

ORAL ARGUMENT NOT YET SCHEDULED

Nos. 15-7016, -7019

**In the United States Court of Appeals
for the District of Columbia Circuit**

Rene Arturo Lopez; Aquilla A.D. Turner; Mohammed Barakatullah Abdussalaam;
Bayenah Nur,
Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

Council on American-Islamic Relations Action Network, Inc.,
Defendant-Appellee.

Iftikhar Saiyed,
Plaintiff-Appellant,

Mohammed Barakatullah Abdussalaam, 1:10-cv-00023-PLF; Rene Arturo Lopez,
1:10-cv-00023-PLF; Bayenah Nur, 1:10-cv-00023-PLF; Aquilla A.D. Turner,
1:10-cv-00023-PLF,
Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

Council on American-Islamic Relations Action Network, Inc.,
Defendant-Appellee.

**On Appeals from the United States District Court
for the District of Columbia**

APPELLANTS' BRIEF

ROBERT JOSEPH MUISE, ESQ.
AMERICAN FREEDOM LAW CENTER
P.O. BOX 131098
ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48113
(734) 635-3756

DAVID YERUSHALMI, ESQ.
LAW OFFICES OF DAVID YERUSHALMI, P.C.
1901 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW, SUITE 201
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006
(646) 262-0500

Attorneys for Plaintiffs-Appellants

CERTIFICATE AS TO PARTIES, RULINGS, AND RELATED CASES

Plaintiffs-Appellants Rene Arturo Lopez, Aquilla A. D. Turner, Mohammed Barakatullah Abdussalaam, Bayenah Nur (No. 15-7016), and Iftikhar Saiyed (No. 15-7019) hereby submit the following certificate pursuant to Circuit Rules 12 and 28(a)(1):

1. Parties and Amici.

The following list includes all parties, intervenors, and amici who have appeared before the district court, and all persons who are parties, intervenors, or amici in this court:

Plaintiffs-Appellants: Rene Arturo Lopez, Aquilla A.D. Turner, Mohammed Barakatullah Abdussalaam, Bayenah Nur, and Iftikhar Saiyed;

Defendant-Appellee: Council on American-Islamic Relations Action Network, Inc.

2. Rulings Under Review.

Plaintiffs-Appellants are appealing from the order and supporting memorandum opinion of U.S. District Court Judge Paul L. Friedman entered on January 29, 2015, granting Defendant-Appellee's motion for summary judgment and denying Plaintiffs-Appellants' Motion for partial summary judgment. The order and supporting memorandum opinion appear on the district court's docket at

entries 92 and 93, respectively, in the lead case (1:10-cv-00022) below and at 97 and 98, respectively, in the member case (1:10-cv-00023) below.

3. Related Cases.

The instant consolidated cases were never previously before this Court or any other court, other than the district court from which this case has been appealed. Plaintiffs-Appellants are not aware of any related cases pending at the appellate court level. A case involving the same parties as in the lead case (No. 15-7016) and the same basic facts was previously before this Court, but that case involved issues arising under 18 U.S.C. § 1962(d). *Lopez v. CAIR*, Appeal No. 09-7129, appealing from *Lopez v. CAIR*, 657 F. Supp. 2d 104, 114-15 (D.D.C. 2009). These consolidated cases do not involve issues related to 18 U.S.C. § 1962(d).

Respectfully submitted,

LAW OFFICES OF DAVID YERUSHALMI, P.C.

/s/ David Yerushalmi

David Yerushalmi, Esq. (D.C. Bar No. 978179)
1901 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 201
Washington, D.C. 20001
dyerushalmi@americanfreedomlawcenter.org
Tel: (646) 262-0500

/s/ Robert J. Muise

Robert J. Muise, Esq.
P.O. Box 131098
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48113
Tel: (734) 635-3756
rmuise@americanfreedomlawcenter.org

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES	iii
GLOSSARY OF TERMS	v
INTRODUCTION	1
JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT	3
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUES.....	4
STATEMENT OF PERTINENT AUTHORITIES	5
STATEMENT OF THE CASE.....	5
A. Procedural History	5
B. Statement of Facts.....	7
1. Background Facts	7
2. The Record Provides Sufficient Evidence to Support a Reasonable Inference that Days Was CAIR’s Agent	9
SUMMARY OF THE ARGUMENT	13
STANDARD OF REVIEW	14
ARGUMENT	15
I. Introductory Caveats.....	15
II. The Record Establishes a Genuine Issue of Material Fact Whether Days Was CAIR’s Agent	19
A. The District Court’s Analysis of the Evidence Was Flawed and Created an Improper Bias Against Plaintiffs’ Case	19

B. The Law of Agency20

C. The Evidence for a CAIR-Days Agency22

 1. Mutual Consent22

 2. Control28

III. Conclusion34

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....35

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE36

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	Page
<i>*Acordia of Va. Ins. Agency v. Genito Glenn, L.P.</i> , 263 Va. 377, 560 S.E.2d 246 (Va. 2002)	26
<i>Allen Realty Corp. v. Holbert</i> , 227 Va. 441, 318 S.E.2d 592 (Va. 1984)	17
<i>Arrington v. United States</i> , 473 F.3d 329 (D.C. Cir. 2006).....	14, 15
<i>Bocek v. JGA Assocs., LLC</i> , No. 14-1208, 2015 U.S. App. LEXIS 10262 (4th Cir. June 18, 2015).....	28
<i>Murphy v. Holiday Inns, Inc.</i> , 216 Va. 490, 219 S.E.2d 874 (VA. 1975)	21
<i>Perry v. Scruggs</i> , 17 Fed. Appx. 81 (4th Cir. 2001)	21, 28
<i>Raney v. Barnes Lumber Corp.</i> , 195 Va. 956, 81 S.E.2d 578 (Va. 1954)	21
<i>Reistroffer v. Person</i> , 247 Va. 45, 379 S.E.2d 450 (Va. 1994)	20
<i>Royal Indem. Co. v. Hook</i> , 155 Va. 956, 157 S.E. 414 (Va. 1931)	28
<i>Whitfield v. Whittaker Mem'l Hosp.</i> , 210 Va. 176, 169 S.E.2d 563 (Va. 1969)	21

* Authorities on which we chiefly rely are marked with asterisks.

Statutes

28 U.S.C. § 12914

28 U.S.C. § 1332.....4

Rule

Fed. R. Civ. P. 56..... 2, 3, 6, 7

Other Authorities

Restatement (Second) of Agency (1958)..... 16, 30

Restatement (Second) of Torts (1965)..... 16

GLOSSARY OF TERMS

CAIR	Council on American-Islamic Relations Action Network, Inc.
CAIR-VA	CAIR chapter in Herndon, Virginia

INTRODUCTION

This is a lawsuit about a Washington, D.C.-based national civil rights organization that touted publicly the legal heroics of one of its lawyers on behalf of the organization's clients when it was useful to do so, only to distance itself and disclaim any legal responsibility when the lawyer was exposed as a fake and a fraud, a man now deceased, who was neither a hero nor an attorney. According to the organization's own promotional material, the fraudster occupied the position of Resident Attorney and Civil Rights Manager of a nearby chapter office and represented dozens if not hundreds of the organization's clients. In reality, however, the man was not a lawyer and could not have appeared in court or acted as legal counsel to anyone.

Indeed, as victims piled up and demanded compensation in February 2008, the organization learned not only that the fraudster had failed to provide legal representation to the organization's clients, but also that he had charged many of the "pro bono" clients legal fees and expenses in the name of the organization. Rather than deal with the havoc responsibly, the organization closed down the chapter office, carted off all of the legal files of the client-victims to its D.C. headquarters without making any effort to contact the victimized clients, paid off a few of the early claimants who discovered the fraud on their own, but generally denied any liability by taking the position that the organization had no

The balance of the brief has been eliminated for this sample. For a copy of the complete brief please call our office. Thank you.