No.	

# In The Supreme Court of the United States

**-----**

VANESSA LEGGETT,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Respondent.

On Petition For Writ Of Certiorari
To The United States Court Of Appeals
For The Fifth Circuit

PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

George Michael DeGeurin Foreman, DeGeurin, Nugent & Gerger 300 Main St. Houston, Texas 77002 (713) 655-9000

Counsel of Record for Petitioner

#### **QUESTIONS PRESENTED**

I.

Did the Court of Appeals err in holding that the petitioner was not protected by the qualified First Amendment privilege enjoyed by journalists?

II.

Was the Court of Appeals' determination that the contemnor had not made an adequate showing to invoke her Fifth Amendment privilege in conflict with the relevant decisions of this Court?

#### LIST OF ALL PARTIES

- 1. Vanessa Leggett, Defendant-Petitioner.
- 2. The United States of America, Plaintiff-Respondent.

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	i
LIST OF ALL PARTIES	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	v
LOWER COURT'S OPINION	1
BASIS FOR JURISDICTION	1
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS RELIED UPON	2
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	3
REASONS FOR REVIEW	7
REASONS FOR REVIEW OF QUESTION ONE	7
I. Did the Court of Appeals err in holding that the petitioner was not protected by the qualific First Amendment privilege for journalists?	ed
A. Do journalists have a qualified First Amen ment privilege in criminal cases that requi a court to conduct a balancing of interests a case by case basis?	re on
B. Has the Court of Appeals in the Fifth Circuentered a decision regarding application of journalist's qualified First Amendment Privlege that is in conflict with the decisions other United States Court of Appeals on the same matter?	ia vi- of he
C. Is <i>Branzburg</i> limited merely to protecting against harassment and oppression of new men without a balancing of the interests?	s-

#### TABLE OF CONTENTS - Continued Page REASONS FOR REVIEW OF QUESTION TWO..... 26 Was the Court of Appeals determination that the contemnor had not made an adequate showing to invoke her Fifth Amendment privilege in conflict with the relevant decisions of this Court?..... 26 CONCLUSION ..... 30 APPENDIX 1. Original Opinion of the Court of Appeals, August 17, 2001......App. 1 District Court's Contempt Order, July 20, 2. Order Denying En Banc Consideration, 3.

### TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page
Cases
Baker v. F & F Investment, 470 F.2d 778 (2d Cir. 1972), cert. denied, 411 U.S. 966 (1973)14
Branzburg v. Hayes, 408 U.S. 665 (1972) passim
Bruno & Sullivan, Inc. v. Globe Newspaper Corp., 633 F.2d 583 (1st Cir. 1980)
Bursey v. United States, 466 F.2d 1059 (9th Cir. 1972)
Cervantes v. Time, Inc., 464 F.2d 986 (8th Cir. 1972), cert. denied, 409 U.S. 1125 (1973)
Clyburn v. New World Communications, Inc., 903 F.2d 29 (D.C. Cir. 1990)11
Counselman v. Hitchcock, 142 U.S. 547 (1892) 26
Farr v. Pitchess, 522 F.2d 464 (9th Cir. 1975), cert. denied, 427 U.S. 912 (1976)
Fisher v. United States, 425 U.S. 391 (1976) 26
Gonzales v. National Broadcasting Co., 194 F.3d 29 (2d Cir. 1999)
Grunewald v. United States, 353 U.S. 391 (1957) 28
In re Grand Jury 95-1, 27 Med. L.Rptr. 1833 (D.D.C. Dec. 27, 1996)
In re Grand Jury Proceedings (Scarce), 5 F.3d 397 (9th Cir. 1993), cert. denied, 510 U.S. 1041 (1994) 19
In re Grand Jury Subpoena (Kent), 646 F.2d 963 (5th Cir. 1981)
In re Lewis, 501 F.2d 418 (9th Cir. 1974), cert. denied, 420 U.S. 913 (1975)

Page
In re Lewis, 517 F.2d 236 (9th Cir. 1975)
In re Shain, 978 F.2d 850 (4th Cir. 1992)
In re Williams, 766 F.Supp. 358 (W.D. Pa. 1991), aff'd by equally divided court, 963 F.2d 567 (3d Cir. 1992) (en banc)
LaRouche v. National Broadcasting Co., 780 F.2d 1134 (4th Cir. 1986)10, 11
Lovell v. City of Griffin, Ga., 303 U.S. 444 (1938) 23
Miller v. Transamerican Press, Inc., 621 F.2d 721 (5th Cir.), modified on rehearing, 628 F.2d 932 (1980), cert. denied, 450 U.S. 1041 (1981)
Near v. Minnesota, 283 U.S. 697 (1931)24
New York Times Co. v. United States, 403 U.S. 713 (1971)
Ohio v. Reiner, 532 U.S. 17, 121 S.Ct. 1252 (2001) 28
Reporter's Committee for Freedom of the Press v. American Tel. & Tel. Co., 593 F.2d 1030 (D.C. Cir. 1978), cert. denied, 440 U.S. 949 (1979)
Shoen v. Shoen, 5 F.3d 1289 (9th Cir. 1993)10, 11
Silkwood v. Kerr-McGee Corp., 563 F.2d 433 (10th         Cir. 1977)
Storer Communications, Inc. v. Giovan, 810 F.2d 580           (6th Cir. 1987)
United States v. Blanton, 534 F.Supp. 295 (S.D.Fla. 1982), aff'd, 730 F.2d 1425 (11th Cir. 1984)20

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES - Continued Page United States v. Burke, 700 F.2d 70 (2nd Cir. 1982), cert. denied, 464 U.S. 816 (1983) . . . . . . 10, 11, 14, 15 United States v. Caporale, 806 F.2d 1487 (11th Cir. 1986), cert. denied, 483 U.S. 1021 (1987).................... 20 United States v. Criden, 633 F.2d 346 (3d Cir. 1980) . . . . 16 United States v. Cuthbertson, 630 F.2d 139 (3d Cir. 1980), cert. denied, 449 U.S. 1126 (1981).....10, 11, 15 United States v. Cuthbertson, 651 F.2d 189 (3d Cir.), United States v. Cutler, 6 F.3d 67 (2d Cir. 1993) . . . . . 15 United States v. Doe, 465 U.S. 605 (1984).................... 27 United States v. Hubbard, 493 F.Supp. 202 (D.D.C. United States v. LaRouche Campaign, 841 F.2d 1176 United States v. Lloyd, 71 F.3d 1256 (7th Cir. 1995),

United States v. Mandujano, 425 U.S. 564 (1976) ..... 26

Zerilli v. Smith, 656 F.2d 705 (D.C. Cir. 1981) ....... 11

United States v. Smith, 135 F.3d 963 (5th Cir.

United States v. Whittington, 786 F.2d 644 (5th Cir.

#### viii

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES - Continued Page CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS U.S. CONST. amend. I..... passim U.S. CONST. amend. V ...... passim STATUTES AND RULES 28 C.F.R. § 50.10...... 5, 13, 25, 26 18 U.S.C. § 2512......6, 29 28 U.S.C. § 1254...... 1 28 U.S.C. § 1826...... 3 Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 17(c).....9, 15, 22 Federal Bureau of Prisons, P.S. 1480.05 § 540.60(3)(d)......23 U.S. Supreme Court Rule 12 ...... 1