

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE  
STATE OF MONTANA**Case No. DA 21-0605**

On Appeal from the Montana First Judicial District Court, Lewis and Clark County  
No. BDV 2021-598, the Honorable Michael McMahon, Presiding

---

**BOARD OF REGENTS OF HIGHER EDUCATION OF THE STATE OF  
MONTANA,**

Petitioner,

vs.

**THE STATE OF MONTANA, BY AND THROUGH AUSTIN KNUDSEN, IN  
HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE  
OF MONTANA,**

Respondent.

---

***AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF OF 81 LEGISLATORS***

---

Greg Overstreet  
State Bar No. 66904853  
Overstreet Law Group  
300 Main Street, Suite 203  
Stevensville, Montana 59870  
Telephone: (406) 209-8592  
greg@overstreetlawgroup.com  
*Attorney for Amici 81 Legislators*

David Dewhirst  
Solicitor General  
Office of Montana Attorney General  
Austin Knudsen  
P.O. Box 201401  
Helena, MT 59620-1401  
*Attorneys for Appellants*

Martha Sheehy  
Sheehy Law Firm  
P.O. Box 584  
Billings, MT 59103-0584

Kyle A. Gray  
Brianna C. McClafferty  
Emily J. Cross  
Holland & Hart LLP  
P.O. Box 639  
Billings MT 59103

Ali Bovingdon  
MUS Chief Legal Counsel  
Office of Comm'r of Higher Education  
Helena, MT 59620-3201  
*Attorneys for Appellees*

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT .....2

II. IDENTITY OF AMICI .....2

III. ARGUMENT .....2

    A. Legislator Amici Wholeheartedly Agree with the Arguments in Appellant’s Opening Brief .....7

    B. The Campus Carry Provisions of HB 102 Were Specifically Passed to Counter the Board’s Ban on Concealed Carry .....7

    C. By Enjoining the Enforcement of Section 5 of HB 102, the District Court’s Ruling Effectively Creates a “Constitution-Free” Zone on MUS Campuses .....7

    D. The Board Willingly Follows Hundreds of Laws of General Applicability .....8

    E. The Board Follows a Multitude of Statutes That Specifically Apply to It .....10

    F. The Board’s Argument That It Can Pick and Choose Which State Statutes It Feels Like Following Had Logical Flaws .....11

        1. If the Board Can Independently Dictate the Laws on Campuses, But Does Not Enact Its Own Law on a Topic, Is There No Law on That Topic on Campus Grounds? .....12

        2. If a Wholly Autonomous Board Approves of a State Statute, Must It Formally Declare Its Agreement With the Hundreds of Statutes It Is Currently Following? .....12

    G. The Board Picked One Law to Ignore, While Following Hundreds of Others, for Purely Political, Not Constitutional Reasons .....13

IV. CONCLUSION .....15

CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE .....17

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

### Cases

<i>Bd. of Regents v. Judge</i> , 168 Mont. 433, 543 P.2d 1323 (1975) .....	2, 11, 13
<i>Powder River Cnty. v. State</i> , 2002 MT 259, 312 Mont. 198, 60 P.3d 357 .....	15

### Montana State Constitution

Article II, §§ 4 - 12 .....	7
Article V, § 1 .....	14
Article X, § 9 .....	2, 12, 13, 15

### Montana Code Annotated

Title 2, Chapter 3 .....	8
Title 2, Chapter 4.....	8
Title 2, Chapter 6 .....	8
Title 2, Chapter 7, Part 5 .....	8
Title 2, Chapter 18 .....	9, 12
Title 16 .....	9
Title 17, Chapter 6 .....	9
Title 17, Chapter 8 .....	9
Title 18 .....	9
Title 19 .....	9
Title 20, Chapter 25 .....	11, 14
Title 30 .....	9
Title 44 .....	9
Title 45 .....	9
Title 46 .....	9
Title 49 .....	9

Title 50, Chapter 4 .....	9
Title 50, Chapter 50 .....	9
Title 50, Chapter 60 .....	9
Title 50, Chapter 61 .....	10
Title 50, Chapter 71 .....	10
Title 50, Chapter 77 .....	10
Title 61 .....	10
Title 75 .....	10
Title 76 .....	10
Title 77 .....	10
Mont. Code Ann. § 2-15-1505 .....	9
Mont. Code Ann. § 20-1-202 .....	10
Mont. Code Ann. § 20-1-225 .....	10, 14
Mont. Code Ann. § 20-1-501 .....	10
Mont. Code Ann. § 20-1-604 .....	10, 13
Mont. Code Ann. § 20-2-111 .....	11
Mont. Code Ann. § 20-2-112 .....	11, 14
Mont. Code Ann. § 20-32-102(1)(c) .....	11
Mont. Code Ann. § 50-3-102(1)(a) .....	11

**Montana Session Laws**

HB 102, 67th Leg. ....	<i>passim</i>
HB 102, 67th Leg. § 5.....	7, 8

## **I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

This amicus curiae brief makes two main points. First, the District Court’s ruling allows “constitution-free” zones on Montana University System (“MUS”) campuses. Second, MONT. CONST. art. X, § 9, which has been interpreted to give the Board of Regents (“Board”) authority over the “academic, administrative and financial matters of substantial importance to the [university] system[,]” *Bd. of Regents v. Judge*, 168 Mont. 433, 454, 543 P.2d 1323, 1333 (1975), does not allow the Board to pick and choose which laws on other topics it will follow. Yet that is exactly what it is doing with HB 102. This will be demonstrated by the description in this brief of the statutes the Board readily follows. There is just one law – just one – the Board refuses to follow: HB 102. The multitude of statutes the Board routinely follows belies the notion implied by the District Court’s ruling that the Board can ignore a statute with which the Board disagrees.

## **II. IDENTITY OF AMICI CURIAE**

This brief is being filed on behalf of:

- Rep. Fred Anderson (HD 20)
- Sen. Duane Ankey (SD 20)
- Sen. Dan Bartel (SD 15)
- Rep. Becky Beard (HD 80)

- Rep. David Bedey (HD 86)
- Rep. Seth Berglee (HD 58)
- Rep. Marta Bertoglio (HD 75)
- Rep. Michele Binkley (HD 85)
- Sen. Mark Blasdel (SD 4)
- Sen. Kenneth Bogner (SD 19)
- Rep. Larry Brewster (HD 44)
- Sen. Bob Brown (SD 7)
- Rep. Ed Buttrey (HD 21)
- Rep. Jennifer Carlson (HD 69)
- Sen. Mike Cuffee (SD 1)
- Rep. Julie Dooling (HD 70)
- Rep. Neil Duram (HD 2)
- Sen. Jason Ellsworth (SD 43)
- Rep. Paul Fielder (HD 13)
- Rep. Ross Fitzgerald (HD 17)
- Rep. Frank Fleming (HD 51)
- Rep. John Fuller (HD 8)
- Rep. Steven Galloway (HD 24)

- Rep. Wylie Galt (HD 30)
- Rep. Frank Garner (HD 7)
- Rep. Jane Gillette (HD 64)
- Rep. Steve Gist (HD 25)
- Sen. Carl Glimm (SD 2)
- Rep. Steve Gunderson (HD 1)
- Sen. Greg Hertz (SD 6)
- Rep. Ed Hill (HD 28)
- Sen. Steve Hinebaugh (SD 18)
- Rep. Jedediah Hinkle (HD 67)
- Rep. Caleb Hinkle (HD 68)
- Rep. Kenneth Holmlund (HD 38)
- Rep. Mike Hopkins (HD 92)
- Sen. David Howard (SD 29)
- Rep. Llew Jones (HD 18)
- Sen. Doug Kary (SD 22)
- Rep. Josh Kassmier (HD 27)
- Sen. Bob Keenan (SD 5)
- Rep. Scot Kerns (HD 23)

- Rep. Rhonda Knudsen (HD 34)
- Rep. Casey Knudsen (HD 33)
- Rep. Dennis Lenz (HD 53)
- Rep. Brandon Ler (HD 35)
- Rep. Denley Loge (HD 14)
- Rep. Marty Malone (HD 59)
- Sen. Theresa Manzella (SD 44)
- Sen. Tom McGillvary (SD 23)
- Rep. Wendy McKamey (HD 19)
- Rep. Braxton Mitchell (HD 3)
- Rep. Terry Monroe (HD 54)
- Rep. Mark Noland (HD 10)
- Rep. Bob Phalen (HD 36)
- Rep. Joe Read (HD 93)
- Sen. Keith Regier (SD 3)
- Rep. Matt Regier (HD 4)
- Rep. Amy Regier (HD 6)
- Rep. Linda Reksten (HD 12)
- Rep. Vince Ricci (HD 55)



- Sen. Dan Salomon (SD 47)
- Rep. Jerry Schillinger (HD 37)
- Rep. Kerri Seekins-Crowe (HD 43)
- Rep. Lola Sheldon-Galloway (HD 22)
- Rep. Derek Skees (HD 11)
- Sen. Cary Smith (SD 27)
- Rep. Mallerie Stromswold (HD 50)
- Rep. Jeremy Trebas (HD 26)
- Rep. Brad Tschida (HD 97)
- Rep. Barry Usher (HD 40)
- Sen. Gordon Vance (SD 34)
- Rep. Sue Vinton (HD 56)
- Rep. Kathy Whitman (HD 96)
- Rep. Katie Zolnikov (HD 45)

Hereinafter “Legislator Amici.”

### III. ARGUMENT

#### **A. Legislator Amici Wholeheartedly Agree with the Arguments in Appellant’s Opening Brief**

In the interest of judicial economy – and in recognition of the fact that courts disfavor an amicus repeating the arguments of a party – Legislator Amici note that they all agree with the arguments in Appellant’s Opening Brief. They note they were involved in the process of enacting HB 102 and that all of them voted for the bill.

#### **B. The Campus Carry Provisions of HB 102 Were Specifically Passed to Counter the Board’s Ban on Concealed Carry**

Legislator Amici know why the campus carry provisions of HB 102 were passed. They were to enforce Montanans’ constitutional right to lawfully carry firearms on MUS campuses.

#### **C. By Enjoining the Enforcement of Section 5 of HB 102, the District Court’s Ruling Effectively Creates a “Constitution-Free” Zone on MUS Campuses**

Section 5 of HB 102 provides that MUS is “prohibited from enforcing or coercing compliance with any rule or regulation that restricts the rights of the people ... reserved in Article II, sections 4 through 12[.]” These are the rights of individual dignity, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, expression, and press, the right of participation in government, the right to know,

the right of privacy, the right against unreasonable searches and seizures, and the right to bear arms.

However, the District Court shockingly enjoined the enforcement of Section 5 of HB 102. *See* Summary Judgment Order at 28 (contained in Appellant’s Opening Brief, Appendix E 028). That is, the District Court prevented the prohibition on the Board restricting the rights of individual dignity, freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, expression, and press, the right of participation in government, the right to know, the right of privacy, the right against unreasonable searches and seizures, and the right to bear arms. Stated another way, the District Court allowed the Board to restrict these rights. This is allowing a “constitution-free” zone on MUS campuses. This Court must reverse the District Court.

**D. The Board Willingly Follows Hundreds of Laws of General Applicability**

To show that the Board does not have wide-ranging autonomy to declare itself exempt from state statutes, it is instructive to note the hundreds of state statutes of general applicability the Board routinely follows:

- Title 2, Chapter 3 (open meetings)
- Title 2, Chapter 4 (Administrative Procedure Act)
- Title 2, Chapter 6 (public records)

- Title 2, Chapter 7, Part 5 (state audits)
- Mont. Code Ann. § 2-15-1505 (executive branch officers – Board of Regents)
- Title 2, Chapter 18 (state employees)
- Title 16 (regulation of alcohol, tobacco, and marijuana)
- Title 17, Chapter 6 (state deposits and investments)
- Title 17, Chapter 8 (disbursements and expenditures of state funds)
- Title 18 (public contracts)
- Title 19 (public retirement systems)
- Title 30 (labor)
- Title 44 (law enforcement (applicable to campus police departments))
- Title 45 (crimes (enforced by campus police departments))
- Title 46 (criminal procedure (applicable to criminal investigations by campus police departments and resulting prosecutions))
- Title 49 (anti-discrimination laws)
- Title 50, Chapter 4 (smoking in public places)
- Title 50, Chapter 50 (regulation of retail food establishments (applicable to MUS food service facilities))

- Title 50, Chapter 60 (building construction standards (applicable to MUS buildings))
- Title 50, Chapter 61 (fire safety in public buildings)
- Title 50, Chapter 71 (occupational safety and health)
- Title 50, Chapter 77 (construction site health and safety (applicable to MUS construction projects))
- Title 61 (motor vehicles (applicable to vehicles on MUS campuses))
- Title 75 (environmental protection)
- Title 76 (land use)
- Title 77 (state lands)

**E. The Board Follows a Multitude of Statutes That Specifically Apply to It**

Except when it comes to one law – HB 102 – the Board routinely follows the many statutes that specifically apply to it and MUS. They include:

- Mont. Code Ann. § 20-1-202 (Board of Regents oaths of office)
- Mont. Code Ann. § 20-1-225 (no financial aid unless student complies with Selective Service requirements)
- Mont. Code Ann. § 20-1-501 (recognition of native American cultural heritage)

- Mont. Code Ann. § 20-1-604 (prohibiting denial of admission based on military reserve or National Guard status)
- Mont. Code Ann. § 20-2-111 (Board of Regents may select a presiding officer)
- Mont. Code Ann. § 20-2-112 (Board of Regents meetings)
- Mont. Code Ann. § 20-32-102(1)(c) (Montana Educational Telecommunications Network)
- Title 20, Chapter 25 (statutes governing MUS)
- Mont. Code Ann. § 50-3-102(1)(a) (annual fire inspections of MUS facilities)

**F. The Board’s Argument That It Can Pick and Choose Which State Statutes It Feels Like Following Has Logical Flaws**

With the exception of the Board’s narrow autonomy over “academic, administrative and financial matters of substantial importance to the [university] system,” *Judge*, 168 Mont. at 454, 543 P.2d at 1333, the Board cannot have unbridled autonomy to decide which statutes it will follow. Allowing it to do so, as the District Court did, would lead to two logical problems. And as Legislator Amici can attest, avoiding these two logical problems is one of the reasons the statutory scheme of the law cannot be what the District Court decided.

**1. If the Board Can Independently Dictate the Laws on MUS Campuses, But Does Not Enact Its Own Law on a Topic, Is There No Law on That Topic on Campus Grounds?**

If the usual rule that state statutes apply within the territory of the state is discarded, the question arises about the effect of a wholly autonomous body not enacting a law on a topic. While the Board has enacted its own law on concealed carry via its Policy 1006, it has not enacted its own laws on any of the hundreds of other state statutes applicable to it. Just HB 102.

Take, for example, motor vehicle laws. If the Board really can choose to ignore state motor vehicle laws on MUS campuses, but does not pass its own motor vehicle laws, what are the applicable motor vehicle laws? There must be some law on a topic such as this, but allowing the Board to dictate its own laws, but failing to enact its own law on a topic, creates a legal vacuum where no law governs that topic. MONT. CONST. art. X, § 9 cannot be interpreted to create legal vacuums on hundreds of topics.

**2. If a Wholly Autonomous Board Approves of a State Statute, Must It Formally Declare Its Agreement With the Hundreds of Statutes It Is Currently Following?**

A person must be able to know what the law is on a MUS campus. If the Board agrees with a state statute – for example, Title 2, Chapter 18 on state employees – a person would not know that this state law applies on MUS campuses unless the Board formally adopted that law. Needless to say, the Board

does not provide a list of the hundreds of state laws it agrees with – it just follows them because they are state laws.

Except for one.

**G. The Board Picked One Law to Ignore, While Following Hundreds of Others, For Purely Political, Not Constitutional Reasons**

What explains the Board’s selection of HB 102 to ignore when it routinely complies with all other applicable statutes? While it is impossible to know the exact mindset of each member of the Board, it seems obvious that the hot-button political issue of firearms is why the Board chose HB 102 as the one statute to attempt to ignore. A further inference is that protecting its limited MONT. CONST. art. X, § 9 autonomy to determine “academic, administrative and financial matters of substantial importance to the [university] system[,]” *Judge*, 168 Mont. at 454, 543 P.2d at 1333, is not the reason for the Board’s attempt to ignore a statute. If “academic, administrative and financial matters of substantial importance to the [university system]” were the driving force when the Board was deciding which statutes it would follow and which it would ignore, one would expect the Board to select statutes that actually arguably interfere with MUS’s operations. A statute interfering with MUS’s academic matters would be Mont. Code Ann. § 20-1-604, which prohibits MUS from denying admission to a prospective student based on military reserve or National Guard status – yet, the Board follows this statute. A



statute arguably interfering with MUS's administrative matters would be Mont. Code Ann. § 20-2-112, which regulates Board meetings and the dozens of other statutes in Title 20, Chapter 5 that govern numerous aspects of MUS's operations – all of which the Board willingly follows. Finally, a statute arguably interfering with MUS's financial matters is Mont. Code Ann. § 20-1-225, which prohibits financial aid to a student who does not comply with Selective Service requirements – another statute the Board seems to routinely follow.

What is different between HB 102 and these other statutes affecting MUS's "academic, administrative and financial" affairs? The answer is obvious: HB 102 involves firearms – and on this topic, the Board is willing to break its apparently otherwise perfect track record of following state statutes.

What is also obvious is that the Board is trying to accomplish via the judicial branch what it could not accomplish via the legislative branch. The Board was heavily involved in the process of passing HB 102. Yet it didn't get what it wanted in the final version of the bill. So now it is attempting to get what it wants from this Court. That is not how it works. The legislative power squarely belongs to the Legislature. *See* MONT. CONST. art. V, § 1 ("The legislative power is vested in a legislature consisting of a senate and a house of representatives.").

The notion that the Board is totally autonomous from state laws enacted by one branch of state government (the Legislature) leads to a logical and inescapable corollary: the Board must then also be totally autonomous from the decisions of the judicial branch. This would allow the Board to only abide with judicial opinions with which it agrees. If the legislative branch has no power over the Board, then neither does the judicial branch.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Allowing the District Court’s ruling to stand would create “constitution-free” zones on MUS campuses. The Board had obvious political motives when it singled out HB 102 as the one statute – out of several hundred – it decided not to follow. It did not file this lawsuit to defend its Article X, § 9 powers over “academic, administrative and financial” matters significantly affecting the university system. If defending its autonomy over these limited topics were the Board’s motivation, it would have picked a statute having to do with these topics instead of HB 102, which does not.

The Board has the burden of proving “beyond a reasonable doubt” that HB 102 violates MONT. CONST. art. X, § 9. *Powder River Cnty. v. State*, 2002 MT 259, ¶ 73, 312 Mont. 198, 60 P.3d 357. It cannot, which means the District Court’s decision must be reversed.

Respectfully Submitted,  
**OVERSTREET LAW GROUP**

By: /s/ Greg Overstreet  
Greg Overstreet  
Attorney for Amici Curiae 81 Legislators

## CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to Mont. R. App. P. 11, I certify that this amicus curiae brief is printed with a proportionately spaced Times New Roman text typeface of 14 points, is double-spaced (except for footnotes and block quotes), and the word count calculated by Microsoft Word is 2996 (excluding the certificates).

/s/ Greg Overstreet  
Greg Overstreet

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 28th day of February 2022, I served upon the following a true and correct copy of the foregoing by e-service, or for Ali Bovingdon by email, to the following:

David Dewhirst  
Solicitor General  
Office of Montana Attorney General  
Austin Knudsen  
P.O. Box 201401  
Helena, MT 59620-1401  
*Attorney for Appellants*

Martha Sheehy  
Sheehy Law Firm  
P.O. Box 584  
Billings, MT 59103-0584

Kyle A. Gray  
Brianna C. McClafferty  
Emily J. Cross  
Holland & Hart LLP  
P.O. Box 639  
Billings MT 59103

Ali Bovingdon  
MUS Chief Legal Counsel  
Office of Commissioner of Higher  
Education  
Helena, MT 59620-3201  
*Attorneys for Appellees*

/s/ Greg Overstreet  
Greg Overstreet

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Stephen H.G. ('Greg') Overstreet, hereby certify that I have served true and accurate copies of the foregoing Brief - Amicus to the following on 02-28-2022:

Martha Sheehy (Attorney)  
P.O. Box 584  
Billings MT 59103  
Representing: Montana Board of Regents of Higher Education  
Service Method: eService

Emily Jayne Cross (Attorney)  
401 North 31st Street  
Suite 1500  
P.O. Box 639  
Billings MT 59103-0639  
Representing: Montana Board of Regents of Higher Education  
Service Method: eService

Brianne McClafferty (Attorney)  
401 North 31st Street, Suite 1500  
P. O. Box 639  
Billings MT 59103-0639  
Representing: Montana Board of Regents of Higher Education  
Service Method: eService

Kyle Anne Gray (Attorney)  
P.O. Box 639  
Billings MT 59103  
Representing: Montana Board of Regents of Higher Education  
Service Method: eService

Kathleen Lynn Smithgall (Govt Attorney)  
215 N. Sanders St.  
Helena MT 59601  
Representing: State of Montana  
Service Method: eService

David M.S. Dewhirst (Govt Attorney)  
215 N Sanders  
Helena MT 59601

Representing: State of Montana  
Service Method: eService

Quentin M. Rhoades (Attorney)  
430 Ryman St.  
2nd Floor  
Missoula MT 59802

Representing: Montana Shooting Sports Association, Inc., Second Amendment Foundation, Idaho  
Second Amendment Alliance, Madison Society Foundation, Inc.  
Service Method: eService

Palmer A. Hoovestall (Attorney)  
608 Lincoln Rd. West  
Helena MT 59602  
Representing: Western Montana Fish & Game Association  
Service Method: eService

Logan Paul Olson (Attorney)  
9 Wilson Street  
Flaxville MT 59222  
Representing: Daniels County  
Service Method: eService

Ali Bovingdon (Attorney)  
1301 E. 6th Street  
P.O. Box 200801  
Helena MT 59620-0801  
Representing: Montana Board of Regents of Higher Education  
Service Method: E-mail Delivery

Electronically Signed By: Stephen H.G. ('Greg') Overstreet  
Dated: 02-28-2022