERNMENT FINALLY RETURNED GERARDO'S TRU CK. WHILE GERARDO HAS RECOVERED HIS OWN TRUCK, THE CASE IS STILL ONGOING, AS WE FILED SUIT ON BEHALF OF A CLASS OF OTHER PEOPLE WHO HAVE HAD THEIR VEHICLES SEIZED BY CBP AND ARE BE ING HELD WITHOUT A HEARING. WE ARE CURRENTLY AWAITING A RULING FROM THE U.S. COURT OF APPE ALS FOR THE 5TH CIRCUIT. NWAORIE V. U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION ANTHONIA NWAORIE IS A REGISTERED NURSE AND AN AMERICAN CITIZEN WHO WAS EN ROUTE TO NIGERIA IN OCTOBER 2017, W ITH $41,377 SHE HAD SAVED TO O

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
KAZAZI V. U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION	PEN A MEDICAL CLINIC. BUT AT HOUSTON'S GEORGE BUSH INTERCONTINENTAL AIRPORT, U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION (CBP) AGENTS DISCOVERED HER MONEY AND TOOK EVERY PENNY - EVEN THOUGH SHE OBTAINED THE MONEY LEGALLY AND PLANNED TO USE IT LEGALLY. CBP STATED IT WOULD RETURN HER MONEY ONLY IF SHE SIGNED AN AGREEMENT WAIVING HER RIGHT TO INTEREST ON THE SEIZED PROP ERTY AND HER RIGHTS TO SUE CBP OVER ANYTHING RELATED TO THE CONFISCATION OF HER MONEY. ANT HONIA TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO FILE A FEDERAL CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT AGAINST CBP, AND WITHIN JUS T ONE MONTH, SHE RECEIVED HER MONEY BACK. YET, IJ FORGED AHEAD WITH THE LAWSUIT TO END CBP 'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND UNLAWFUL BEHAVIOR. WE RECEIVED A SETBACK IN AUGUST 2019 WHEN A DIS TRICT COURT DISMISSED THE CASE, BUT WE HAVE APPEALED THE DISMISSAL TO THE U.S. COURT OF AP PEALS FOR THE 5TH CIRCUIT. MORALES V. CITY OF INDIO, ET AL. LOCAL GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS IN INDIO, CALIFORNIA, TEAMED UP WITH A PRIVATE LAW FIRM TO CHARGE PROPERTY OWNERS TO COVER TH E COSTS OF THEIR OWN PROSECUTIONS. UNDER THIS OUTRAGEOUS SCHEME, THE LAW FIRM PROVIDED IND IO AND SEVERAL OTHER CALIFORNIA CITIES WITH "COST-NEUTRAL" CODE ENFORCEMENT SERVICES. THIS MEANS THAT EVERY TICKET THE CITY ISSUED FOR VIOLATIONS SUCH AS UNMOWED GRASS OR "SUN-DAMA GED" ADDRESS NUMBERS WAS MONEY IN THE BANK FOR THE CITY AND FOR THE LAW FIRM, WHICH THEN B ILLED PROPERTY OWNERS THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS FOR "PROSECUTION FEES." IF OWNERS DARED TO CONT EST THE FEES, THEIR LEGAL BILLS SIMPLY GREW LARGER. IJ FILED A CLASS ACTION SUIT AGAINST T HE CITY IN FEBRUARY 2018 TO PUT A STOP TO THIS EGREGIOUS FORM OF POLICING FOR PROFIT. AND THAT DECEMBER, WE WON A RESOUNDING VICTORY WHEN THE CITY OF INDIO AGREED TO RETURN THE MON EY OF EVERYONE WHO WAS VICTIMIZED BY THE CITY'S SCHEME. IT WAS A WELCOME RELIEF FOR OUR CL IENT RAMONA MORALES AND COUNTLESS OTHERS LIKE HER. THE CASE WILL OFFICIALLY CONCLUDE ONCE THE COURT GRANTS FINAL APPROVAL TO THE SETTLEMENT. EL-SHABAZZ, ET AL. V. CITY OF NEW YORK, ET AL. IN A FEDERAL CLASS ACTION LAWSUIT, IJ IS REPRESENTING THREE RENTERS TO CHALLENGE N EW YORK CITY'S "NO-FAULT" EVICTION LAW, WHICH ALLOWS POLICE TO SHUTTER A PROPERTY AND EVIC T THE TENANT SIMPLY BECAUSE A CRIME OCCURRED ON THE PREMISES - EVEN IF THE TENANT HAD NO K NOWLEDGE OF THE CRIME. IJ CLIENT SUNG CHO OPERATES A LAUNDROMAT IN A RENTAL SPACE IN MANHA TTAN AND FELL PREY TO THE SCHEME IN 2013, WHEN UNDERCOVER POLICE WENT TO THE LAUNDROMAT AS KING CUSTOMERS IF THEY WANTED TO PURCHASE STOLEN ELECTRONICS. NEITHER SUNG NOR ANY OF HIS EMPLOYEES WERE INVOLVED IN THE STING, BUT BECAUSE TWO CUSTOMERS TOOK THE BAIT, SUNG WAS TH REATENED WITH EVICTION. THE CITY OFFERED TO DROP THE ACTION IF SUNG AGREED TO WAIVE HIS FO URTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO REFUSE WARRANTLESS SEARCHES, GIVE POLICE UNLIMITED ACCESS TO HIS S ECURITY CAMERAS, AND CONSENT TO FINES AND SANCTIONS FOR ALLEGED CRIMINAL OFFENSES AT THE B USINESS WITHOUT THE OPPORTUNITY TO GO BEFORE A JUDGE. THE DISTRICT COURT DISMISSED THE CAS E ON JURISDICTIONAL GROUNDS IN

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
KAZAZI V. U.S. CUSTOMS AND BORDER PROTECTION	JANUARY 2018, HOLDING THAT SUCH A CLAIM CAN ONLY BE BROUGHT IN STATE COURT. THE U.S. COUR T OF APPEALS FOR THE 2ND CIRCUIT REVERSED THIS RULING IN DECEMBER 2018, AND THE CASE IS NO W MOVING FORWARD IN THE DISTRICT COURT. PLATT V. MOORE ARIZONA RESIDENTS TERRY AND RIA PLA TT LOANED THEIR CAR TO THEIR SON WHO WAS PULLED OVER BY POLICE FOR A WINDOW TINT VIOLATION . THE POLICE FOUND CASH AND A SMALL AMOUNT OF PERSONAL-USE MARIJUANA, BOTH OF WHICH THE SO N ACKNOWLEDGED WERE HIS. EVEN THOUGH ARIZONA LAW DOES NOT ALLOW FORFEITURE OF A CAR UNDER SUCH CIRCUMSTANCES, THE POLICE AND PROSECUTOR STILL SEIZED AND HELD THE PLATTS' CAR. NAVAJ O COUNTY PROSECUTORS THEN USED A TROUBLING PROCEDURE THAT TURNS PROSECUTORS INTO JUDGES TO KEEP THE PLATTS FROM HAVING THEIR DAY IN COURT. A MONTH AFTER THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE G OT INVOLVED, THE GOVERNMENT RELENTED AND RETURNED THE CAR TO TERRY AND RIA. IN RESPONSE TO CASES LIKE THE PLATTS', THE ARIZONA LEGISLATURE ENACTED IMPORTANT REFORMS TO THE STATE'S FORFEITURE SYSTEM. BUT ARIZONA STILL ALLOWS "UNCONTESTED FORFEITURE" FROM THOSE WHO HAVE N EVER BEEN CHARGED WITH, MUCH LESS CONVICTED OF, ANY CRIME. SO, THE PLATTS AND IJ ARE CONTI NUING TO FIGHT IN COURT TO ENSURE THE VIOLATION OF TERRY AND RIA'S RIGHTS IS RECOGNIZED AN D TO PREVENT THIS FROM HAPPENING TO THEM OR OTHERS IN THE FUTURE. CITY OF DALLAS V. HINGA MBOGO, HINGA AUTOMOTIVE CO., D/B/A HINGA AUTO REPAIR, AND 3516 ROSS AVENUE, DALLAS, TEXAS FOR 30 YEARS, KENYAN IMMIGRANT HINGA MBOGO HAS OWNED AND OPERATED HIS AUTO GARAGE ON ROSS AVENUE IN DALLAS. BUT THEN THE CITY DEMANDED THAT HINGA CLOSE UP SHOP AND LEAVE BECAUSE HI S POPULAR GARAGE DID NOT FIT THE CITY COUNCIL'S VISION FOR THE NEIGHBORHOOD. SEVERAL YEARS AGO, THE CITY PASSED RETROACTIVE ZONING LAWS - A PROCESS OFFICIALLY KNOWN AS "AMORTIZATIO N" - AND SPECIFICALLY DISALLOWED ANY AUTOMOTIVE-RELATED BUSINESS IN THE ROSS STREET NEIGHB ORHOOD. IN ADDITION, THE CITY SLAPPED HINGA WITH MORE THAN $300,000 IN FINES, EVEN THOUGH THE CITY REGULATIONS EXPLICITLY LIMIT FINES TO $2,000. HINGA AND IJ SOUGHT THE TEXAS SUPRE ME COURT'S REVIEW OF A LOWER COURT'S JULY 2017 DECISION THAT DISMISSED THE CASE, NOT JUST SO THAT HE COULD CONTINUE TO OPERATE HIS BUSINESS ON LAND HE HAS OWNED FOR DECADES, BUT AL SO TO SET PRECEDENT THAT PROTECTS THE RIGHTS OF OTHERS. UNFORTUNATELY, HINGA'S LONG ROAD T O JUSTICE CAME TO AN ABRUPT AND FRUSTRATING END WHEN THE TEXAS SUPREME COURT REFUSED TO HE AR HIS CHALLENGE IN AUGUST 2019.

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
SOUROVELIS V. CITY OF PHILADELPHIA	IN SEPTEMBER 2018, IJ SUCCESSFULLY DISMANTLED THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA'S DRACONIAN FORFEIT URE PROGRAM, USHERING IN LONG-AWAITED JUSTICE TO THE 35,000 PHILADELPHIANS WHO WERE STRIPP ED OF THEIR PROPERTY AND THEIR CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS. UNTIL IJ SUED, PHILADELPHIA ROUTINEL Y SEIZED HOMES, CARS, AND CASH WITHOUT NOTICE. IT FORCED OWNERS TO NAVIGATE THE NOTORIOUS "COURTROOM 478," WHERE SO-CALLED "HEARINGS" WERE RUN ENTIRELY BY PROSECUTORS, WITHOUT ANY JUDGES OR COURT-APPOINTED LAWYERS TO DEFEND PROPERTY OWNERS. MISSING EVEN A SINGLE "HEARIN G" MEANT THAT PROSECUTORS COULD PERMANENTLY TAKE AN OWNER'S PROPERTY, SELL IT, AND USE THE PROCEEDS FOR ANY LAW-ENFORCEMENT PURPOSE THEY WISHED, CREATING A PERVERSE INCENTIVE TO SE IZE PROPERTY FOR FORFEITURE. IJ PUT ALL THIS TO AN END BY SECURING TWO SWEEPING CONSENT DE CREES - WHICH RECEIVED PRELIMINARY APPROVAL IN MAY 2019 - THAT CURB THE FINANCIAL INCENTIV ES UNDER WHICH LAW ENFORCEMENT KEEPS AND USES FORFEITURE REVENUE, FUNDAMENTALLY REFORM PRO CEDURES FOR SEIZING AND FORFEITING PROPERTY, AND ESTABLISH A $3 MILLION FUND TO COMPENSATE THOSE WHOSE PROPERTY WAS WRONGLY CONFISCATED. CASINO REINVESTMENT DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY V . CHARLES AND LUCINDA BIRNBAUM, ET AL. IN FEBRUARY 2019, IJ WON A DECISIVE VICTORY ON BEHA LF OF PIANO TUNER CHARLIE BIRNBAUM, SAVING HIS LONGTIME FAMILY HOME FROM AN UNCONSTITUTION AL EMINENT DOMAIN ATTEMPT. THE SUPERIOR COURT OF NEW JERSEY, APPELLATE DIVISION, AFFIRMED IJ'S LOWER-COURT VICTORY FROM 2016, WHICH CALLED THE STATE'S ATTEMPT TO TAKE CHARLIE'S HIS TORIC ATLANTIC CITY HOME "A MANIFEST ABUSE OF EMINENT DOMAIN POWER." THE LONG-RUNNING COUR T BATTLE PIT BIRNBAUM'S FAMILY HISTORY AGAINST THE STATE CASINO REINVESTMENT AND DEVELOPME NT AUTHORITY, WHICH SOUGHT TO TAKE THE HOME IN SERVICE OF A "DEVELOPMENT" PROJECT THAT IT COULD NEITHER EXPLAIN NOR IDENTIFY. THANKS TO THIS VICTORY, CHARLIE CAN FINALLY REST EASY KNOWING THAT THE HOME HE INHERITED FROM HIS PARENTS - HOLOCAUST SURVIVORS WHO IMMIGRATED T O AMERICA NEARLY 70 YEARS AGO - IS SAFE FROM THE STATE'S WRECKING BALL. IT ALSO SENDS A ST RONG MESSAGE TO OTHER LAND-HUNGRY AGENCIES THAT IJ IS READY TO CHALLENGE ABUSIVE TAKINGS A ND PROTECT THE SWEEPING REFORMS TO EMINENT DOMAIN LAWS WE HAVE WORKED SO HARD TO SECURE. F OR THIS VICTORY, IJ RECEIVED FROM THE GOVERNMENT $221,935 IN FEES IN DECEMBER 2019. FULL C IRCLE OF LIVING AND DYING, ET AL. V. SANCHEZ, ET AL. AKHILA MURPHY AND DONNA PEIZER ARE EN D-OF-LIFE DOULAS, HELPING PLAN HOME FUNERALS AND PROVIDING EMOTIONAL AND PRACTICAL SUPPORT TO THE DYING PERSON AND FAMILY. HOME FUNERALS ARE AN AMERICAN TRADITION LEGAL IN EVERY ST ATE, AND THEY ARE EXPERIENCING A RESURGENCE. IN DECEMBER 2019, THE CALIFORNIA CEMETERY AND FUNERAL BUREAU RULED THAT AKHILA AND DONNA'S BUSINESS IS AN UNLICENSED FUNERAL AGENCY, ME ANING AKHILA AND DONNA MUST BECOME LICENSED FUNERAL DIRECTORS AND BUILD A FUNERAL HOME. TH IS DECISION PROTECTS FUNERAL HOMES FROM COMPETITION WHILE LIMITING OPTIONS FOR GRIEVING FA MILIES. SO, AKHILA AND DONNA H

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
SOUROVELIS V. CITY OF PHILADELPHIA	AVE JOINED WITH IJ TO FILE A LAWSUIT IN FEDERAL COURT TO DEFEND THEIR FIRST AMENDMENT RIGH T TO FREE SPEECH AND THEIR FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT RIGHT TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING. GURROLA V. DUNCAN AND KEPPLE DARIO GURROLA LEARNED HOW TO FIGHT FIRES IN CALIFORNIA'S WELL-KNOWN INM ATE FIREFIGHTING PROGRAM. WHEN HE FINALLY TURNED HIS LIFE AROUND, HE THOUGHT HE COULD TURN THE SKILLS HE LEARNED WHILE INCARCERATED INTO A GOOD CAREER SERVING THE PUBLIC AS A FIREF IGHTER. BUT CALIFORNIA, DESPITE USING THOUSANDS OF INMATES TO FIGHT ITS INCREASINGLY DESTR UCTIVE WILDFIRES, PERMANENTLY BANS THOSE SAME PEOPLE FROM RECEIVING THE EMT CERTIFICATION NEEDED TO BECOME A CAREER FIREFIGHTER IF THEY HAVE MORE THAN ONE FELONY ON THEIR RECORD - EVEN WHEN THE CONVICTIONS ARE OLD AND IRRELEVANT. SO, ALTHOUGH HE HAS ALL THE NECESSARY SK ILLS AND TRAINING, DARIO CAN ONLY WORK AS A VOLUNTEER OR SEASONAL FIREFIGHTER. DARIO AND I J ARE CHALLENGING THIS UNJUST RESTRICTION TO VINDICATE THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT OF DARIO A ND THOUSANDS LIKE HIM TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING. HARPER V. CITY OF LINCOLN, ET AL. IN 2019, NEBRASKA JOINED THE VAST MAJORITY OF STATES IN ALLOWING HOME BAKERS TO SELL THEIR SHELF-S TABLE GOODS DIRECTLY TO INFORMED CONSUMERS WITHOUT THE BURDENSOME PERMITTING AND INSPECTIO NS THAT APPLY TO RESTAURANTS. LINCOLN'S CINDY HARPER, WHO HAD TESTIFIED IN FAVOR OF THE CH ANGE, STARTED SELLING HER SUGAR COOKIES AND CUPCAKES UNDER THE NEW LAW. SUCH FOODS ARE SAF E AND GIVE BUYERS AND SELLERS GREATER CHOICE ABOUT WHAT TO EAT AND HOW TO SUPPORT THEMSELV ES. A FEW MONTHS LATER, HOWEVER, THE CITY OF LINCOLN PASSED NEW REGULATIONS LOCALLY THAT S UBJECT LINCOLN HOME BAKERS TO MANY OF THE SAME PERMITTING AND INSPECTION REQUIREMENTS THE NEBRASKA LEGISLATURE EXEMPTED THEM FROM. LOCAL ORDINANCES CANNOT PREEMPT STATE LAW, SO CIN DY AND IJ ARE CHALLENGING LINCOLN'S ORDINANCE IN COURT. BARNES AND MISSION INVESTIGATIONS GROUP, LLC, V. JESS L. ANDERSON, ET AL. IJ SCORED A FAST VICTORY FOR ECONOMIC LIBERTY WHEN IT CHALLENGED UTAH'S RESIDENCY REQUIREMENT FOR PRIVATE INVESTIGATOR LICENSES ON BEHALF OF JEREMY BARNES, WHO LIVES JUST OVER THE BORDER IN IDAHO AND WANTS TO EXPAND HIS BUSINESS I NTO THE BEEHIVE STATE. RECOGNIZING THAT RESIDENCY REQUIREMENTS FOR OCCUPATIONAL LICENSES A RE CONSTITUTIONALLY INDEFENSIBLE, THE UTAH LEGISLATURE PASSED A BILL IN JUNE 2020 REMOVING THIS REQUIREMENT, JUST TWO MONTHS AFTER IJ FILED SUIT. N'DA AND DIGNITY NON-EMERGENCY MED ICAL TRANSPORTATION, INC., V. HYBL, ET AL. MARC N'DA RUNS A HOME HEALTH AGENCY, AND WHEN H E SAW HIS PATIENTS GETTING BAD SERVICE FROM NON-EMERGENCY MEDICAL TRANSPORTATION COMPANIES , HE DECIDED TO START HIS OWN COMPANY TO PROVIDE BETTER SERVICE. TO DO SO, HE NEEDS A "CER TIFICATE OF PUBLIC CONVENIENCE AND NECESSITY" FROM THE GOVERNMENT. SUCH LAWS PROTECT ESTAB LISHED BUSINESSES BY SHUTTING OUT NEW COMPETITION, RAISING PRICES AND LOWERING SERVICE. AM ONG OTHER REQUIREMENTS, MARC MUST GET PERMISSION FROM HIS COMPETITORS BEFORE HE CAN BEGIN OPERATING. NOT SURPRISINGLY, T

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
SOUROVELIS V. CITY OF PHILADELPHIA	HOSE COMPETITORS SAID "NO." SO, MARC HAS TEAMED UP WITH THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE TO PROTE CT HIS CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING. THE GOOD NEWS FOR MARC AND HIS PATIE NTS IS THAT WHAT THE GOVERNMENT AND THE INSIDERS ARE DOING IS NOT ONLY WRONG BUT UNCONSTIT UTIONAL - IT VIOLATES THREE DIFFERENT PARTS OF THE NEBRASKA CONSTITUTION. HAY, ET AL. V. A SOTIN COUNTY, WASHINGTON, ET AL. WHEN KATHY HAY SAW HER NEIGHBORS IN ASOTIN COUNTY, WASHIN GTON, STRUGGLING TO PUT FOOD ON THE TABLE, SHE BUILT A "LITTLE FREE PANTRY" ON HER PROPERT Y SO THAT HER NEIGHBORS COULD TAKE AND DONATE FOOD. HER COMMUNITY APPRECIATED IT, BUT THE ASOTIN COUNTY BOARD OF HEALTH DIDN'T. IN FEBRUARY 2020, THEY CLOSED HER PANTRY AND ORDERED HER TO COMPLY WITH A LONG LIST OF DEMANDS BEFORE SHE COULD REOPEN IT. LATER, AS THE COVID PANDEMIC RAGED AND PEOPLE ACROSS AMERICA WERE CONVERTING THEIR LITTLE LENDING LIBRARIES I NTO PANTRIES, THE COUNTY SENT KATHY AN INVOICE FOR $2,800 AND A LETTER DEMANDING SHE PAY F OR THE ILLEGAL ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS AGAINST HER. KATHY, NEIGHBORS WHO USED HER PANTRY, AND IJ HAVE FILED A CONSTITUTIONAL LAWSUIT IN FEDERAL COURT TO STRIKE DOWN THE POLICIES THAT P REVENT KATHY FROM SHARING FOOD WITH THOSE IN NEED. MICKELSON, ET AL. V. NORTH DAKOTA DEPAR TMENT OF HEALTH, ET AL. IN 2017, THE NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE PASSED THE COTTAGE FOOD ACT, GREATLY EXPANDING THE FREEDOM TO BUY AND SELL HOMEMADE FOODS. NORTH DAKOTANS LIKE FARMER DANIELLE MICKELSON USED THIS FOOD FREEDOM TO SUPPORT THEMSELVES AND CONSUME HOMEMADE FOODS THAT WOULD OTHERWISE NOT BE AVAILABLE. BUT IN JANUARY 2020, THE NORTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT O F HEALTH, HAVING FAILED TO CONVINCE THE LEGISLATURE TO PASS NEW RESTRICTIONS ON FOOD FREED OM, ILLEGALLY ISSUED REGULATIONS THAT ARBITRARILY BAN THE SALE OF ALL BUT A FEW TYPES OF H OMEMADE FOODS. STATE AGENCIES CANNOT PASS REGULATIONS THAT CONTRADICT STATUTES. IJ IS CHAL LENGING THESE REGULATIONS SO THAT ALL NORTH DAKOTANS CAN ENJOY GREATER ECONOMIC OPPORTUNIT Y AND A GREATER VARIETY OF FOODS TO CHOOSE FROM.

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
MILLS AND SOUTHWEST ENGINEERING CONCEPTS, LLC V. ARIZONA BOARD OF TECHNICAL	REGISTRATION, ET AL. FOR 12 YEARS, GREG MILLS HAS RUN AN ARIZONA ENGINEERING FIRM. LIKE 80 % OF AMERICAN ENGINEERS, HE DOES NOT HAVE AN ENGINEER'S LICENSE, WHICH IS NOT LEGALLY REQU IRED FOR THE PROJECTS THAT HE WORKS ON. BUT IN MAY 2019, THE ARIZONA BOARD OF TECHNICAL RE GISTRATION THREATENED TO SHUT DOWN GREG'S COMPANY AND FINE HIM BECAUSE HE DOES NOT HAVE AN EXTREMELY BURDENSOME STATE-ISSUED LICENSE, A LICENSE THAT THE BOARD'S OWN RULES SAY HE WO ULDN'T NEED IF HE WORKED AT A MANUFACTURING COMPANY. GREG PARTNERED WITH IJ SO THAT HE AND OTHER ARIZONA ENGINEERS CAN DO THE WORK THEY ARE QUALIFIED TO DO WITHOUT UNCONSTITUTIONAL INTERFERENCE FROM THE BOARD. IN MAY 2020, HOWEVER, THE MARICOPA COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT RUL ED THAT GREG COULD NOT SUE TO PROTECT HIS RIGHTS UNTIL THE BOARD FINISHED ITS ADMINISTRATI VE PROCESS AGAINST HIM. WE ARE APPEALING THIS RULING. SINGH, ET AL. V. NORTH CAROLINA DEP' T OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, ET AL.; SINGLETON AND SINGLETON VISION CENTER V. NORTH CAR OLINA DEP'T OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, ET AL. NORTH CAROLINA MAKES IT ILLEGAL FOR DOCTO RS TO OFFER NEW HEALTH CARE SERVICES, BUILD NEW FACILITIES OR BUY NEW EQUIPMENT WITHOUT OB TAINING A SPECIAL PERMIT CALLED A "CERTIFICATE OF NEED" (CON) FROM A BOARD DOMINATED BY RE GULATORS AND INDUSTRY INSIDERS. IF THE BOARD DETERMINES THAT THERE ARE ALREADY "ENOUGH" PR OVIDERS IN A COMMUNITY, DOCTORS ARE FORBIDDEN FROM OFFERING SERVICES TO PATIENTS WHO NEED THEM. BY STIFLING COMPETITION, CON LAWS DIRECTLY HARM THOUSANDS OF PATIENTS, WHO MUST SEEK EXPENSIVE TREATMENT FROM EXISTING PROVIDERS. IN 2018, IJ TEAMED UP WITH DR. GAJENDRA SING H, WHO OPENED A CENTER IN 2017 TO PROVIDE X-RAYS, MRI SCANS, AND MORE AT AFFORDABLE PRICES . BUT A BOARD MADE UP OF HEALTH INDUSTRY INSIDERS DECIDED THERE WAS NO NEED FOR ANOTHER MR I SCANNER IN HIS REGION AND PREVENTED HIM FROM EVEN APPLYING.. IN THE SPRING OF 2020, DR. SINGH HAD TO CLOSE HIS IMAGING CENTER, IN PART BECAUSE OF THE COSTS IMPOSED BY THE CON LAW . AS A RESULT, DR. SINGH'S LAWSUIT COULD NOT CONTINUE, BUT SHORTLY THEREAFTER IJ JOINED UP WITH DR. JAY SINGLETON, AN OPHTHALMOLOGIST FROM NEW BERN, TO FILE A NEW CHALLENGE TO NORT H CAROLINA'S CON LAW. DR. SINGLETON OWNS A STATE-OF-THE-ART OUTPATIENT OPERATING FACILITY, BUT CAN'T EVEN START THE CON APPLICATION PROCESS TO PERFORM SURGERIES THERE BECAUSE A FOR MULA PUT IN PLACE BY STATE REGULATORS HAS ALREADY DETERMINED THAT HIS COMMUNITY DOES NOT " NEED" ANOTHER SURGERY CENTER. TIWARI, ET AL. V. MEIER, ET AL. DIPENDRA TIWARI AND KISHOR S APKOTAARE ARE NEPALI IMMIGRANTS WHO WANT TO START A HOME HEALTH AGENCY THAT CATERS TO THE LARGE NEPALI-SPEAKING POPULATION IN LOUISVILLE, KENTUCKY. THEIR FUTURE COMPETITOR - A $2 B ILLION HEALTH CARE CONGLOMERATE - ARGUED THAT THEIR NEW AGENCY WAS UNNEEDED, AND THE STATE OF KENTUCKY REFUSED TO ISSUE DIPENDRA AND KISHOR'S BUSINESS A CERTIFICATE OF NEED THAT WO ULD ALLOW THEM TO OPERATE. SO, DIPENDRA, KISHOR, AND IJ ARE CHALLENGING KENTUCKY'S CON REQ UIREMENT FOR HOME HEALTH AGENC

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
MILLS AND SOUTHWEST ENGINEERING CONCEPTS, LLC V. ARIZONA BOARD OF TECHNICAL	IES IN FEDERAL COURT. THIS IS ONE OF SEVERAL IJ CASES CHALLENGING CON LAWS, WHICH ARTIFICI ALLY LIMIT ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE AND RAISE COSTS. GARRETT AND HELD V. TEXAS STATE BOARD OF PHARMACY, ET AL.; BRIDGES, ET AL. V. MONTANA BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS, ET AL. IN 44 STA TES AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, DOCTORS CAN AND DO DISPENSE MEDICINE DIRECTLY TO THEIR P ATIENTS. THIS CAN SAVE PATIENTS TIME AND MONEY AND MAKE IT MORE LIKELY THEY WILL FILL THEI R PRESCRIPTION. TEXAS AND MONTANA, HOWEVER, ALLOW ONLY DOCTORS IN CERTAIN RURAL AREAS TO D ISPENSE MEDICATION, EVEN THOUGH DOCTOR DISPENSING IS JUST AS SAFE AS DISPENSING BY PHARMAC IES. THE BANS SERVE ONLY TO PROTECT THE PROFITS OF PHARMACIES, NOT PUBLIC HEALTH. SO, IJ I S REPRESENTING DOCTORS FROM TEXAS AND MONTANA IN TWO LAWSUITS CHALLENGING THESE STATES' BA NS ON DOCTOR DISPENSING. N'DAKPRI, ET AL. V. LOUISIANA STATE BOARD OF COSMETOLOGY, ET AL. IJ CONTINUES OUR BRAIDING FREEDOM INITIATIVE WITH A CASE IN LOUISIANA REPRESENTING THREE N ATURAL HAIR BRAIDERS - ASHLEY N'DAKPRI, LYNN SCHOFIELD, AND MICHELLE ROBERTSON - WHO WANT TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING BUT FACE ENORMOUS AND IRRATIONAL OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING HURDLES. ALTHOUGH HAIR BRAIDING IS NOT A THREAT TO PUBLIC SAFETY, THE LOUISIANA STATE BOARD OF COSM ETOLOGY REQUIRES ANYONE SEEKING A BRAIDING LICENSE TO COMPLETE 500 HOURS OF UNNECESSARY AN D IRRELEVANT TRAINING. THIS RUNS AFOUL OF THE LOUISIANA CONSTITUTION, WHICH DOES NOT ALLOW THE GOVERNMENT TO LICENSE SOMETHING AS SAFE AND COMMON AS BRAIDING HAIR. IN OCTOBER 2019, A JUDGE IN BATON ROUGE DENIED THE BOARD'S MOTION TO DISMISS, SO THE CASE CONTINUES. VISIB LY, INC. V. THE MEDICAL LICENSING BOARD OF INDIANA, ET AL.; OPTERNATIVE, INC. V. SOUTH CAR OLINA BOARD OF MEDICAL EXAMINERS TECHNOLOGY ALLOWS CONSUMERS TO TAKE A ROUTINE VISION TEST IN THE COMFORT OF THEIR OWN HOME USING THEIR PERSONAL COMPUTER AND SMARTPHONE. AN OPHTHAL MOLOGIST REVIEWS THE RESULTS AND WRITES A PRESCRIPTION. DEVELOPED BY HEALTHCARE STARTUP VI SIBLY, THESE TESTS ARE INEXPENSIVE AND ENABLE MORE PEOPLE TO GET EYEGLASS PRESCRIPTIONS MO RE QUICKLY AND EASILY THAN EVER BEFORE. OPTOMETRISTS HAVE GONE TO EXTRAORDINARY LENGTHS TO PROTECT THEMSELVES FROM ONLINE COMPETITORS LIKE VISIBLY. FOR EXAMPLE, THE INDIANA AND SOU TH CAROLINA OPTOMETRIC ASSOCIATIONS AGGRESSIVELY LOBBIED TO CONVINCE LEGISLATORS TO BAN TH E USE OF TECHNOLOGY IN THE EYE CARE SPACE. IN APRIL 2019, IJ FILED SUIT IN INDIANA TO STAM P OUT THIS BLATANT ECONOMIC PROTECTIONISM AND PROTECT BOTH THE RIGHTS OF ENTREPRENEURS TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING, AND THE RIGHTS OF DOCTORS AND PATIENTS TO BENEFIT FROM MODERN TECHN OLOGY. UNFORTUNATELY, VISIBLY AND IJ HAD TO DISMISS THIS LAWSUIT THAT AUGUST DUE TO A SHIF T IN HOW THE FDA CLASSIFIES ONLINE VISION TESTING SOFTWARE. WE ARE CONTINUING TO LITIGATE A SIMILAR CASE IN SOUTH CAROLINA, WHICH IS CURRENTLY ON APPEAL BEFORE THE SOUTH CAROLINA C OURT OF APPEALS. HIGHT V. U.S. DEP'T OF HOMELAND SECURITY CAPTAIN HIGHT HAS BEEN A MERCHAN T MARINER FOR MORE THAN 20 YEA

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
MILLS AND SOUTHWEST ENGINEERING CONCEPTS, LLC V. ARIZONA BOARD OF TECHNICAL	RS, WITH EIGHT OF THOSE YEARS SPENT COMMANDING SHIPS ALL OVER THE WORLD. BUT HE DECIDED TO RETURN TO THE UNITED STATES AND SEEK EMPLOYMENT CLOSER TO HIS FAMILY, WORKING TOWARD GETT ING HIS LICENSE TO PILOT COMMERCIAL VESSELS ON THE SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND LAKE ONTARIO. PILOTING ON THE GREAT LAKES IS HIGHLY REGULATED, AND CAPTAIN HIGHT WAS REQUIRED BY THE CO AST GUARD TO TRAIN WITH THE SAINT LAWRENCE SEAWAY PILOTS' ASSOCIATION, A FOR-PROFIT BUSINE SS. AFTER DISAGREEMENTS OVER THE FINANCIAL PRACTICES OF THE ASSOCIATION'S LEADERSHIP, THE ASSOCIATION SUDDENLY INFORMED THE COAST GUARD THAT IT RECOMMENDED AGAINST GRANTING CAPTAIN HIGHT A LICENSE. WITH NO MEANINGFUL WAY TO CONTEST THE RECOMMENDATION WITH THE COAST GUAR D, HIGHT TEAMED UP WITH THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE LAST MARCH TO DEFEND HIS RIGHT TO DUE PR OCESS AND ASK THE COAST GUARD TO STOP THE PRACTICE OF DELEGATING ITS POWER TO THE SELF-INT ERESTED PRIVATE ORGANIZATION. A VICTORY IN THIS CASE WOULD BOTH VINDICATE CAPTAIN HIGHT AN D CURB UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAWMAKING AUTHORITY AMONG SIMILAR ASSOCIATIONS NATIONWIDE. SURFVIV E, ET AL. V. CITY OF SOUTH PADRE ISLAND YOU MIGHT THINK THAT SOUTH PADRE ISLAND, A POPULAR BEACH-FRONT TOURIST DESTINATION IN TEXAS, WOULD BE A HAVEN FOR FOOD TRUCKS. INSTEAD, THE CITY GOVERNMENT CAPS FOOD TRUCK PERMITS AT ONLY 12 AND REQUIRES FOOD TRUCKS GET A RESTAURA NT OWNER'S APPROVAL ON THEIR APPLICATION. NOT ONLY DOES THIS MEAN LESS CHOICE AND HIGHER P RICES FOR SOUTH PADRE ISLAND RESIDENTS AND VISITORS, IT VIOLATES THE TEXAS CONSTITUTION, W HICH FORBIDS LAWS THAT SERVE ONLY TO PROTECT BUSINESSES FROM COMPETITION. IJ TEAMED UP WIT H SURFVIVE - A LOCAL NONPROFIT'S FOOD TRUCK - AND FOOD TRUCK OWNERS ANUBIS AND RAMSES AVAL OS TO CHALLENGE SOUTH PADRE ISLAND'S LAW. THIS CASE IS PART OF IJ'S NATIONAL STREET VENDIN G INITIATIVE, WHICH SEEKS TO VINDICATE THE RIGHTS OF STREET VENDORS NATIONWIDE.

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
HAVEMAN, ET AL. V. BUREAU OF PROFESSIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL AFFAIRS, ET AL.	IJ IS TAKING ON A PENNSYLVANIA LAW THAT NOT ONLY VIOLATES DUE PROCESS AND THE RIGHT TO EQU AL PROTECTION; IT ALSO GIVES EVEN MORE POWER TO ALREADY UNACCOUNTABLE GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS . THE COMMONWEALTH'S COLLATERAL CONSEQUENCE LAW, WHICH REQUIRES INDIVIDUALS TO HAVE "GOOD MORAL CHARACTER" IN ORDER TO GET A LICENSE, DENIES EX-OFFENDERS LIKE OUR CLIENTS COURTNEY HAVEMAN AND AMANDA SPILLANE FROM CONTRIBUTING TO SOCIETY AND HAVING A SECOND CHANCE AT LIF E. AFTER SPENDING MONTHS AND THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS ATTENDING COSMETOLOGY SCHOOL, COURTNEY A ND AMANDA WERE DENIED A LICENSE DESPITE BOTH HAVING TURNED THEIR LIVES AROUND YEARS AGO AN D THE FACT THAT THEIR PRIOR CONVICTIONS HAVE NO RELATIONSHIP TO BEAUTY AND FACIAL CARE. RE FUSING TO GIVE UP, THEY JOINED WITH IJ TO BRING AN END TO THE UNCONSTITUTIONAL REQUIREMENT IN DECEMBER 2018. IN JUNE 2020, THE PENNSYLVANIA LEGISLATURE PASSED AN OCCUPATIONAL LICEN SING REFORM BILL THAT WOULD ALLOW PEOPLE LIKE COURTNEY AND AMANDA TO RECEIVE LICENSES. WE ARE PUSHING FOR A DECISION IN THIS CASE TO HELP CHALLENGE UNREASONABLE LAWS THAT MAKE IT H ARDER FOR AMERICANS TO WORK IN THE FIELD OF THEIR CHOOSING. DIAZ, ET AL. V. CITY OF FORT P IERCE, FLORIDA, ET AL. IN FEBRUARY 2019, A FLORIDA CIRCUIT COURT ISSUED A PRELIMINARY INJU NCTION STATING THAT THE CITY OF FORT PIERCE CANNOT ENFORCE ITS UNCONSTITUTIONAL BAN ON FOO D TRUCKS OPERATING WITHIN 500 FEET OF ANOTHER ESTABLISHMENT THAT SELLS FOOD. FORT PIERCE'S LAW WAS CREATED IN 2014 FOR THE SOLE PURPOSE OF PROTECTING RESTAURANT OWNERS FROM COMPETI TION. FOOD TRUCK OWNERS BENNY DIAZ AND BRIAN PEFFER JOINED WITH THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE IN DECEMBER 2018 TO CHALLENGE THE BAN AND, THANKS TO THIS RULING, THEY AND OTHER FOOD TRUC K OWNERS CAN OPERATE THEIR FOOD TRUCKS WHILE LITIGATION CONTINUES, UNTIL THE BAN IS STRUCK DOWN FOR GOOD. JACKSON, ET AL. V. KEMP, ET AL. IN A MAJOR VICTORY FOR ECONOMIC FREEDOM IN THE PEACH STATE, THE GEORGIA SUPREME COURT RULED IN MAY 2020 THAT A CONSTITUTIONAL CHALLE NGE TO THE STATE'S NEW LACTATION CONSULTANT LICENSE WILL GO FORWARD. REVERSING A TRIAL COU RT DECISION THAT HAD DISMISSED THE CASE IN 2019, THE GEORGIA SUPREME COURT UNANIMOUSLY AFF IRMED THAT IT HAS "LONG INTERPRETED THE GEORGIA CONSTITUTION AS PROTECTING A RIGHT TO WORK IN ONE'S CHOSEN PROFESSION FREE FROM UNREASONABLE GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE." MARY JACKSON, A CERTIFIED LACTATION COUNSELOR, AND REACHING OUR SISTERS EVERYWHERE (ROSE) - A NONPROFIT DEDICATED TO PROVIDING BREASTFEEDING SUPPORT TO MINORITY COMMUNITIES - JOINED WITH IJ IN JUNE 2018 TO CHALLENGE GEORGIA'S MANDATE THAT LACTATION CONSULTANTS BE CERTIFIED BY A PRIV ATE ORGANIZATION TO BECOME INTERNATIONAL BOARD CERTIFIED LACTATION CONSULTANTS (IBCLC). DO ING SO REQUIRES ROUGHLY TWO YEARS OF COLLEGE COURSES AND MORE THAN 300 HOURS OF SUPERVISED CLINICAL WORK. IJ'S CLIENTS HAVE YEARS OF EXPERIENCE, AND THERE IS NO PROOF THAT BEING IB CLC-CERTIFIED IMPROVES THE QUALITY OF CARE. VERY FEW LACTATION CONSULTANTS IN GEORGIA ARE IBCLC-CERTIFIED. THIS CASE SER

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
HAVEMAN, ET AL. V. BUREAU OF PROFESSIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL AFFAIRS, ET AL.	VES TO PROTECT THEIR RIGHTS, AND THE RIGHTS OF NON-IBCLC LACTATION CONSULTANTS ACROSS THE STATE, TO EARN A LIVING PROVIDING MOTHERS AND BABIES WITH THE CARE THEY NEED. WHITE COTTAG E RED DOOR, LLC V. TOWN OF GIBRALTAR LISA AND KEVIN HOWARD, ALONG WITH JESSICA AND CHRIS H ADRABA, OPENED A FOOD TRUCK OUTSIDE THEIR FAMILY BUSINESS IN FISH CREEK, WISCONSIN. DESPIT E OBTAINING THE PROPER STATE AND COUNTY PERMITS FOR THEIR TRUCK, THE TOWN'S CONSTABLE TOLD THE QUARTET TO STOP VENDING AND HAD THE COUNTY REVOKE THE TRUCK'S ZONING PERMIT. WHEN THE COUNTY REFUSED, THE TOWN BOARD PASSED A TOTAL BAN ON VENDING GOODS FROM MOBILE VEHICLES, INCLUDING FOOD TRUCKS. AT THE ROOT OF THE BAN IS THE TOWN BOARD'S SCHEME TO PROTECT ESTABL ISHED RESTAURANTS FROM HEALTHY COMPETITION. WITH IJ'S HELP, LISA, KEVIN, JESSICA, AND CHRI S ARE CHALLENGING THIS UNCONSTITUTIONAL VENDING BAN TO SAVE THEIR BUSINESS AND ESTABLISH T HAT VENDORS' RIGHT TO EARN A LIVING DOES NOT DEPEND ON WHETHER THEIR BUSINESSES HAVE WHEEL S OR NOT. IN NOVEMBER 2019, A JUDGE DENIED THE TOWN'S MOTION TO DISMISS THE LAWSUIT, SO TH E CASE CONTINUES. SANCHEZ V. OFFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION IJ JOINED WIT H ALTAGRACIA YLUMINADA "ILUMI" SANCHEZ IN APRIL 2018 TO FIGHT THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA'S O FFICE OF THE STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF EDUCATION'S (OSSE) REGULATIONS REQUIRING MANY OF THE CITY'S DAY CARE PROVIDERS TO GO TO COLLEGE OR LOSE THEIR JOBS. THESE DISASTROUS REGULATION S WOULD HAVE CAREER-ENDING CONSEQUENCES FOR ILUMI, WHO RUNS A DAY CARE IN HER HOME IN NORT HEAST D.C. AND HAS WORKED WITH CHILDREN FOR OVER 20 YEARS SINCE COMING TO THE U.S. FROM HE R NATIVE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC. TO COMPLY WITH THE NEW REGULATIONS AND RETURN TO SCHOOL FOR A DEGREE IRRELEVANT TO CHILDCARE IS TOO MUCH OF A STRAIN ON ILUMI'S TIME AND MONEY. FOR PAR ENTS, THE REGULATIONS WOULD RAISE PRICES AND LOWER OPTIONS. IN MAY 2020, THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE D.C. CIRCUIT REJECTED A LOWER COURT'S DISMISSAL OF THE LAWSUIT. A WIN IN THIS CASE WILL ENSURE THAT ILUMI AND HUNDREDS OF D.C. DAY CARE PROVIDERS MAY CONTINUE TO D O WHAT THEY LOVE WITHOUT UNWARRANTED GOVERNMENT INTERFERENCE. RUSSINKO, ET AL. V. NEW JERS EY DEP'T OF HEALTH, ET AL. HOME BAKERS HEATHER RUSSINKO, LIZ CIBOTARIU, AND MARTHA RABELLO HAVE TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO CONTEST THE NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH'S REQUIREMENT THAT THEY BE LICENSED AS A "RETAIL FOOD ESTABLISHMENT" TO SELL THEIR HOMEMADE GOODS. THIS ENTAI LS USING A COMMERCIAL-GRADE KITCHEN THAT IS SEPARATE FROM ONE'S PERSONAL HOME KITCHEN, PAY ING FEES, AND ABIDING BY HUNDREDS OF PAGES OF REGULATIONS. BANNING THE SALE OF HOME-BAKED GOODS DIRECTLY TO CONSUMERS SERVES NO OTHER PURPOSE THAN TO GIVE COMMERCIAL BAKERS UNDUE P ROTECTION FROM COMPETITION. THE COURT SERVED IJ AND THE HOME BAKERS A FIRST-ROUND VICTORY IN APRIL 2018, WHEN IT DENIED THE NEW JERSEY HEALTH DEPARTMENT'S REQUEST TO DISMISS THE LA WSUIT CHALLENGING THE STATE'S BAN. IN APRIL 2020, THE HEALTH DEPARTMENT PUBLISHED PROPOSED RULES THAT WOULD ALLOW HEATHE

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
HAVEMAN, ET AL. V. BUREAU OF PROFESSIONAL AND OCCUPATIONAL AFFAIRS, ET AL.	R, LIZ, MARTHA, AND OTHER NEW JERSEY BAKERS TO SELL THEIR HOMEMADE BAKED GOODS. SHAW, ET A L. V. METRO. GOV'T OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE, IS THE CENTER OF COUNTRY MUSIC. YET, INCREDIBLY, THE CITY BANNED MUSICIANS FROM MAKING MUSIC IN THEIR OWN HOMES. NASHVILLE HAD OUTLAWED HOME-BASED BUSINESSES, PREVENTING LOCAL MUSICIANS, HAIR STYL ISTS, AND OTHER BUDDING ENTREPRENEURS FROM BUILDING THEIR OWN AMERICAN DREAM. NASHVILLE RE SIDENTS LIKE IJ CLIENTS LIJ SHAW AND PAT RAYNOR FACED STEEP FINES IF ANY CUSTOMERS PHYSICA LLY CAME TO THEIR HOMES TO DO BUSINESS. IJ AND THE BEACON CENTER OF TENNESSEE TEAMED UP TO VINDICATE PEOPLE'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO USE THEIR HOMES TO EARN AN HONEST LIVING. IN O CTOBER 2019, A NASHVILLE COURT DISMISSED THE SUIT. WE HAVE APPEALED THAT RULING. KING AND MARTIN V. LOUISVILLE/JEFFERSON COUNTY METRO. GOVERNMENT NOBODY SHOULD NEED THEIR COMPETITO RS' PERMISSION TO OPERATE A BUSINESS. THAT'S WHY, IN 2017, TWO LOUISVILLE FOOD TRUCK OWNER S TEAMED UP WITH THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE TO FIGHT A CITY LAW THAT BANNED TRUCKS FROM OPE RATING WITHIN 150 FEET OF ANY RESTAURANT THAT SELLS SIMILAR FOOD. LOUISVILLE, RECOGNIZING THAT ITS 150-FOOT RULE FLUNKED A CONSTITUTIONAL TEST, WISELY REPEALED THE RULE IN MARCH OF 2018. FURTHERMORE, THE CITY AGREED TO A FEDERAL CONSENT DECREE IN WHICH IT PROMISED TO TR EAT FOOD TRUCKS JUST LIKE ANY OTHER COMMERCIAL VEHICLE. IN AUGUST 2019, AFTER EIGHT MONTHS OF STONEWALLING, IJ RECEIVED EMAILS REVEALING HOW A CITY COUNCIL MEMBER COORDINATED WITH RESTAURANT OWNERS TO TRY TO UNDERMINE THE CONSENT DECREE. THE RESULTING UPROAR LED THE COU NCIL TO GET RID OF THE ORDINANCE'S ANTI-COMPETITIVE PROVISIONS. BIRCHANSKY, ET AL. V. CLAB AUGH, ET AL. CERTIFICATE OF NEED (CON) LAWS REQUIRE MEDICAL PROVIDERS TO PROVE TO THE GOVE RNMENT THAT THERE IS A "NEED" FOR NEW MEDICAL SERVICES BEFORE THEY ARE ALLOWED TO OFFER TH EM. IJ CLIENT OPHTHALMOLOGIST LEE BIRCHANSKY IS JUST ONE CASUALTY OF THIS SYSTEM. FOR MORE THAN 20 YEARS, DR. BIRCHANSKY HAS TRIED TO OPEN HIS OWN OUTPATIENT SURGERY CENTER NEXT TO HIS OFFICE IN CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA. THOUGH HE IS RECOGNIZED AS ONE OF THE TOP OPHTHALMOLOGI STS IN THE COUNTRY, DR. BIRCHANSKY WAS DENIED A CERTIFICATE OF NEED TO OPEN HIS CENTER ON FOUR SEPARATE OCCASIONS - EACH TIME AFTER TWO EXISTING OPERATING FACILITIES INTERVENED TO PROTECT THEIR BUSINESSES FROM COMPETITION. UNFORTUNATELY, THE FEDERAL TRIAL COURT RULED AG AINST DR. BIRCHANSKY AND THE OTHER PLAINTIFFS, AND, IN APRIL 2020, THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT COUR T OF APPEALS AFFIRMED THAT RULING. HOWEVER, THERE IS SOME GOOD NEWS: DURING LITIGATION, IO WA GRANTED DR. BIRCHANSKY'S CON APPLICATION. DR. BIRCHANSKY CAN FINALLY OPEN HIS CENTER, E VEN IF OTHER DOCTORS - AND THEIR PATIENTS - REMAIN SHUT OUT.

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
ALEXIS BAILLY VINEYARD AND THE NEXT CHAPTER WINERY V. DOHMAN	A LITTLE-KNOWN MINNESOTA LAW REQUIRES WINERIES IN THE STATE MAKE THEIR WINE PRIMARILY USIN G GRAPES GROWN IN MINNESOTA, EVEN THOUGH FEW TYPES OF GRAPES CAN GROW IN MINNESOTA'S CLIMA TE. THIS LAW HURTS THE ECONOMIC VIABILITY OF MINNESOTA VINEYARDS, MAKES IT HARDER FOR MINN ESOTA WINE-LOVERS TO LOCALLY FIND THE KINDS OF WINES THEY LIKE, AND HINDERS THE INTERSTATE COMMERCE THAT BINDS AMERICA TOGETHER. IJ JOINED FORCES WITH TWO MINNESOTA WINERIES, ALEXI S BAILLY VINEYARD AND NEXT CHAPTER WINERY, TO CHALLENGE THIS ONEROUS AND UNCONSTITUTIONAL LAW. IN APRIL 2018, A FEDERAL JUDGE DISMISSED THE SUIT ON PROCEDURAL GROUNDS, BUT IN JULY 2019, THE 8TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS REVERSED THIS DECISION AND SENT THE CASE BACK TO TRIAL COURT. PIZZA DI JOEY, LLC V. MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF BALTIMORE IN MAY 2016, TWO BALTIMORE-AREA FOOD TRUCKS - PIZZA DI JOEY AND MINDGRUB CAFE - JOINED WITH IJ TO FILE A L AWSUIT AGAINST THE CITY CHALLENGING ITS BAN ON MOBILE VENDORS OPERATING WITHIN 300 FEET OF ANY BRICK-AND-MORTAR ESTABLISHMENT SELLING SIMILAR FOOD. AND ON DECEMBER 20, 2017, A CIRC UIT COURT JUDGE RULED THAT THE 300-FOOT BAN WAS TOO VAGUE, GIVING BALTIMORE 60 DAYS TO STO P ENFORCING IT. UNFORTUNATELY, IN MAY 2019, AN APPEALS COURT OVERTURNED THAT DECISION AND REINSTATED THE RULE. IJ AND THE FOOD TRUCK OWNERS KEPT UP THE FIGHT AGAINST THIS PROTECTIO NIST LAW AND APPEALED TO THE MARYLAND COURT OF APPEALS, THE STATE'S HIGHEST COURT. WE ARE AWAITING A RULING TO SEE IF BALTIMORE RESIDENTS CAN ENJOY THE INCREASED CHOICE AND LOWER P RICES THAT MORE COMPETITION FROM FOOD TRUCK WOULD BRING. BURKE V. CITY OF CHICAGO IN A BLO W TO FOOD FREEDOM IN MAY 2019, THE ILLINOIS SUPREME COURT UPHELD TWO PROVISIONS OF CHICAGO 'S LAW THAT BLOCK FOOD TRUCKS FROM PARKING WITHIN 200 FEET OF RESTAURANTS AND REQUIRE THEY INSTALL GPS DEVICES SO CITY OFFICIALS MAY TRACK THEIR EVERY MOVE. THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTI CE CHALLENGED THESE TWO PROVISIONS IN 2012 ON BEHALF OF LAURA PEKARIK, OWNER OF THE CUPCAK ES FOR COURAGE FOOD TRUCK. NOT ONLY DOES CHICAGO'S RULE STYMIE A COMMON, LOW-COST PATH INT O THE RESTAURANT INDUSTRY FOR THE CITY'S ENTREPRENEURS, IT FORCES EVERYDAY CHICAGOANS TO C ONTINUE TO SUFFER FROM FEWER CHOICES AND HIGHER PRICES. IN OCTOBER 2019, IJ ASKED THE U.S. SUPREME COURT TO TAKE THE CASE ON THE GROUNDS THAT CHICAGO'S GPS MONITORING VIOLATES THE FOURTH AMENDMENT PROTECTIONS FROM UNREASONABLE SEARCHES BY THE GOVERNMENT. UNFORTUNATELY, THE SUPREME COURT DECLINED TO HEAR THE CASE. COURTNEY AND COURTNEY V. GOLTZ, ET AL. FOR YE ARS, BROTHERS JIM AND CLIFF COURTNEY HAVE WANTED TO PROVIDE CONVENIENT FERRY SERVICE ACROS S LAKE CHELAN IN WASHINGTON STATE TO ENHANCE ECONOMIC PROSPERITY IN THEIR SMALL COMMUNITY LOCATED AT THE NORTHERN END OF THE LAKE. BUT THE STATE REQUIRES JIM AND CLIFF TO EITHER OB TAIN THE EXISTING FERRY COMPANY'S PERMISSION TO COMPETE, OR PROVE IN A TRIAL-LIKE HEARING THAT THE EXISTING COMPANY IS NOT PROVIDING "REASONABLE AND ADEQUATE SERVICE AND THAT A NEW SERVICE IS NECESSARY. REALIZI

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
ALEXIS BAILLY VINEYARD AND THE NEXT CHAPTER WINERY V. DOHMAN	NG THAT THE STATE IS MORE CONCERNED WITH PROTECTING ESTABLISHED INTERESTS THAN FOSTERING E CONOMIC FREEDOM AND OPPORTUNITY, JIM AND CLIFF HAVE JOINED WITH IJ TO PROTECT THEIR RIGHT - AND THE RIGHT OF EVERY AMERICAN - TO PURSUE AN HONEST LIVING FREE FROM PROTECTIONIST INT ERFERENCE BY THE GOVERNMENT. IN APRIL 2020, THE 9TH U.S. CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS RULED AG AINST US. WE PLAN TO APPEAL THIS DECISION TO THE U.S. SUPREME COURT. KILLEEN, ET AL. V. YA VAPAI COUNTY, ET AL. JOSHUA AND EMILY KILLEEN MOVED FROM CALIFORNIA AND BOUGHT UNDEVELOPED DESERT PROPERTY IN YAVAPAI COUNTY, IN THE HEART OF ARIZONA, ENVISIONING A MODEST HOME FOR THEMSELVES AND A RUSTIC WELLNESS AND WEDDING RETREAT. WHILE THEY WORKED TO GET THEIR PERM ITS IN ORDER, COUNTY OFFICIALS DIRECTED THEM TO PULL DOWN ANY ONLINE ADVERTISEMENTS SAYING THAT THEIR BUSINESS WOULD BE "COMING SOON OR TAKING ANY ADVANCED BOOKINGS. THE COUNTY ALS O BANNED JOSHUA AND EMILY FROM HAVING FRIENDS AND NEIGHBORS OVER FOR YOGA AND POTLUCK MEAL S, EVEN THOUGH THOSE EVENTS WERE FREE OF CHARGE AND TOOK PLACE OUTSIDE. ZONING CODES OFTEN MICROMANAGE HOW AMERICANS CAN USE THEIR PROPERTY, BUT THEY CANNOT DO SO IN A WAY THAT VIO LATES THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, ESPECIALLY ONE'S CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS TO FREE SPEECH AND ASS OCIATION. IN MAY 2020, JOSHUA AND EMILY TEAMED UP WITH THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE TO PROTEC T THEIR RIGHT TO COMMUNICATE ABOUT THEIR FUTURE BUSINESS AND TO WELCOME THEIR FRIENDS ONTO THEIR PROPERTY FOR FOOD, FELLOWSHIP, AND EXERCISE. REGULUS BOOKS, LLC, V. CITY OF CHARLOT TESVILLE AND DIVERS; HART V. COUNTY OF ALBEMARLE THE CITY OF CHARLOTTESVILLE AND ALBEMARLE COUNTY HAVE DECIDED TO REQUIRE A BUSINESS LICENSE TO WRITE NOVELS, AND THEY HAVE ASSESSED THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS IN BACK TAXES AGAINST SOME OF THEIR HARDWORKING FREELANCE WRITERS, W HILE EXEMPTING NEWSPAPERS, MAGAZINES, RADIO, AND TELEVISION. CHARLOTTESVILLE'S MONEY-GRAB ISN'T JUST WRONG, IT'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL. THAT'S WHY BESTSELLING NOVELISTS CORBAN ADDISON A ND JOHN HART TEAMED UP WITH IJ IN JULY 2019 TO FILE LAWSUITS AGAINST THE CITY AND COUNTY A SKING FOR REFUNDS OF THEIR BUSINESS LICENSE TAXES AND CHALLENGING THEIR CONSTITUTIONALITY UNDER THE FIRST AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS. THESE CUTTING-EDGE LAWSUITS WILL VINDICATE AMER ICANS' RIGHT TO SPEAK FOR A LIVING WITHOUT BEING BURDENED BY DISCRIMINATORY TAXES. UPTON'S NATURALS CO. AND THE PLANT BASED FOODS ASSOCIATION V. BRYANT AND GIPSON PEOPLE CAN BUY AN D SELL VEGAN FOODS IN MISSISSIPPI USING THE TERMS THEY UNDERSTAND BEST THANKS TO AN IJ FRE E SPEECH VICTORY. AT THE BEHEST OF THE MEAT INDUSTRY, MISSISSIPPI HAD BANNED THE USE OF "M EAT" TERMS TO SELL PLANT-BASED FOODS, MEANING NO USE OF "VEGGIE BURGER OR "VEGAN HOT DOG." IJ PARTNERED WITH INDEPENDENT VEGAN FOOD MAKER UPTON'S NATURALS AND THE PLANT BASED FOODS ASSOCIATION TO FILE A FEDERAL LAWSUIT CHALLENGING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF MISSISSIPPI'S LAW. IN RESPONSE, THE MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE ADOPTED NEW REGULATIONS IN NOV EMBER 2019 ALLOWING THE USE OF

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
ALEXIS BAILLY VINEYARD AND THE NEXT CHAPTER WINERY V. DOHMAN	"MEAT" TERMS WHEN THE LABEL MAKES CLEAR THE FOOD IS PLANT-BASED. KERSTEN, ET AL. V. CITY OF MANDAN WHEN BRIAN BERUBE AND AUGUST "AUGIE" KERSTEN PAINTED A WESTERN-THEMED MURAL ON T HEIR SALOON, COMPLETE WITH THE BAR'S NAME "LONESOME DOVE" IN FANCY SCRIPT, CUSTOMERS LOVED IT, BUT THE CITY OF MANDAN, NORTH DAKOTA, DID NOT. THE CITY WOULD GRANT THEM NEITHER A MU RAL PERMIT (SINCE THE MURAL ADVERTISED THEIR BUSINESS) NOR A SIGN PERMIT (SINCE IT WAS PAI NTED ON A WALL) AND INSTEAD ORDERED THEM TO REMOVE THE MURAL OR FACE THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS IN FINES. SO, BRIAN AND AUGIE TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO CHALLENGE MANDAN'S MURAL ORDINANCE AND VINDICATE THEIR FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS. IN RESPONSE TO THE SUIT, THE CITY REWROTE ITS MURA L CODE TO NOT DISCRIMINATE AGAINST BUSINESSES' SPEECH, IMPROVING THE FREE SPEECH RIGHTS OF EVERYONE IN THE CITY. THIS CASE CLOSED IN FEBRUARY 2020. IJ RECEIVED FROM THE GOVERNMENT $60,000 IN FEES IN THIS CASE. LANCASTER COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE V. WALKER, ET AL . CARTER WALKER IS A REPORTER FOR THE MEDIA GROUP LNP, COVERING THE GOVERNMENT IN LANCASTE R COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA. CARTER WANTED TO KNOW WHAT THE COUNTY WAS DOING WITH THE CASH AND PROPERTY IT ACQUIRED THROUGH CIVIL FORFEITURE - A PRACTICE UNDER WHICH THE GOVERNMENT CAN SEIZE PROPERTY FROM THOSE NOT ACCUSED OF ANY CRIME - SO, HE ASKED THE LANCASTER COUNTY DIS TRICT ATTORNEY FOR THAT INFORMATION. THE DA REFUSED, WRONGLY CLAIMING AN EXCEPTION UNDER T HE STATE'S RIGHT TO KNOW LAW. CARTER APPEALED THAT DENIAL TO PENNSYLVANIA'S OFFICE OF OPEN RECORDS, WHICH CONCLUDED THAT THE RECORDS SHOULD BE PUBLIC. WHEN THE LANCASTER DA APPEALE D THE DECISION, CARTER, LNP, AND IJ TEAMED UP TO MAKE FORFEITURE RECORDS IN LANCASTER COUN TY AND THE NEIGHBORING BERKS COUNTY AVAILABLE TO THE PUBLIC IN ORDER TO EXPOSE ABUSES.

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
CATO INSTITUTE V. SEC	SINCE THE 1970S, THE SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION HAS REFUSED TO SETTLE ANY ENFORCEM ENT ACTIONS UNLESS THE DEFENDANT AGREES TO A GAG ORDER. FACED WITH THE POTENTIALLY STAGGER ING COST OF CHALLENGING THE SEC'S PROSECUTION, MANY DEFENDANTS AGREE TO SETTLE. THIS PREVE NTS THOSE WHO BELIEVE THEY ARE INNOCENT FROM CRITICIZING THE SEC'S ACTIONS AGAINST THEM, E FFECTIVELY MEANING A GOVERNMENT AGENCY IS DECIDING WHO CAN CRITICIZE THAT AGENCY. THE CATO INSTITUTE, A D.C.-BASED THINK TANK, WANTS TO PUBLISH A BOOK BY SOMEONE WHO BELIEVES HE IS THE VICTIM OF ABUSE BY THE SEC AND TO HOST A PANEL DISCUSSION WITH OTHERS. IJ JOINED CATO TO CHALLENGE THE SEC'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL INFRINGEMENT ON FREE SPEECH. IN FEBRUARY 2020, A FEDERAL JUDGE IN D.C. DISMISSED THE LAWSUIT, HOLDING THAT CATO COULDN'T CHALLENGE THE SEC' S POLICY BECAUSE, ALTHOUGH THE POLICY PREVENTS CATO FROM PUBLISHING INFORMATION IN THE PUB LIC INTEREST, IT DOESN'T REGULATE CATO DIRECTLY. WE ARE APPEALING THIS RULING. HINES V. TE XAS STATE BOARD OF VETERINARY MEDICAL EXAMINERS, ET AL. DR. RON HINES IS A RETIRED AND PHY SICALLY DISABLED LICENSED VETERINARIAN IN TEXAS. FROM 2002 TO 2012, HE GAVE PET OWNERS ARO UND THE COUNTRY VETERINARY ADVICE, MOSTLY TO THOSE WHO LACKED ACCESS TO VETERINARIANS AND OFTEN FOR FREE - THAT IS, UNTIL THE TEXAS STATE BOARD OF VETERINARY MEDICAL EXAMINERS SHUT RON DOWN, SUSPENDED HIS LICENSE, AND FINED HIM. RON AND IJ FILED A FEDERAL LAWSUIT TO VIN DICATE RON'S FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHT TO FREE SPEECH, BUT AN APPEALS COURT RULED THAT RON'S S PEECH WASN'T PROTECTED BECAUSE IT'S PART OF AN OCCUPATION. SINCE THEN, THE U.S. SUPREME CO URT HAS AFFIRMED THAT THE FIRST AMENDMENT PROTECTS PROFESSIONAL SPEECH, SO RON AND IJ HAVE FILED A NEW LAWSUIT TO VINDICATE HIS RIGHT TO GIVE VETERINARY ADVICE TO PET OWNERS WHO NE ED IT AND TO HELP ALL THOSE WHO USE THE INTERNET TO SPEAK IN INNOVATIVE WAYS. MISSISSIPPI BOARD OF LICENSURE FOR PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND SURVEYORS V. VIZALINE BRENT MELTON AND S COTT DOW ARE MISSISSIPPI ENTREPRENEURS AND FOUNDERS OF VIZALINE, LLC, A STARTUP THAT PROVI DES SMALL BANKS WITH INFORMATION ABOUT THEIR PROPERTIES BY USING PUBLIC INFORMATION TO DRA W LINES ON A MAP. IN 2017, HOWEVER, THE MISSISSIPPI BOARD OF LICENSURE FOR PROFESSIONAL EN GINEERS AND SURVEYORS SUED THE COMPANY, CLAIMING IT WAS PRACTICING UNLICENSED SURVEYING. T HE BOARD IS MADE UP OF PROFESSIONAL ENGINEERS AND SURVEYORS WHO HAVE A CLEAR INTEREST IN S HUTTING DOWN INNOVATIVE AND AFFORDABLE ALTERNATIVES THAT COMPETE WITH THEM. IN FEBRUARY 20 20, THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 5TH CIRCUIT AFFIRMED THAT THE FIRST AMENDMENT'S PROT ECTION OF FREEDOM OF SPEECH APPLIES TO OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING LAWS AND REMANDED THE CASE T O THE DISTRICT COURT. THE RULING IS A MAJOR VICTORY THAT WILL HELP ENTREPRENEURS IN MANY F IELDS VINDICATE THEIR RIGHTS IN COURT. PCHS, ET AL. V. GRAFILO, ET AL. IN 2017, BOB SMITH, OWNER OF THE PACIFIC COAST HORSESHOEING SCHOOL, RECEIVED A NOTICE FROM THE STATE OF CALIF ORNIA THREATENING TO SHUT HIM

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
CATO INSTITUTE V. SEC	DOWN FOR VIOLATING STATE LAW BY ADMITTING STUDENTS WHO HADN'T GRADUATED FROM HIGH SCHOOL. SO, WHEN ESTEBAN NAREZ, A RANCH HAND, APPLIED TO BOB'S SCHOOL A FEW MONTHS LATER, BOB HAD TO REJECT HIS APPLICATION. CALIFORNIA'S LAW NOT ONLY HURTS STUDENTS WITH LITTLE EDUCATION BY PREVENTING THEM FROM LEARNING WELL-PAYING TRADES, IT ALSO VIOLATES THE FIRST AMENDMENT. BOB, ESTEBAN, AND IJ CHALLENGED THIS MISGUIDED LAW IN COURT. IN JUNE 2020, THE 9TH U.S. C IRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS RULED THAT CALIFORNIA RESTRICTED BOB AND ESTEBAN'S FIRST AMENDMENT RIGHTS AND SENT THE CASE BACK TO THE DISTRICT COURT, WHERE CALIFORNIA WILL BE HARD-PRESSE D TO DEFEND ITS UNCONSTITUTIONAL SPEECH RESTRICTION. DEL CASTILLO V. FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH IN 2014, HEATHER DEL CASTILLO LEFT AN UNFULFILLING CAREER TO START A BUSINESS PROV IDING PERSONALIZED HEALTH COACHING. SHE NEVER CLAIMED TO BE A LICENSED NUTRITIONIST OR DIE TITIAN, BUT THE FLORIDA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH ORDERED HER TO CEASE PROVIDING NUTRITIONAL AD VICE AND DEMANDED THAT SHE PAY OVER $750 IN FINES. HEATHER COULDN'T AFFORD TO SPEND YEARS AND THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS GETTING THE DEGREE TO BECOME A LICENSED DIETICIAN, SO SHE SHUT HE R BUSINESS DOWN. THESE SORTS OF OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING LAWS PROTECT THE ECONOMIC INTERESTS OF LICENSE HOLDERS BY CENSORING WHAT OTHERS CAN SAY AND HEAR. HEATHER AND IJ FILED A FEDE RAL LAWSUIT CHALLENGING FLORIDA'S UNCONSTITUTIONAL RESTRICTIONS ON GIVING DIETARY ADVICE. UNFORTUNATELY, IN JULY 2019, A FEDERAL DISTRICT UPHELD THE LICENSING REQUIREMENT ON THE BA SIS THAT HEATHER'S ADVICE WAS "CONDUCT NOT "SPEECH AND THEREFORE EXEMPT FROM FIRST AMENDME NT PROTECTIONS. WE ARE APPEALING THIS RULING. BILLUPS, ET AL. V. CITY OF CHARLESTON; FREEN OR, ET AL. V. MAYOR AND ALDERMAN OF THE CITY OF SAVANNAH IJ SUCCESSFULLY CHALLENGED ORDINA NCES IN CHARLESTON, SOUTH CAROLINA, AND SAVANNAH, GEORGIA, REQUIRING THAT ANYONE GIVING A PAID CITY TOUR OBTAIN A SPECIAL LICENSE. THE GOVERNMENT CAN'T DECIDE WHO GETS TO SPEAK, BU T THESE CITIES DEMANDED THAT TOUR GUIDES PASS EXTENSIVE TESTS TO RECEIVE A TOUR GUIDE LICE NSE. IJ CHALLENGED THESE REQUIREMENTS TO VINDICATE THE RIGHTS OF TOUR GUIDES AND ALL AMERI CANS WHO SPEAK FOR A LIVING. IN MAY 2019, A FEDERAL COURT IN SAVANNAH RULED THAT THAT CITY 'S ORDINANCE VIOLATED THE FIRST AMENDMENT, AND IN JUNE 2020, THE 4TH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPE ALS RULED THAT CHARLESTON'S ORDINANCE DID AS WELL. THESE RULINGS ARE IMPORTANT VICTORIES I N IJ'S EFFORTS TO ENSURE THAT OCCUPATIONAL SPEECH ENJOYS THE SAME CONSTITUTIONAL PROTECTIO N AS OTHER TYPES OF SPEECH. IJ RECEIVED $161,500 IN FEES FROM THE SAVANNAH CITY GOVERNMENT . METRO. GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY, ET AL., V. TENNESSEE DEPARTMENT OF E DUCATION, ET AL. IN MAY 2019, TENNESSEE ENACTED THE TENNESSEE EDUCATION SAVINGS ACCOUNT PI LOT PROGRAM ACT, GIVING THOUSANDS OF LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME FAMILIES IN TENNESSEE WITH GRE ATER SCHOOL CHOICE. IJ IS INTERVENING ON BEHALF OF TWO PARENTS, NATU BAH AND BUILGUISSA DI ALLO, TO DEFEND THE PROGRAM FR

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
CATO INSTITUTE V. SEC	OM A LAWSUIT CHALLENGING ITS CONSTITUTIONALITY. THE PROGRAM PROVIDES SCHOLARSHIPS WORTH UP TO $7,300 TO FAMILIES FROM SHELBY COUNTY AND METRO NASHVILLE SCHOOL DISTRICTS TO SEND THE IR CHILDREN TO PRIVATE SCHOOLS. UNFORTUNATELY, IN MAY 2020 THE CHANCERY COURT FOR DAVIDSON RULED THAT THE PROGRAM VIOLATED THE HOME RULE AMENDMENT OF THE TENNESSEE CONSTITUTION AND ENJOINED FURTHER IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM. NATU, BUILGUISSA, AND IJ ARE APPEALING TH IS RULING TO PRESERVE A LIFELINE FOR FAMILIES WHO WOULD LIKE TO LEAVE PUBLIC SCHOOLS THAT DO NOT MEET THEIR CHILDREN'S NEEDS. MORENCY, ET AL. V. STATE OF NEVADA, ET AL. TO ENSURE T HAT STUDENTS OF EVERY BACKGROUND HAVE THE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY THEY NEED TO SUCCEED, TH E STATE ESTABLISHED THE NEVADA EDUCATIONAL CHOICE SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM, A NEED-BASED PROGRA M FUNDED BY PRIVATE DONATIONS INCENTIVIZED BY TAX CREDITS. TO ACCOMMODATE THE STATE'S GROW ING POPULATION AND INCREASING EDUCATION COSTS, THE LAW INCREASED THE NUMBER OF TAX CREDITS AVAILABLE BY 10% ANNUALLY. THE STATE REPEALED THIS SO-CALLED "ESCALATOR PROVISION" IN 201 9, BUT THE NEVADA CONSTITUTION DOES NOT ALLOW THE LEGISLATURE TO DO ANYTHING TO INCREASE T AX REVENUE WITHOUT A TWO-THIRDS VOTE IN BOTH THE STATE HOUSE AND SENATE, AND THE LEGISLATI ON PASSED WITH LESS THAN A TWO-THIRDS MAJORITY. NEVADA PARENTS, A SCHOLARSHIP ORGANIZATION , AND PRIVATE DONORS TEAMED UP WITH IJ TO FILE SUIT IN NEVADA STATE COURT CHALLENGING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF THE REDUCTION IN TAX CREDITS. IN MAY 2020, A JUDGE UPHELD THE 2019 CH ANGE. WE ARE APPEALING THIS RULING.

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
GILLIS, ET AL. V. HASSON, JR., ET AL.	IN MAINE, THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE AND THE FIRST LIBERTY INSTITUTE FILED A FEDERAL LAWSUI T IN AUGUST 2018 TO OVERTURN A STATE LAW THAT EXCLUDES PARENTS WHO SELECT RELIGIOUS OPTION S FROM PARTICIPATING IN THE NATION'S SECOND-OLDEST SCHOOL CHOICE PROGRAM. MAINE'S "TUITION ING" PROGRAM, WHICH ENABLES PARENTS IN TOWNS THAT DO NOT OPERATE PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOLS TO CH OOSE THE PUBLIC OR PRIVATE SCHOOL THAT BEST SUITS THEIR CHILDREN'S NEEDS, HAS BARRED RELIG IOUS OPTIONS FOR NEARLY FOUR DECADES. BUT BY SINGLING OUT RELIGIOUS SCHOOLS, AND ONLY RELI GIOUS SCHOOLS, FOR DISCRIMINATION, MAINE IS VIOLATING BOTH THE RELIGIOUS FREEDOM AND EQUAL PROTECTION GUARANTEES IN THE U.S. CONSTITUTION. LAST JUNE, A DISTRICT COURT JUDGE UPHELD THE EXCLUSIVE, ANTI-CHOICE LAW. THE CASE IS NOW ON APPEAL AT THE U.S. COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE 1ST CIRCUIT. IJ'S LANDMARK U.S. SUPREME COURT VICTORY IN ESPINOZA V. MONTANA IN JUNE SHOWS THAT MAINE'S RESTRICTION IS CLEARLY UNCONSTITUTIONAL. SUMMIT CHRISTIAN ACADEMY, ET A L. V. MEOTTI, ET AL. WASHINGTON'S WORK-STUDY PROGRAM IS A FINANCIAL AID PROGRAM THAT PROVI DES FUNDING FOR LOW- AND MIDDLE-INCOME STUDENTS WHO WANT TO EARN MONEY DURING COLLEGE, OFT EN BY WORKING IN JOBS THAT RELATE TO THEIR FIELD OF STUDY. PARTICIPATING EMPLOYERS RANGE F ROM NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONS TO BUSINESSES AND GOVERNMENT AGENCIES, BUT ALL HAVE ONE THING IN COMMON: IN ORDER TO PARTICIPATE, THE EMPLOYER AND THE POSITION A STUDENT WOULD FILL MUS T NOT HAVE ANY RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION. THE U.S. CONSTITUTION REQUIRES GOVERNMENT TO BE NEUT RAL TOWARD RELIGION, NEITHER FAVORING NOR DISFAVORING IT. THAT IS WHY IJ TEAMED UP WITH A SECTARIAN EMPLOYER - A PRIVATE CHRISTIAN SCHOOL - AND A UNIVERSITY STUDENT GROUP IN AUGUST 2018 TO CHALLENGE WASHINGTON STATE'S SECTARIAN EXCLUSION. IN RESPONSE TO THE LAWSUIT, WAS HINGTON ADOPTED NEW RULES SO THAT WASHINGTON'S STUDENTS AND RELIGIOUS EMPLOYERS, FOR THE F IRST TIME EVER, NOW HAVE FULL FREEDOM TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PROGRAM. FRIEND OF THE COURT B RIEFS IN ADDITION TO LITIGATING THE ABOVE-DESCRIBED CASES, THE INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE FILED AMICUS BRIEFS IN THE FOLLOWING CASES BETWEEN JULY 1, 2019 AND JUNE 30, 2020: J.K.J. V. PO LK COUNTY, WISCONSIN STATE OF WASHINGTON V. JOEL VILLELA DAVID THOMPSON, ET AL. V. HEATHER HEBDON, ET AL. JESUS HERNANDEZ, ET AL. V. JESUS MESA, JR AMERICANS FOR PROSPERITY FOUNDAT ION V. XAVIER BECERRA DOE V. IOWA STATE OF KANSAS V. CHARLES GLOVER CINDY MENDOZA, ET AL. V. MATTHEW L. GARRETT CTIA - THE WIRELESS ASSOCIATION V. CITY OF BERKELEY, CA II CATHERINE REGINA HARPER, ET AL. V. PROFESSIONAL PROBATION SERVICES, INC. IN RE MERRILL LYNCH MORTGA GE INVESTORS TRUST MORTGAGE LOAN ASSET-BACKED CERTIFICATES, SERIES 2006-RM2 FRED ROBINSON, ET AL. V. JEFF LONG STATE OF ARIZONA V. WILLIAM MIXTON ARIZONA ADVOCACY NETWORK, ET AL. V . CITIZENS CLEAN ELECTIONS COMMISSION, ET AL. V. THE STATE OF ARIZONA FNU TANZIN, ET AL. V . MUHAMMED TANVIR, ET AL. VIOLET DOCK PORT, INC., L.L.C., V. DREW M. HEAPHY, ET AL. ROXANN E TORRES V. JANET MADRID, ET A

990 Schedule O, Supplemental Information

Return Reference	Explanation
GILLIS, ET AL. V. HASSON, JR., ET AL.	L. MICAH JESSOP ET AL. V. CITY OF FRESNO, ET AL. BETHANY AUSTIN V. STATE OF ILLINOIS CITY OF CHICAGO V. ROBBIN L. FULTON, ET AL. SEC V. BARRY D. ROMERIL STATE OF WASHINGTON V. SHAN NON B. BLAKE CLYDE S. BOVAT V. STATE OF VERMONT