
**United States
Constitution**

An ESC shall take no action abridging the freedom of speech or the right of the people to petition the board for redress of grievances. *U.S. Const. Amend. I, XIV*

The board may confine its meetings to specified subject matter and may hold nonpublic sessions to transact business, but when the board sits in public meetings to conduct public business and hear the views of citizens, it may not discriminate between speakers on the basis of the content of their speech or the message it conveys. *Rosenberger v. Rector & Visitors of Univ. of Virginia*, 515 U.S. 819, 828 (1995); *City of Madison v. Wis. Emp. Rel. Comm'n*, 429 U.S. 167, 176 (1976); *Pickering v. Bd. of Educ.*, 391 U.S. 563, 568 (1968)

A board may create a limited public forum for the purpose of hearing comments from the public so long as:

1. The board does not discriminate against speech on the basis of viewpoint;
2. Any restrictions are reasonable in light of the purpose served by the forum; and
3. The board provides alternative paths for expressing categories of protected speech that are excluded from the forum.

Fairchild v. Liberty Indep. Sch. Dist., 597 F.3d 747 (5th Cir. 2010)

Public Comment

As long as the requirements of the Open Meetings Act are satisfied and the right of citizens to apply to the board for redress of their grievances is not abridged, the board need not provide a public forum for every citizen wishing to express an opinion on a matter. Reasonable restraints on the number, length, and frequency of presentations are permissible. The board may limit the number of persons it will hear on a particular subject and the frequency with which they may appear, so long as the regulation does not abridge constitutionally guaranteed rights of freedom of speech and to petition, nor unfairly discriminate among views seeking expression. *Atty. Gen. Op. H-188* (1973)

Response to
Complaints

There is no requirement that the board negotiate or even respond to complaints. However, the board must stop, look, and listen and must consider the petition, address, or remonstrance. *Prof'l Ass'n of College Educators v. El Paso County Comty. [College] Dist.*, 678 S.W.2d 94 (Tex. App.—El Paso 1984, writ ref'd n.r.e.)

Disruption

It is a criminal offense for a person, with intent to prevent or disrupt a lawful meeting, to substantially obstruct or interfere with the ordinary conduct of a meeting by physical action or verbal utterance

and thereby curtail the exercise of others' First Amendment rights.
*Penal Code 42.05; Morehead v. State, 807 S.W. 2d 577 (Tex. Cr.
App. 1991)*