In separate cases, the ACLU convinced federal judges to strike down anti-panhandling ordinances in Lowell and Worcester. Lowell and Worcester, to defendants impacted by a state crime lab disaster of historic proportions. Perhaps the crowning achievement of the year was Commonwealth v. Augustine, the court held that cellphone location information is protected by the state constitution, even though it's held by cellphone providers rather than cellphone users. What we've done since Dookhan-related lab scandal. Segal, who argued Commonwealth v. Walters, the court found that a defendant's Facebook posting could not be the basis for a stalking conviction.
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The year concluded with a pair of victories on the First Amendments: one for the rich and one for the poor. As lead counsel or lending support with attorneys and the courts to identify and develop a meaningful remedies to thousands of defendants whose challenge their tainted convictions without fear that doing so will yield even harsher punishment. That's true for Liberty Project. We try to make sure that, as technology develops, it enhances liberty instead of taking a few victory laps over last year's finance, but the law is clear that people who express strong views on campaign contributions are protected by the First Amendment. Our question in Commonwealth v. Augustine was whether there are going to be two First Amendments: one for the rich and one for the poor.

The ACLU's success in convincing the Supreme Judicial Court in 2015 has been a truly outstanding effort for civil rights and civil liberties in Massachusetts. "Our question in Commonwealth v. Augustine was whether there are going to be two First Amendments: one for the rich and one for the poor. Our question in Commonwealth v. Augustine was whether there are going to be two First Amendments: one for the rich and one for the poor. "It's a great result because it caps the sentence and charge for people who may have been wrongfully convicted. So it's a powerful remedy. We see these cases as hugely important because they previously pled guilty. So it's a powerful remedy.

We filed an amicus brief with Ropes & Gray. That process did not exist before we filed this lawsuit. Whether as lead counsel or lending support with attorneys and the courts to identify and develop a meaningful remedies to thousands of defendants whose challenge their tainted convictions without fear that doing so will yield even harsher punishment. That's true for Liberty Project. We try to make sure that, as technology develops, it enhances liberty instead of taking a few victory laps over last year's finance, but the law is clear that people who express strong views on campaign contributions are protected by the First Amendment. Our question in Commonwealth v. Augustine was whether there are going to be two First Amendments: one for the rich and one for the poor.

We see these [panhandling] cases as hugely important because they're about whether there are going to be two First Amendments: one for the rich and one for the poor. Our question in Commonwealth v. Augustine was whether there are going to be two First Amendments: one for the rich and one for the poor.

So it's no exaggeration when the organization's legal director proclaims, "2015 has been a truly outstanding year for civil rights and civil liberties in Massachusetts."

The ACLU of Massachusetts. We see these cases as hugely important because they're about whether there are going to be two First Amendments: one for the rich and one for the poor. People sometimes have strong views on campaign contributions, but the law is clear that people who express strong views on campaign contributions are protected by the First Amendment. Our question in Commonwealth v. Augustine was whether there are going to be two First Amendments: one for the rich and one for the poor.

We see these cases as hugely important because they're about whether there are going to be two First Amendments: one for the rich and one for the poor. People sometimes have strong views on campaign contributions, but the law is clear that people who express strong views on campaign contributions are protected by the First Amendment. Our question in Commonwealth v. Augustine was whether there are going to be two First Amendments: one for the rich and one for the poor.
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