



701 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004 202 434 7300 202 434 7400 fax www.mintz.com

Nathan Lewin

Direct dial 202 661 8740 nlewin@mintz.com

April 23, 2002

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS

Ms. Marcia Waldron, Clerk United States Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit United States Courthouse 601 Market Street, Room 21400 Philadelphia, PA 19106-1790

Re: Tenafly Eruv Association, Inc., et al. v. Borough of Tenafly, et al.

No. 01-3301

Dear Ms. Waldron:

Oral argument in the above case was heard on March 21, 2002, before a panel of Circuit Judges Nygaart, Roth and Ambro. This letter is being submitted pursuant to Rule 28(j) of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure to advise the Court of the following language in the majority opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States in *Ashcroft v. Free Speech Coalition*, No. 00-795, decided April 16, 2002, at p. 17:

The argument, in essence, is that protected speech may be banned as a means to ban unprotected speech. This analysis turns the First Amendment upside down.

The Government may not suppress lawful speech as the means to suppress unlawful speech. Protected speech does not become unprotected merely because it resembles the latter. The Constitution requires the reverse.

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY AND POPEO, P.C.

Ms. Marcia Waldron, Clerk Page 2

This language is relevant to the questions asked at oral argument concerning Tenafly's constitutional authority to prohibit the eruv as a means of avoiding an Establishment Clause violation.

Respectfully submitted,

Nathan Lewin Attorney for Appellants Chaim Book, Yosifa Book and Stephen Brenner

NL:mdd

cc: Bruce S. Rosen, Esq. (all via facsimile)
Walter A. Lesnevich, Esq.
Noah R. Feldman, Esq.
Richard D. Shapiro, Esq.
Robert G. Sugarman, Esq.
Ronald K. Chen, Esq.
Nathan J. Diament, Esq.
Kevin J. Hasson, Esq.
David Zwiebel, Esq.

WDC 313150v1