

Douglas McCue
Professor Hanson
JMC100
4 Dec, 2024
Case Brief

SNYDER v. PHELPS, 562 U.S. 443 (2011)

Facts:

Marine Lance Corporal Matthew Snyder died while in the service to his country. The Westboro Baptist Church picketed the funeral with signs stating messages such as "Thank God for Dead Soldiers" and "America is Doomed," claiming the deaths of soldiers were a punishment for the nation's tolerance of homosexuality. Albert Snyder, the father, filed a lawsuit against the members of the Westboro Baptist Church (led by Fred Phelps), alleging intentional infliction of emotional distress, intrusion upon seclusion, and civil conspiracy. He argued that the church's actions caused severe emotional distress. A jury awarded Snyder \$10.9 million in damages, later reduced to \$5 million. The Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals reversed, holding that the church's speech was protected under the First Amendment.

Issue:

Does the First Amendment protect public protest speech, even when it causes emotional distress to private individuals?

Rule:

- 1) The First Amendment protects speech that discusses public concern and cannot be restricted simply because it is offensive or distasteful.
- 2) The determination of whether speech addresses a matter of public or private concern depends on its content, form, and context.

Analysis:

The Court analyzed whether the church's speech was a matter of public concern and determined that its messages addressed issues of public matters, such as the morality of the U.S., homosexuality, and the nation's policies. The Court emphasized that the protestors picketed on public land while in compliance with local laws and did not directly target the funeral service. Emotional distress alone does not justify limiting speech on matters of public concern.

Conclusion:

The Supreme Court ruled 8-1 in favor of Phelps and the Westboro Baptist Church, holding that their speech was protected under the First Amendment. Chief Justice Roberts wrote the majority decision. Justice Alito dissented, arguing that the speech was targeted and intentionally inflicted emotional harm, thus not deserving constitutional protection.