[[DATE]]

Dear [[insert name of elected official]],

As a resident of [[insert the county you reside in]] county, I appreciate that you use social media to engage with your constituency. I was once able to read and comment on your posts and the posts of other members of the community on your [[insert the name of the social media platform]] platform. [[Option to insert personal sentence here, for example: I felt like this was a valuable way to engage in public discourse and I miss being able to participate in this way.]] Unfortunately, I was blocked from your [[insert the name of the social media platform]] page on [[insert approximate date you were blocked]]. I am writing to request that you please unblock me so I can participate in the public discourse on your forum again.

The Supreme Court has declared that: “the axiom of the First Amendment is [that] the state has no power to ban speech on the basis of its content.”*Williams-Yulee v. Florida Bar*, 135 S.Ct. 1656 (2015). Specifically, the Supreme Court has established that content-based restrictions on speech in public forums or places “devoted to assembly and debate” are unconstitutional. Erwin Chemerinsky, *Constitutional Law* 1593 (5 ed. 2005); *R.A.V. v. City of St. Paul*, 505 U.S. 377, 382 (1992).

Recent court decisions have held that social media accounts of public officials are public forums and are therefore subject to the First Amendment. In January 2019, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals confirmed a lower court ruling in *Davison v. Loudoun Cty. Bd. of Supervisors* that blocking people on social media is viewpoint or content-based discrimination in its most natural form. 267 F. Supp. 3d 702 (E.D. Va. 2017).The Court ruled that government officials are “strictly limited” in their ability to regulate private speech in public forums—even in forums they create on social media. Similarly, in *Leuthy et al. v. LePage*, a court ruled that blocking people who disagreed with Governor LePage of Maine, constituted not only viewpoint discrimination, but government censorship as well. No. 1:17-CV-00296-JAW, 2018.   
 In 2019, the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit found that then-President Trump’s Twitter page was a public forum and that Trump violated the Constitution “by blocking the Individual Plaintiffs and preventing them from viewing, retweeting, replying to, and liking his tweets.”928 F.3d 226, 238 (2d Cir. 2019). In a 2021 concurring opinion, Justice Clarence Thomas recounted the reasoning of the Second Circuit in *Knight*: Trump violated the First Amendment “by using his control of the Twitter account to block the plaintiffs from accessing the comment threads.” 593 U. S. \_\_\_\_ (2021); 928 F. 3d 226 (2019). Like the Plaintiffs in *Knight,* I have also been blocked from the site of a public official and prevented from viewing and replying to comments on the public forum. You, like then-President Trump, are a public official and cannot prevent me from engaging in the comment threads on your social media page in accordance with the Constitution.

Please restore my ability to engage with you and other members of the community on your [[insert the name of the social media platform]] platform in accordance with the Constitution.

Sincerely,

[[Insert your name]]

[Insert your signature]]