

1 ANTHONY L. FRANÇOIS, Cal. Bar No. 184100  
E-mail: TFrancois@pacificlegal.org  
2 TIMOTHY R. SNOWBALL, Cal. Bar No. 317379  
E-mail: TSnowball@pacificlegal.org  
3 Pacific Legal Foundation  
930 G Street  
4 Sacramento, California 95814  
Telephone: (916) 419-7111  
5 Facsimile: (916) 419-7747

6 JAMES M. MANLEY, Ariz. Bar No. 031820\* (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
E-mail: JManley@pacificlegal.org  
7 Pacific Legal Foundation  
3217 E. Shea Blvd., # 108  
8 Phoenix, Arizona 85028  
Telephone: (916) 288-1405  
9 Facsimile: (916) 419-7747

10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
12 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
13 FRESNO DIVISION

15 PETER STAVRIANOUDAKIS; KATHERINE  
STAVRIANOUDAKIS; SCOTT TIMMONS;  
16 ERIC ARIYOSHI; **and** AMERICAN FALCONRY  
CONSERVANCY,

17 Plaintiffs,

18 v.

19  
20 UNITED STATES FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE;  
CHARLTON H. BONHAM, in his official capacity  
21 as Director of California Department of Fish and  
Wildlife; **and** JIM KURTH, in his official capacity  
22 as Deputy Director Exercising the Authority of the  
Director of United States Fish & Wildlife Service,

23 Defendants.  
24  
25  
26  
27

No. 1:18-cv-01505-LJO-BAM

**FIRST AMENDED  
COMPLAINT FOR  
DECLARATORY AND  
INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

28 \*Licensed to practice law in Arizona and Colorado. Not licensed to practice law in California.

1                                   **INTRODUCTION**  
2                                   **CIVIL RIGHTS COMPLAINT FOR**  
3                                   **DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

4           Plaintiffs Peter Stavrianoudakis, Katherine Stavrianoudakis, Eric Ariyoshi, Scott Timmons,  
5           and American Falconry Conservancy, by and through undersigned counsel, bring this First  
6           Amended Complaint, filed pursuant to stipulation of the parties and approved by the Court (ECF  
7           no. 15), for declaratory and injunctive relief, and allege as follows:

8                                   **JURISDICTION & VENUE**

9           1.        This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 (federal  
10           question jurisdiction) and 1343 (jurisdiction to redress deprivations of civil rights), and the Civil  
11           Rights Act of 1871, 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

12           2.        Venue is proper in this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b) because this judicial  
13           district is one in which a defendant is subject to the court’s personal jurisdiction.

14           3.        The Court has authority to provide the relief requested under the Fourth  
15           Amendment, First Amendment, Fourteenth Amendment, 28 U.S.C §§ 2201 & 2202 (Declaratory  
16           Judgment Act), 42 U.S.C. § 1983, and its inherent equitable powers.

17           4.        Defendant Charlton Bonham is Director of the California Department of Fish and  
18           Wildlife, and is a “person” within the meaning 42 U.S.C. § 1983. *See Will v. Michigan Dep't of*  
19           *State Police*, 491 U.S. 58, 71 n.10 (1989).

20                                   **INTRODUCTION**

21           5.        The First and Fourth Amendments contain some of the most important and well-  
22           protected individual civil liberties contained in the United States Constitution, and constrain both  
23           federal officials and, through the Fourteenth Amendment, state officials.

24           6.        Falconry is the art of housing, tending, training, flying, and hunting with birds of  
25           prey, such as falcons, hawks, and eagles.

26           7.        In 2008, ostensibly for the purpose of regulating the “taking, possessing, purchasing,  
27           bartering, [or] selling” certain birds of prey pursuant to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, 16 U.S.C.  
28           § 703, *et seq.*, and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, 16 U.S.C. § 668, *et seq.*, the U.S.  
Fish and Wildlife Service promulgated regulations governing falconry. *See* 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(a).

1           8.       The Migratory Bird Treaty Act grants Defendants the “authority, with a search  
2 warrant, to search any place” and by plain implication denies the authority to search without a  
3 warrant. 16 U.S.C. § 706. Neither the Migratory Bird Treaty Act nor the Bald and Golden Eagle  
4 Protection Act grant Defendants the authority to conduct warrantless searches of private property  
5 or regulate falconers’ speech.

6           9.       The federal regulations include 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(b)(4)(i), which authorizes  
7 Defendants to conduct warrantless searches of falconry “facilities” to ensure that the “facilities  
8 standards” in § 21.29 are met, and 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(d)(2) and (d)(9), which grant state officials  
9 the power to conduct warrantless searches of the “equipment and records” of falconers.

10          10.       The federal regulations also include 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)–(9), which prohibit  
11 falconers from photographing or filming their birds to make movies, commercials, or in other  
12 commercial ventures unrelated to falconry, limit compensation for falcon-related educational  
13 speech, and dictate the content of conservation education programs.

14          11.       The federal regulations encourage states to create licensing and regulatory schemes  
15 consistent with the federal regulations. Any state rules must be at least as restrictive as the federal  
16 rules. 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(b).

17          12.       Pursuant to 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(b), California promulgated falconry regulations in  
18 2014, including 14 C.C.R. § 670(h)(13)(A), which contains substantively identical speech  
19 restrictions as those contained in the federal regulations, and further bans any compensation of  
20 falconers’ speech if the “fees charged, compensation, or pay received ... exceed the amount  
21 required to recover costs.”

22          13.       In 2017, the California regulations were amended to include 14 C.C.R.  
23 § 670(j)(3)(A), which authorizes warrantless searches of falconry “facilities, equipment, or raptors  
24 possessed” by licensees, including the power to “inspect, audit, or copy any permit, license,  
25 book[,]” or other required record.

26          14.       Failure to comply with the above requirements may result in the denial of a falconry  
27 license or in a previous license’s immediate suspension. 14 C.C.R. § 670(j)(3)(A).

28       ///

1 15. A refusal to allow inspection may be inferred if, after “reasonable attempts” by the  
2 department, the licensee is unavailable for inspection. *Id.*

3 16. Failure to follow the state and federal regulations also subjects Plaintiffs to civil and  
4 criminal penalties. *See* 16 U.S.C. § 707; 14 C.C.R. § 747.

5 17. Falconry license holders are required to renew their licenses annually. 14 C.C.R.  
6 § 670(a)(1); 14 C.C.R. § 670(e)(4); 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(c)(1)(i).

7 18. As a consequence, licensed falconers are forced to continually consent to  
8 unconstitutional searches of their private homes and property as conditions of licensure, thereby  
9 suffering ongoing and continuing constitutional injury.

10 19. This suit seeks to vindicate the rights of Plaintiffs to be secure in their private homes  
11 and curtilage against unreasonable warrantless searches by armed government agents under the  
12 Fourth Amendment, and their rights to freedom of speech under the First Amendment.

13 20. Plaintiffs will suffer the continued deprivation of their constitutional rights due to  
14 the continual enforcement of the unconstitutional rules complained of herein by state and federal  
15 officials, unless the regulations challenged herein are declared unconstitutional and unlawful and  
16 Defendants are enjoined from enforcing them.

17 21. This action seeks wholly prospective declaratory and injunctive relief and no  
18 monetary damages against any party.

### 19 **PARTIES**

20 22. Plaintiff Peter Stavrianoudakis is a United States citizen, Deputy Public Defender  
21 for Stanislaus County, and Pacific Coast Director for American Falconry Conservancy. He resides  
22 in Hilmar, California, and was first licensed as a falconer over 30 years ago. He is a Master  
23 Falconer.

24 23. Plaintiff Katherine Stavrianoudakis is a United States citizen and a Service  
25 Coordinator for Valley Mountain Regional Center, a nonprofit that provides services for the  
26 developmentally disabled. She resides in Hilmar, California, and is married to and lives in the same  
27 residence as Plaintiff Peter Stavrianoudakis. She does not have a falconry license but is subject to  
28 the same intrusive inspections of her home by Defendants as her husband.

1           24.     Plaintiff Eric Ariyoshi is a United States citizen, Marketing Director for a California  
2 winery, and Secretary for American Falconry Conservancy. He resides in Novato, California, and  
3 has been a licensed falconer for 20 years.

4           25.     Plaintiff Scott Timmons is a United States citizen, and owner of Aerial Solutions, a  
5 small privately owned abatement company, and a member of American Falconry Conservancy. He  
6 resides in Lompoc, California, and has been licensed as a falconer for 30 years. He has been  
7 licensed to use falcons in professional abatement for more than 10 years. Abatement is the practice  
8 of flying certain species of raptor over a given area as a deterrent to the presence of other invasive  
9 bird species. Abatement is important in the prevention of nuisance caused by seagulls and other  
10 bird species at landfills and near airports.

11          26.     Plaintiff American Falconry Conservancy is a membership organization established  
12 in 2002 and composed of approximately 100 members across the United States. American Falconry  
13 Conservancy is dedicated to protecting and preserving the practice of falconry, and protecting  
14 falconers' rights.

15          27.     Defendant Greg Sheehan is Principal Deputy Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife  
16 Service. In his capacity as Principal Deputy Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service he is  
17 charged with enforcing the federal warrantless search and speech regulations challenged in this  
18 lawsuit. By enforcing the policies complained of in this action, he is currently depriving Plaintiffs  
19 of their rights to be free from unreasonable warrantless searches of their private property, and rights  
20 to freedom of speech guaranteed by the United States Constitution, and will continue to do so absent  
21 this Court's injunction. Defendant Sheehan is sued in his official capacity.

22          28.     Defendant Charlton Bonham is Director of the California Department of Fish and  
23 Wildlife. In his capacity as Director of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife he is charged  
24 with enforcing the California and federal warrantless search and speech regulations challenged in  
25 this lawsuit. By enforcing the policies complained of in this action, he is currently depriving  
26 Plaintiffs of their rights to be free from unreasonable warrantless searches of their private property,  
27 and rights to freedom of speech guaranteed by the United States Constitution, and will continue to  
28 do so absent this Court's injunction. Defendant Bonham is sued in his official capacity.

1           29.     Defendant U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is responsible for creating and enforcing  
2 the federal warrantless search and speech regulations challenged in this lawsuit. By enforcing the  
3 policies complained of in this action, it is currently depriving Plaintiffs of their rights to be free  
4 from unreasonable warrantless searches of their private property, and rights to freedom of speech  
5 guaranteed by the United States Constitution.

## 6                                 **LEGAL BACKGROUND**

### 7     **The Fourth Amendment Forbids Unreasonable Warrantless Searches**

8           30.     The Fourth Amendment protects “persons, houses, papers, and effects” from  
9 unreasonable warrantless searches by government agents. U.S. Const. amend IV.

10          31.     Under the privacy-based approach to the Fourth Amendment, a search warrant is  
11 required for government searches where (1) a person has exhibited an actual (subjective)  
12 expectation of privacy in the area searched, and (2) the expectation is one that society is prepared  
13 to recognize as reasonable. *Katz v. United States*, 389 U.S. 347, 361 (1967) (Harlan, J., concurring).

14          32.     Under Fourth Amendment privacy analysis, private homes and curtilage enjoy a  
15 strong presumption of privacy. *See Kyllo v. United States*, 533 U.S. 27, 34 (2001); *Camara v.*  
16 *Municipal Court of the City and County of San Francisco*, 387 U.S. 523 (1967).

17          33.     Property rights also provide an independent basis for requiring a warrant under the  
18 Fourth Amendment. *See, e.g., Collins v. Virginia*, 138 S. Ct. 1663 (2018); *Florida v. Jardines*,  
19 569 U.S. 1 (2013); *United States v. Jones*, 565 U.S. 400 (2012).

### 20     **Federal and California Unreasonable Warrantless Search Regimes**

21          34.     Under 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(b)(4)(i), Defendants purport to authorize themselves to  
22 inspect Plaintiffs’ facilities without a warrant “to ensure that the facilities standards” in § 21.29 are  
23 met.

24          35.     50 C.F.R. § 21.29(d)(2) and (d)(9) grant state officials the purported power to  
25 conduct warrantless searches of the “equipment and records” of Plaintiff falconers.

26          36.     14 C.C.R. § 670(j)(3)(A), purports to authorize warrantless searches of falconry  
27 “facilities, equipment, or raptors possessed” by licensees, including the power to “inspect, audit, or  
28 copy any permit, license, book[,]” or other required record.

1           37. Plaintiffs’ falconry “facilities,” are located within private homes or structures within  
2 the curtilage of private homes, as are the targeted “equipment and records.”

3           38. Plaintiffs’ birds, falconry equipment, and records are also “papers and effects”  
4 protected by the Fourth Amendment.

5 **The First Amendment Presumptively Prohibits Content-Based Speech Restrictions**

6           39. The First Amendment protects the right of free speech by commanding that  
7 “Congress shall make no law ... abridging the freedom of speech.” U.S. Const. amend. I.

8           40. Regulations that control speech based on its content are “presumptively invalid, and  
9 the Government bears the burden to rebut that presumption.” *United States v. Stevens*, 559 U.S.  
10 460, 468 (2010).

11           41. Movies, commercials, entertainment, advertisements, educational programs, and  
12 promotion or endorsement of products are forms of speech protected by the First Amendment.

13 **Federal and California Speech Restrictions**

14           42. 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(9)(i) prohibits Plaintiffs from photographing or filming their  
15 birds for “movies, commercials, or in other commercial ventures”— if the images will be used in  
16 a production that is not about falcons or falconry.

17           43. 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(9)(ii) prohibits Plaintiffs from photographing or filming their  
18 birds for “advertisements; as a representation of any business, company, corporation, or other  
19 organization; or for promotion or endorsement of any products, merchandise, goods, services,  
20 meetings, or fairs”—unless the promotion or endorsement is of “a nonprofit falconry organization  
21 or association” or “products or endeavors related to falconry.”

22           44. 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(8)(v) imposes content-based restrictions about what Plaintiffs can  
23 discuss in conservation education programs—including “information about the biology, ecological  
24 roles, and conservation needs of raptors and other migratory birds.”

25           45. 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(iv) prohibits Plaintiffs from being paid to speak in a  
26 conservation education program using their birds if they charge a fee for the presentation that  
27 exceeds the amount required to recoup their costs.

28           46. 14 C.C.R. § 670(h)(13)(A) prohibits Plaintiffs from being paid to speak in any

1 context using their birds if they charge a fee for the presentation that exceeds the amount required  
2 to recoup their costs.

### 3 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

#### 4 **Peter and Katherine Stavrianoudakis**

5 47. Peter Stavrianoudakis has been interested in, housed, cared for, trained, and flown  
6 falcons and other birds of prey used in falconry since he was 16-years old.

7 48. On or about 1980, when he was 20-years old, Peter secured his first falconry license  
8 and has held a valid falconry license for the last 38 years.

9 49. Peter last renewed his falconry license in June 2018, and will renew his license in  
10 June 2019.

11 50. Peter has continuously complied with all requirements for falconry licensure.

12 51. In approximately 1983, Peter was subject to an unreasonable warrantless search of  
13 his home and warrantless arrest by armed members of the California Department of Fish and  
14 Wildlife related to his lawful activities as a non-resident falconer in Nevada.

15 52. No charges were filed against Peter related to this incident.

16 53. Peter first became affiliated with American Falconry Conservancy in 2017.

17 54. Shortly thereafter he became the Pacific Coast Director for American Falconry  
18 Conservancy for a two-year term expiring in 2019.

19 55. Peter has never been sanctioned or cited by U.S. Fish and Wildlife, California Fish  
20 and Wildlife, or any other agency or body, related to his practice of falconry.

21 56. In his time as a falconer, Peter has housed, cared for, trained, and flown  
22 approximately 15 birds.

23 57. Currently, Peter owns one four-year-old aplomado falcon named "Ares."

24 58. Peter has owned, housed, cared for, trained, and flown Ares for the last three years.

25 59. Peter has a close personal bond and friendship with Ares that rivals that of any other  
26 human and pet.

27 ///

28 ///



1           60. Peter does not generate any type of income, or participate in any kind of industry  
2 through his ownership, training, or care of Ares.

3           61. Ares lives exclusively inside Peter's home, and is occasionally weathered in a  
4 protected enclosure in his yard to ensure the health of his falcon.

5           62. There is no separate structure used for the care or housing of Ares.

6           63. Peter and Katherine Stavrianoudakis were married in May 2014.

7           64. Peter and Katherine's home was originally purchased by Peter's mother Darlene  
8 Stavrianoudakis in 1973.

9           65. Peter and Katherine have lived there together for a total of five years.

10          66. Katherine does not, and has never, held a falconry license or practiced falconry.

11 **Eric Ariyoshi**

12          67. Eric Ariyoshi has been interested in, housed, cared for, trained, and flown falcons  
13 and other birds of prey used in falconry since he was 13-years old.

14          68. In 1988, when he was 16-years old, Eric secured his first falconry license and has  
15 held a valid falconry license for approximately the last 30 years.

16          69. Eric last renewed his falconry license in June 2018, and will renew his license in  
17 June 2019.

18          70. Eric has continuously complied with all requirements for falconry licensure.

19          71. In his time as a falconer, Eric has housed, cared for, trained, and flown  
20 approximately 20 birds.

21          72. Eric has never been sanctioned or cited by U.S. Fish and Wildlife, California Fish  
22 and Wildlife, or any other agency or body, related to his practice of falconry.

23          73. Eric currently owns one three-year-old male Peregrine Falcon named "Finn."

24          74. Finn is housed in an unrestricted mews located 30 feet away with a direct line of  
25 sight to the rear of Eric's home.

26          75. Eric first became aware of American Falconry Conservancy in 2016, shortly  
27 thereafter become the organization's Secretary.

28          76. Eric has given uncompensated educational presentations about falconry.///

1 **Scott Timmons**

2 77. In 1988, when he was 20-years old, Scott secured his first falconry license and has  
3 held a valid falconry license for approximately 30 years.

4 78. Scott last renewed his falconry license in June 2018, and will renew his license in  
5 June 2019.

6 79. Scott has continuously complied with all requirements for falconry licensure.

7 80. In his time as a falconer, Scott has housed, cared for, trained, and flown  
8 approximately 40 birds; 20 falconry birds and 20 birds used for abatement services.

9 81. Species that Scott has owned include red-tailed hawks, coopers hawks, peregrine  
10 falcons, and hybrid species.

11 82. In 1992, Scott was approached on his mother's private property in Thousand Oaks,  
12 California, by officers of the California Fish & Game Department.

13 83. Scott was living with his mother and attending college at the time.

14 84. The officers claimed to be there to inquire as to whether he was still in possession  
15 of a certain red-tailed hawk.

16 85. Scott told them that said hawk had flown away, and they soon revealed that they  
17 were already in possession of the hawk.

18 86. Scott believes the officers used the hawk as pretext to attempt an unreasonable  
19 warrantless search of his mother's private property.

20 87. Scott has never been sanctioned or cited by U.S. Fish and Wildlife, California Fish  
21 and Wildlife, or any other agency or body, related to his practice of falconry.

22 88. Currently, Scott owns three birds: "June," is a five-year-old Goshawk, "Jeppa" is a  
23 five-year-old Peregrine Falcon, and "Tio" is a six-year-old Harris Hawk.

24 89. Scott has a close personal bond and friendship with June, Jeppa, and Tio that rivals  
25 that of any other human and pet.

26 90. Scott's falcons live exclusively in mews and other structures directly adjacent to his  
27 home.

28 ///

1           91.     Scott first heard of and became acquainted with American Falconry Conservancy in  
2 2014 and became a member in 2018.

3           92.     Scott is the owner of an abatement services company called Aerial Solutions.

4           93.     Abatement is the practice of flying certain species of raptor over a given area as a  
5 deterrent to the presence of other invasive bird species. Abatement is important in the prevention  
6 of nuisance caused by seagulls and other bird species at landfills and near airports.

7           94.     Scott has been asked to perform educational presentations, including conservation  
8 education presentations, at the same time that he is flying his birds for abatement. But he has  
9 declined to perform these demonstrations because of the regulations that prohibit compensation for  
10 speaking that exceeds the amount required to recoup his costs.

11 **American Falconry Conservancy**

12           95.     American Falconry Conservancy is a membership organization established in 2002  
13 and composed of approximately 100 members from across the United States.

14           96.     American Falconry Conservancy’s stated purpose is to promote “the broadest  
15 liberties possible that are not in conflict with legitimate conservation efforts based upon sound  
16 biological and legal reasoning,” and “promote knowledge of quality falconry, as well as to instill  
17 pride in falconers for the cultural heritage of the sport, and its place in world history.”

18           97.     American Falconry Conservancy is comprised of six districts across the United  
19 States, with each region overseen by a regional director.

20           98.     American Falconry Conservancy is managed by an executive board consisting of a  
21 president, vice-president, secretary, and treasurer, with membership decisions vested in a board of  
22 directors.

23           99.     American Falconry Conservancy membership is open to “[a]ny falconer—neither  
24 antagonistic nor detrimental to the association or its purpose—of good moral character and over  
25 the age of 17 years.”

26           100.    American Falconry Conservancy members pay annual dues, starting at \$30 for one  
27 year.

28 ///

1           101. By virtue of holding falconry licenses, all members of American Falconry  
2 Conservancy are subject to the federal warrantless search provisions challenged herein.

3           102. By virtue of holding falconry licenses, all members of American Falconry  
4 Conservancy residing in California are subject to the California warrantless search provision  
5 challenged herein.

6           103. By virtue of holding falconry licenses, all members of American Falconry  
7 Conservancy are subject to the federal speech restrictions challenged herein.

8           104. By virtue of holding falconry licenses, all members of American Falconry  
9 Conservancy residing in California are subject to the California speech restrictions challenged  
10 herein.

11           105. American Falconry Conservancy members have been subject to unreasonable  
12 warrantless searches pursuant to the regulations challenged herein.

13           106. American Falconry Conservancy members are subject to the speech prohibiting  
14 regulations complained of in this action.

15           107. Certain members of American Falconry Conservancy have declined to create  
16 photographs, movies, commercials, and other expression due to Defendants' active enforcement of  
17 the regulations complained of in this action.

18           108. Certain members of American Falconry Conservancy have modified the content of  
19 their educational presentations due to Defendants' active enforcement of the regulations  
20 complained of in this action.

21           109. Certain members of American Falconry Conservancy have declined to perform  
22 educational presentations and engage in other expression due to Defendants' active enforcement of  
23 the regulations limiting compensation complained of in this action.

24           110. American Falconry Conservancy as an association is dedicated to protecting and  
25 preserving the practice of falconry and protecting falconers' rights.

26           111. Neither the claims asserted here, nor the specific relief requested, require the  
27 participation of individual members of American Falconry Conservancy.

28 ///

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**CLAIMS FOR RELIEF**  
**Count I**  
**(50 C.F.R. § 21.29(b)(4)(i), 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(d)(2) and (d)(9), and 14 C.C.R. § 670(j)(3)(A))**  
**(Warrantless Search of Falconry License Holders)**  
**(Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments)**

112. Plaintiffs incorporate the allegations in the preceding paragraphs.

113. Under 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(b)(4)(i), Defendants assert the purported authority to inspect Plaintiffs’ facilities without a warrant “to ensure that the facilities standards” in § 21.29 are met.

114. 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(d)(2) and (d)(9) purports to grant state officials the power to conduct warrantless searches of the “equipment and records” of Plaintiff falconers.

115. 14 C.C.R. § 670(j)(3)(A), purports to authorize warrantless searches of falconry “facilities, equipment, or raptors possessed” by licensees, including the power to “inspect, audit, or copy any permit, license, book[.]” or other required record.

116. Plaintiffs’ falconry “facilities” are located within private homes or structures within the curtilage of private homes, as are the targeted “equipment and records.”

117. Plaintiffs’ birds, falconry equipment, and records are also “papers and effects” protected by the Fourth Amendment.

118. As a condition of securing and maintaining their falconry licenses, Plaintiffs are forced, in violation of the unconstitutional conditions doctrine, to waive their Fourth Amendment rights to be free from unreasonable warrantless searches of their private homes and curtilage.

119. Falconry license holders are required to renew their licenses annually, and as a consequence are forced to continually consent to unconstitutional searches of their private homes and property as a condition of licensure, thereby suffering ongoing and continuing constitutional injury.

120. Day-to-day, Plaintiffs live in ongoing fear of their home and curtilage being subject to unreasonable warrantless search by armed government agents.

121. The federal and California search provisions challenged herein violate Plaintiffs’ Fourth Amendment rights and exceed Defendants’ authority under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law to compensate for the loss of these fundamental

1 freedoms and will suffer irreparable injury absent an injunction restraining Defendants'  
2 enforcement of the regulations complained of in this action. Plaintiffs are therefore entitled to  
3 declaratory and permanent injunctive relief against continued enforcement and maintenance of  
4 Defendants' unconstitutional laws, practices, and policies. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201, 2202.

5 **Count II**  
6 **(50 C.F.R. § 21.29(b)(4)(i), 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(d)(2) and (d)(9), and 14 C.C.R. § 670(j)(3)(A))**  
7 **(Warrantless Search of Non-Falconry License Holders)**  
8 **(Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments)**

9 122. Plaintiffs incorporate the allegations in the preceding paragraphs.

10 123. Under 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(b)(4)(i), Defendants assert the purported authority to  
11 inspect Plaintiffs' facilities without a warrant "to ensure that the facilities standards" in § 21.29 are  
12 met.

13 124. 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(d)(2) and (d)(9) purports to grant state officials the power to  
14 conduct warrantless searches of the "equipment and records" of Plaintiff falconers.

15 125. 14 C.C.R. § 670(j)(3)(A), which authorizes warrantless searches of falconry  
16 "facilities, equipment, or raptors possessed" by licensees, including the power to "inspect, audit, or  
17 copy any permit, license, book[.]" or other required record.

18 126. Katherine Stavrianoudakis does not, and has never, held a falconry license or  
19 practiced falconry; yet her private home and curtilage is still subject to unreasonable warrantless  
20 searches.

21 127. Peter Stavrianoudakis's falconry "facility" is located within Katherine's private  
22 home, as are the targeted "equipment and records."

23 128. Day-to-day Katherine lives in ongoing fear of her home and curtilage being subject  
24 to unreasonable warrantless search by armed government agents.

25 129. The federal and California search provisions challenged herein violate Katherine's  
26 Fourth Amendment rights and exceed Defendants' authority under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.

27 130. Katherine has no adequate remedy at law to compensate for the loss of these  
28 fundamental freedoms and will suffer irreparable injury absent an injunction restraining  
Defendants' enforcement of the regulations complained of in this action. Katherine is therefore

1 entitled to declaratory and permanent injunctive relief against continued enforcement and  
2 maintenance of Defendants’ unconstitutional laws, practices, and policies. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201,  
3 2202.

4 **Count III**  
5 **(50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(9)(i))**  
6 **(Free Speech)**  
7 **(First and Fourteenth Amendments)**

8 131. Plaintiffs incorporate the allegations in the preceding paragraphs.

9 132. The First Amendment to the United States Constitution, as applied to the states  
10 through the Fourteenth Amendment, protects the truthful, non-misleading speech that Plaintiffs  
11 would engage in but for the regulations complained of in this action.

12 133. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(9)(i) prohibits  
13 Plaintiffs from photographing or filming their birds for “movies, commercials, or in other  
14 commercial ventures”—but only if the images will be used in a production that is not about  
15 falcons or falconry.

16 134. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(9)(i) prohibits  
17 Plaintiffs from engaging in lawful communication using their birds.

18 135. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(9)(i) burdens  
19 speech protected by the First Amendment.

20 136. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(9)(i) is based on  
21 the content of the regulated speech.

22 137. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(9)(i) is not tailored  
23 to serve a substantial or compelling government interest.

24 138. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(9)(i) is an  
25 unconstitutional condition imposed on falconry permits, in violation of the First Amendment.

26 139. But for Defendants’ active enforcement of 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(9)(i), Plaintiffs  
27 would photograph or film their birds for “movies, commercials, or in other commercial ventures”  
28 unrelated to falcons or falconry.

140. By prohibiting Plaintiffs from photographing or filming their birds for “movies,

1 commercials, or in other commercial ventures” unrelated to falcons or falconry, Defendants  
2 currently maintain and actively enforce a set of laws, practices, policies, and procedures under  
3 color of state and federal law that deprive Plaintiff falconers and American Falconry Conservancy  
4 members of their rights to freedom of speech, in violation of the First and Fourteenth  
5 Amendments to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

6 141. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law to compensate for the loss of these  
7 fundamental freedoms and will suffer irreparable injury absent an injunction restraining  
8 Defendants’ enforcement of the regulations complained of in this action. Plaintiffs are therefore  
9 entitled to declaratory and permanent injunctive relief against continued enforcement and  
10 maintenance of Defendants’ unconstitutional laws, practices, and policies. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201,  
11 2202.

12 **Count IV**  
13 **(50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(9)(ii))**  
14 **(Commercial Speech)**  
15 **(First and Fourteenth Amendments)**

16 142. Plaintiffs incorporate the allegations in the preceding paragraphs.

17 143. The First Amendment to the United States Constitution, as applied to the states  
18 through the Fourteenth Amendment, protects the truthful, non-misleading speech that Plaintiffs  
19 would engage in but for the regulations complained of in this action.

20 144. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(9)(ii) prohibits  
21 Plaintiffs from photographing or filming their birds for “advertisements; as a representation of any  
22 business, company, corporation, or other organization; or for promotion or endorsement of any  
23 products, merchandise, goods, services, meetings, or fairs”—unless the promotion or endorsement  
24 is of “a nonprofit falconry organization or association” or “products or endeavors related to  
25 falconry.”

26 145. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(9)(ii) prohibits  
27 Plaintiffs from engaging in lawful communication using their birds.

28 146. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(9)(ii) burdens  
speech protected by the First Amendment.



1           147.    On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(9)(ii) is based on  
2 the content of the regulated speech.

3           148.    On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(9)(ii) is not tailored  
4 to serve a substantial or compelling government interest.

5           149.    On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(9)(ii) is an  
6 unconstitutional condition imposed on falconry permits, in violation of the First Amendment.

7           150.    But for Defendants’ active enforcement of 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(9)(ii), Plaintiffs  
8 would photograph or film their birds for “advertisements; as a representation of any business,  
9 company, corporation, or other organization; or for promotion or endorsement of any products,  
10 merchandise, goods, services, meetings, or fairs” unrelated to falconry.

11           151.    By prohibiting Plaintiffs from photographing or filming their birds for  
12 “advertisements; as a representation of any business, company, corporation, or other organization;  
13 or for promotion or endorsement of any products, merchandise, goods, services, meetings, or fairs”  
14 unrelated to falconry, Defendants currently maintain and actively enforce a set of laws, practices,  
15 policies, and procedures under color of state and federal law that deprive Plaintiff falconers and  
16 American Falconry Conservancy members of their rights to freedom of speech, in violation of the  
17 First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

18           152.    Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law to compensate for the loss of these  
19 fundamental freedoms and will suffer irreparable injury absent an injunction restraining  
20 Defendants’ enforcement of the regulations complained of in this action. Plaintiffs are therefore  
21 entitled to declaratory and permanent injunctive relief against continued enforcement and  
22 maintenance of Defendants’ unconstitutional laws, practices, and policies. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201,  
23 2202.

24   **Count V**  
25   **(50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(v))**  
26   **(Compelled Content of Conservation Education Programs)**  
27   **(First and Fourteenth Amendments)**

28           153.    Plaintiffs incorporate the allegations in the preceding paragraphs.

          154.    The First Amendment to the United States Constitution, as applied to the states

1 through the Fourteenth Amendment, protects the truthful, non-misleading speech that Plaintiffs  
2 would engage in but for the regulations complained of in this action.

3 155. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(v) imposes  
4 content-based restrictions about what Plaintiffs can discuss in conservation education programs—  
5 including requiring discussion of “information about the biology, ecological roles, and conservation  
6 needs of raptors and other migratory birds.”

7 156. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(v) prohibits  
8 Plaintiffs from engaging in lawful communication using their birds.

9 157. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(v) compels  
10 Plaintiffs to communicate particular messages when conducting conservation education programs.

11 158. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(v) burdens  
12 speech protected by the First Amendment.

13 159. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(v) is based on  
14 the content of the regulated speech.

15 160. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(v) is not tailored  
16 to serve a substantial or compelling government interest.

17 161. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(v) is an  
18 unconstitutional condition imposed on falconry permits, in violation of the First Amendment.

19 162. But for Defendants’ active enforcement of 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(v), Plaintiffs  
20 would determine the content of conservation education programs that they perform.

21 163. By prohibiting Plaintiffs from determining the content of conservation education  
22 programs that they perform, Defendants currently maintain and actively enforce a set of laws,  
23 practices, policies, and procedures under color of state and federal law that deprive Plaintiff  
24 falconers and American Falconry Conservancy members of their rights to freedom of speech, in  
25 violation of the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C.  
26 § 1983.

27 164. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law to compensate for the loss of these  
28 fundamental freedoms and will suffer irreparable injury absent an injunction restraining

1 Defendants' enforcement of the regulations complained of in this action. Plaintiffs are therefore  
2 entitled to declaratory and permanent injunctive relief against continued enforcement and  
3 maintenance of Defendants' unconstitutional laws, practices, and policies. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201,  
4 2202.

5 **Count VI**  
6 **(50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(iv))**  
7 **(Payment for Conservation Education Programs)**  
8 **(First and Fourteenth Amendments)**

9 165. Plaintiffs incorporate the allegations in the preceding paragraphs.

10 166. The First Amendment to the United States Constitution, as applied to the States  
11 through the Fourteenth Amendment, protects the truthful, non-misleading speech that Plaintiffs  
12 would engage in but for the regulations complained of in this action.

13 167. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(iv) prohibits  
14 Plaintiffs from being paid to speak in a conservation education program using their birds if they  
15 charge a fee for the presentation that exceeds the amount required to recoup their costs.

16 168. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(iv) imposes a  
17 disincentive to engage in conservation education programs by limiting compensation.

18 169. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(iv) burdens  
19 speech protected by the First Amendment.

20 170. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(iv) is based on  
21 the content of the regulated speech.

22 171. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(iv) is not  
23 tailored to serve a substantial or compelling government interest.

24 172. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(iv) is an  
25 unconstitutional condition imposed on falconry permits, in violation of the First Amendment.

26 173. But for Defendants' active enforcement of 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(iv), Plaintiffs  
27 would accept compensation for conservation education programs that exceeds the amount required  
28 to recoup their costs.

174. By prohibiting Plaintiffs from receiving compensation for conservation education

1 programs that exceeds the amount required to recoup their costs, Defendants currently maintain  
2 and actively enforce a set of laws, practices, policies, and procedures under color of state and  
3 federal law that deprive Plaintiff falconers and American Falconry Conservancy members of their  
4 rights to freedom of speech, in violation of the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United  
5 States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

6 175. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law to compensate for the loss of these  
7 fundamental freedoms and will suffer irreparable injury absent an injunction restraining  
8 Defendants' enforcement of the regulations complained of in this action. Plaintiffs are therefore  
9 entitled to declaratory and permanent injunctive relief against continued enforcement and  
10 maintenance of Defendants' unconstitutional laws, practices, and policies. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201,  
11 2202.

12 **Count VI**  
13 **(14 C.C.R. § 670(h)(13)(A))**  
14 **(Free Speech)**  
15 **(First and Fourteenth Amendments)**

16 176. Plaintiffs incorporate the allegations in the preceding paragraphs.

17 177. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 14 C.C.R. § 670(h)(13)(A) incorporates  
18 the speech restrictions contained in 50 C.F.R. § 21.29 and is unconstitutional for the same reasons.

19 178. On its face and as enforced by Defendants, 14 C.C.R. § 670(h)(13)(A) prohibits  
20 Plaintiffs from being paid to speak in any context using their birds if they charge a fee for the  
21 presentation that exceeds the amount required to recoup their costs. It is unconstitutional for the  
22 same reasons as 50 C.F.R. § 21.29(f)(8)(iv).

23 179. But for Defendants' active enforcement of 14 C.C.R. § 670(h)(13)(A), Plaintiffs  
24 would accept compensation for speaking using their birds that exceeds the amount required to  
25 recoup their costs.

26 180. By prohibiting Plaintiffs from speaking using their birds and by prohibiting  
27 Plaintiffs from accepting compensation for that speech that exceeds the amount required to recoup  
28 their costs, Defendants currently maintain and actively enforce a set of laws, practices, policies,  
and procedures under color of state and federal law that deprive Plaintiff falconers and American

1 Falconry Conservancy members of their rights to freedom of speech, in violation of the First and  
2 Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution and 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

3 181. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law to compensate for the loss of these  
4 fundamental freedoms and will suffer irreparable injury absent an injunction restraining  
5 Defendants' enforcement of the regulations complained of in this action. Plaintiffs are therefore  
6 entitled to declaratory and permanent injunctive relief against continued enforcement and  
7 maintenance of Defendants' unconstitutional laws, practices, and policies. *See* 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201,  
8 2202.

9 **Count VII**  
10 **(5 U.S.C. § 706)**  
11 **(Regulations In Excess of Statutory Jurisdiction, Authority, or Limitations)**

12 182. Plaintiffs incorporate the allegations in the preceding paragraphs.

13 183. The regulations challenged herein were promulgated pursuant to the Migratory  
14 Bird Treaty Act, 16 U.S.C. § 703, *et seq.*, and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, 16  
15 U.S.C. § 668, *et seq.*

16 184. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act grants Defendants the “authority, with a search  
17 warrant, to search any place” and by plain implication denies the authority to conduct searches  
18 without a warrant. 16 U.S.C. § 706.

19 185. Neither the Migratory Bird Treaty Act nor the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection  
20 Act grant Defendants the authority to regulate falconers' speech.

21 186. The regulations challenged herein are in excess of statutory jurisdiction, authority,  
22 or limitations in violation of 5 U.S.C. § 706(2)(C).

23 187. Plaintiffs have no adequate remedy at law and will suffer irreparable injury absent  
24 an injunction restraining Defendants' enforcement of the regulations complained of in this action.  
25 Plaintiffs are therefore entitled to declaratory and permanent injunctive relief against continued  
26 enforcement and maintenance of Defendants' illegal laws, practices, and policies. *See* 28 U.S.C.  
27 §§ 2201, 2202.

28 ///

///

1 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

2 Wherefore, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court enter judgment in their favor as  
3 follows:

4 A. Declare that regulations challenged herein violate Plaintiffs’ rights to be free from  
5 unreasonable searches protected by the Fourth and Fourteenth Amendments on their face and as  
6 applied;

7 B. Declare that regulations challenged herein violate Plaintiffs’ rights to freedom of  
8 speech protected by the First and Fourteenth Amendments on their face and as applied;

9 C. Preliminarily and permanently enjoin Defendants, their officers, agents, servants,  
10 employees, and all persons in active concert or participation with them from enforcing the  
11 regulations complained of in this action;

12 D. Award Plaintiffs their costs, attorneys’ fees, and other expenses in accordance with  
13 law, including 42 U.S.C. § 1988; and

14 E. Order such additional relief as may be just and proper.

15 DATED: January 18, 2018.

16 Respectfully submitted,

17 ANTHONY L. FRANÇOIS  
18 TIMOTHY R. SNOWBALL  
19 JAMES M. MANLEY

20 By: s/Timothy R. Snowball  
TIMOTHY R. SNOWBALL

21 Attorneys for Plaintiffs