

Your Honor & All to Whom This May Concern:

Being submitted *with* this letter is the transcript of my arraignment which occurred on 10-24-2016. I received this transcript from Lisa Schmidt, Recorder, on 1-20-2016 via email.

First off, with all due respect to M(r)s. Schmidt, there are places throughout the transcript wherein the words I stated were not recorded into the transcript. I was concerned this might occur, which is *why* I reserved my “First Amendment right to film public officials”. Some of the reasons I gave on that day included “both national *and* international security”, the fact that this is a “publicly-pertinent case”.

On pages 6 & 7 of the transcript, however, you will see that *what is recorded* is that I stated the following: "I read several places where the Department of Justice says that we have a first amendment right to film publicly pertinent cases and I'd like to exert my right in court to be able to make sure this is filmed for educational purposes and for public safety". This is why today as well as throughout this case it is *vital* that the case is filmed.

There is a South Central Judicial District *Electronic & Photographic Media Coverage of Judicial Proceedings* POLICY (“Policy”) being submitted along with this letter as well. I received a copy of this Policy from Kelli Peterson who was arrested around the same time as me, & she informed me that she was not permitted to film in court due to the fact that she had not submitted an EXPANDED MEDIA REQUEST in such a manner as to be compliant with the Policy. On page two of the Policy, what is shown is that the Policy appears to have been implemented by Judge Hagerty *only ten days after my arraignment* on 11-7-2016!

I have probable cause to suspect that this Policy was implemented as a direct result of my having reserved (asserted) my “First Amendment right to film”, & due to concerns I have for my safety *and* the safety of others, as well as— again— both national & international security purposes, educational purposes, & the fact that this is a publicly-pertinent case which involves Constitutional question, I drafted this letter for submission today in order to ensure my right to film is honored. Because I have witnessed *many* civil rights violations, it is vital to ensure this proceeding is accessible with purity of evidence for public benefit, as a transcript is not sufficient *especially* when key words throughout the transcript of my arraignment were omitted— *so in part* this proceeding needs to be filmed *also* for my personal safety & to maintain the integrity of the courts.

Also being submitted alongside this letter is a 5 page *printout* of Digital Media Law Project's “Recording Police Officers and Public Officials” webpage (“Printout”), located here:

<http://www.dmlp.org/legal-guide/recording-police-officers-and-public-officials>

This printout is included because it provides evidence of several cases which reinforce the First Amendment “assumed” right to film public officials (*Fordyce v. City of Seattle*, 55 F.3d 436, 438 (9th Cir. 1995)) which “police lack the authority to prohibit” *Iacobucci v. Boulter*, 193 F3d 14 (1st Cir. 1999) when “the citizen's activities are peaceful, not performed in derogation of any law, and done in the exercise of his First Amendment rights”. Another relevant case includes *Smith v. City of Cumming*, 212 F3d 1332, 1333 (11th Cir. 2000) because it reserves the “right to record matters of public interest”, to which this case qualifies as for several reasons. There are several other cases cited throughout the Printout which are relevant to reserving the right to film, & even though several of these cases were ruled in various districts, The Fourteenth Amendment of course provides “equal protection of the laws” to all citizens. Today I enter into the record here in Morton

County that we have an inalienable right to film in court so long as that right is not abused & is done in alignment with The Preamble (Mutual Defense, “promotion of the General Welfare”), which is my intent here today.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter!

Sincerely,
Alex “Distance” Wilson

“The Founding Fathers knew that if American citizens failed to share information & were unable to speak freely, they would be worse off than they had been as subjects under Britain's King George III. The Founding Fathers were former colonists under a tyranny that controlled information & freedom of expression. King George III suppressed free speech, especially speech critical of the Crown or the government. Without the First Amendment's guarantee of free speech, freedom of the press, religion & assembly— the rest of the Amendments are meaningless! The purpose of the first amendment is to permit free & open discussion about important public affairs.”¹

¹ U.S. Congressman Ted Poe's, 2nd District of Texas, Official website:
<http://poe.house.gov/2007/11/thefirstamendment-right-to-speech>