PruneYard Shopping Center v. Robins

| APPELLANT | APPELLEE |
|--|---|
| PruneYard Shopping Center | Robins |
| LOCATION | |
| <u>The Pruneyard</u> | |
| DOCKET NO. | DECIDED BY |
| 79-289 | <u>Burger Court (/courts?court=Burger Court)</u> |
| LOWER COURT | |
| Supreme Court of California | |
| CITATION | ADVOCATES |
| <u>447 US 74 (1980)</u> | <u>Elinor Hadley Stillman (advocates/elinor_hadley_stillman)</u> |
| (https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/447/74) | Argued the cause for the United States as amicus curiae urging affirmance |
| ARGUED Mar 18, 1980 | Philip L. Hammer (advocates/philip 1 hammer) Argued the cause for the appellee |
| , - | <u>Max L. Gillam, Jr. (advocates/max_l_gillam)</u> |
| | Argued the cause for the appellants |

PruneYard Shopping Center v. Robins | Oyez

Elinor Hadley Stillman (advocates/elinor h stillman)

for United States, as amicus curiae, by special leave of Court

Facts of the case

High school students seeking support for their opposition to a United Nations resolution against Zionism set up a table in PruneYard to distribute literature and solicit signatures for a petition. A security guard told them to leave since their actions violated the shopping center's regulations against "publicly expressive" activities.

Question

Did PruneYard's regulations violate the students' free speech rights?

Conclusion

Sort: by seniority by ideology

<< decision 1 of 2 >>

UNANIMOUS DECISION

MAJORITY OPINION BY WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST

William J. BreByncom, R. Whitearry A. Blackhillion H. Rehnq



Warren E. Bullgeter StewaThurgood MaeshislF. PowjedhijrPaul

PruneYard Shopping Center v. Robins | Oyez UNANIMOUS DECISION MAJORITY OPINION BY WILLIAM H. REHNQUIST William J. BreByncom, R. Whitearry A. Blackkrilliam H. Rehnq

rren E. Bullegetter StewaTthurgood MateshislF. PowjedhyhrPaul

Yes. Since the California Constitution protected "speech and petitioning, reasonably exercised, in shopping centers even when the shopping centers are privately owned," PruneYard could not prevent the students from soliciting on its property. The Court argued that it was within California's power to guarantee this expansive free speech right since it did not unreasonably intrude on the rights of private property owners.

Cite this page

APA Bluebook Chicago MLA

"PruneYard Shopping Center v. Robins." *Oyez*, https://www.oyez.org/cases/1979/79-289. Accessed 14 May. 2017.