

CAHILL GORDON & REINDEL LLP  
32 OLD SLIP  
NEW YORK, NY 10005

HELENE R. BANKS  
ANIRUDH BANSAL  
DAVID L. BARASH  
LANDIS C. BEST  
BRADLEY J. BONDI  
BROCKTON B. BOSSON  
JONATHAN BROWNSON \*  
JOYDEEP CHOUDHURI \*  
JAMES J. CLARK  
CHRISTOPHER W. CLEMENT  
LISA COLLIER  
AYANO K. CREED  
PRUE CRIDDLE ‡  
SEAN M. DAVIS  
STUART G. DOWNING  
ADAM M. DWORKIN  
ANASTASIA EFIMOVA  
JENNIFER B. EZRING  
HELENA S. FRANCESCHI  
JOAN MURTAGH FRANKEL  
JONATHAN J. FRANKEL

ARIEL GOLDMAN  
PATRICK GORDON  
JASON M. HALL  
STEPHEN HARPER  
WILLIAM M. HARTNETT  
NOLA B. HELLER  
CRAIG M. HOROWITZ  
DOUGLAS S. HOROWITZ  
TIMOTHY B. HOWELL  
DAVID G. JANUSZEWSKI  
ELAI KATZ  
JAKE KEAVENY  
BRIAN S. KELLEHER  
RICHARD KELLY  
CHÉRIE R. KISER †  
JOEL KURTZBERG  
TED B. LACEY  
MARC R. LASHBROOK  
ALIZA R. LEVINE  
JOEL H. LEVITIN  
GEOFFREY E. LIEBMANN

TELEPHONE: (212) 701-3000  
WWW.CAHILL.COM

1990 K STREET, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1181  
(202) 862-8900

CAHILL GORDON & REINDEL (UK) LLP  
20 FENCHURCH STREET  
LONDON EC3M 3BY  
+44 (0) 20 7920 9800

WRITER'S DIRECT NUMBER  
(212) 701-3120

BRIAN T. MARKLEY  
MEGHAN N. McDERMOTT  
WILLIAM J. MILLER  
EDWARD N. MOSS  
NOAH B. NEWITZ  
WARREN NEWTON §  
DAVID R. OWEN  
JOHN PAPACHRISTOS  
LUIS R. PENALVER  
KIMBERLY PETILLO-DÉCOSSARD  
SHEILA C. RAMESH  
MICHAEL W. REDDY  
OLEG REZZY  
THORN ROSENTHAL  
TAMMY L. ROY  
JONATHAN A. SCHAFFZIN  
DARREN SILVER  
JOSIAH M. SLOTNICK  
RICHARD A. STIEGLITZ JR.  
ROSS E. STURMAN  
SUSANNA M. SUH

ANTHONY K. TAMA  
JONATHAN D. THIER  
JOHN A. TRIPODORO  
GLENN J. WALDRIP, JR.  
HERBERT S. WASHER  
MICHAEL B. WEISS  
DAVID WISHENGRAD  
C. ANTHONY WOLFE  
COREY WRIGHT  
ELIZABETH M. YAHL  
JOSHUA M. ZELIG

\* ADMITTED AS A SOLICITOR IN  
ENGLAND AND WALES ONLY  
‡ ADMITTED AS A SOLICITOR IN  
WESTERN AUSTRALIA ONLY  
† ADMITTED IN DC ONLY  
§ ADMITTED AS AN ATTORNEY  
IN THE REPUBLIC OF SOUTH AFRICA  
ONLY

November 18, 2021

Re: *Project Veritas v. The New York Times Company, Maggie  
Astor, Tiffany Hsu, and John Does 1-5 (Index No.  
63921/2020)*

Dear Justices Lefkowitz and Wood:

We write on behalf of Defendant The New York Times Company (“The Times”) in the above-captioned action to inform the Court that we are in receipt of Plaintiff’s Motion for an Order to Show Cause (NYSCEF # 164-68). Plaintiff’s Motion and proposed Order to Show Cause seek the extraordinary remedy of a prior restraint—“the most serious and the least tolerable infringement on First Amendment rights.” *Nebraska Press Association v. Stuart*, 427 U.S. 539, 559 (1976). As the United States Supreme Court recognized nearly 100 years ago, the “chief purpose of the [First Amendment] guaranty [is] to prevent previous restraints upon publication.” *Near v. Minnesota ex rel. Olson*, 283 U.S. 697, 713 (1931). Prior restraints bear a “heavy presumption against . . . constitutional validity,” “may be imposed only in the most exceptional cases,” and can only be issued “upon a showing on the record that such expression will immediately and irreparably create public injury.” *Porco v. Lifetime Entertainment Services, LLC*, 116 A.D.3d 1264, 1266 (3d Dep’t 2014) (internal citations and quotation marks omitted) (reversing order enjoining the broadcast of a movie claimed to violate NY Civil Rights Law Sections 50/51 and finding the order to be an unconstitutional prior restraint).

Plaintiff's proposed Order to Show Cause requests, among other things, that the Court enter an order directing The Times to "refrain from further disseminating or publishing" information that Project Veritas asserts, without evidence, that The Times obtained improperly. Such an order is, on its face, the paradigmatic example of an unconstitutional prior restraint. *See, e.g., Alexander v. United States*, 509 U.S. 544, 550 (1993) ("Temporary restraining orders and permanent injunctions—i.e., court orders that actually forbid speech activities—are classic examples of prior restraints."); *Organization for a Better Austin v. Keefe*, 402 U. S. 415 (1971) (vacating order "enjoining petitioners from distributing leaflets anywhere in the town of Westchester, Illinois" as impermissible prior restraint); *Vance v. Universal Amusement Co.*, 445 U. S. 308, 311, 317 (1980) (per curiam) (striking down, on prior restraint grounds, Texas statute that authorized courts, upon a showing that obscene films had been shown in the past, to issue an injunction prohibiting future exhibition of films that had not yet been found to be obscene); *Porco*, 116 A.D.3d at 1266.

Before the imposition of such a draconian and disfavored restriction, The Times should have the opportunity to be heard. The Times therefore respectfully requests that the Court hold in abeyance Plaintiff's request to enter an Order to Show Cause in order to permit The Times to file a response in opposition to Plaintiff's request no later than November 24, 2021. As our forthcoming opposition will make clear, Plaintiff's request is factually and legally deficient. The request lacks merit and seeks relief that the Court cannot and must not grant.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Joel Kurtzberg  
Joel Kurtzberg

Hon. Joan B. Lefkowitz  
Hon. Charles D. Wood  
Supreme Court Justices, 9<sup>th</sup> JD  
Westchester County Courthouse  
111 Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard  
White Plains, New York 10601

VIA NYSCEF

Cc: All counsel of record (*via NYSCEF*)