

## Anti-SLAPP Laws

**Key: ✓- Yes X- No ?-Unclear or has not been addressed**

- **Any Forum:** Speech made in any forum is protected. Not restricted to speech made before a governmental body.
- **Any Public Issue:** Protection granted for speech made in connection with any issue of public interest or concern. Not restricted to issues under consideration by a governmental body or speech aimed at procuring government action in favor of the speaker.
- **Mandatory Attorney Fees/Costs:** Award of costs and attorney fees is mandatory for successful anti-SLAPP defendants
- **Additional Burden:** Statute or case law requires overcoming additional burdens, such as the SLAPP suit being brought in “bad faith,” or that the speech was without knowledge or reckless disregard for its falsity.
- **Amendment After Grant:** Pleadings may be amended after an anti-SLAPP motion is granted.
- **Amendment While Pending:** Pleadings may be amended while an anti-SLAPP motion is pending.
- **Immediate Appeal:** Anti-SLAPP motions are immediately appealable after denial.

Jurisdiction	Statute or Case Law?	Any Forum?	Any Public Issue?	Mandatory Attorney Fees/Costs?	Additional Burden?	Amendment After Grant?	Amendment While Pending?	Immediate Appeal?
Alabama	N/A							
Alaska	N/A							
Arizona	Ariz. Rev. Stat. Ann. 12-751 (2011)	✓		✓		?	?	?
Arkansas	Ark. Code. Ann. 16-63-501-8 (2010)	✓		✓	✓	?	?	?
California	Cal. Civ. Proc. Code 425.16	✓	✓	✓		✓/X <sup>1</sup>	X	✓
Colorado	Case Law Only <sup>2</sup>	✓				?	?	?

<sup>1</sup> In state courts, claims may not be amended if an anti-SLAPP motion is pending or has been granted. In federal courts, leave to amend may be granted.

<sup>2</sup> Leading Case: Protect Our Mountain Environment, Inc. v. District Court of County of Jefferson, 677 P.2d 1361 (Colo. 1984).

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Statute or Case Law?</b>	<b>Any Forum?</b>	<b>Any Public Issue?</b>	<b>Mandatory Attorney Fees/Costs?</b>	<b>Additional Burden?</b>	<b>Amendment After Grant?</b>	<b>Amendment While Pending?</b>	<b>Immediate Appeal?</b>
<b>Connecticut</b>	Case Law Only <sup>3</sup>				✓	?	?	?
<b>Delaware</b>	Del. Code. Ann. tit. 10 section 8136 (2011)	✓				✓	✓	?
<b>D.C.</b>	D.C. Law 16-5501 <sup>4</sup>	✓	✓	✓ <sup>5</sup>		X	?	✓
<b>Florida</b>	Fla. Stat. 768.295 (2011)	✓ <sup>6</sup>		✓		?	?	?
<b>Georgia</b>	Ga. Code. Ann. 9-11-11.1	✓		✓		?	✓	✓
<b>Hawaii</b>	Haw. Rev. Stat. 634F-1 to 634F-4 (2011)			✓		?	✓	✓
<b>Idaho</b>	N/A							
<b>Illinois</b>	735 Ill. Comp. Stat. 110/15 (2011)	✓	✓	✓		?	?	✓
<b>Indiana</b>	Ind. Code. 34-7-7-1 to 10 (2011)	✓	✓	✓	✓	?	?	?
<b>Iowa</b>	N/A							
<b>Kansas</b>	Public Speech Protection Act (HB 2054) passed March 2016. Added by SB 319, § 1	✓	✓	✓		?	?	✓
<b>Kentucky</b>	N/A							

<sup>3</sup> Leading Cases: Field v. Kearns, 682 A.2d 148 (Conn. App. Ct. 1996); Royce v. Willowbrook Cemetery, Inc., 2003 Conn. Super. LEXIS 262 (Conn. Super. Ct. Feb. 3, 2003); Arigno v. Murzin, 2001 Conn. Super. LEXIS 2875 (Conn. Super. Ct. Oct. 2, 2001).

<sup>4</sup> The D.C. Circuit has held, in Abbas v. Foreign Policy Group, 783 F.3d 1328 (D.C. Cir. 2015), that the DC anti-SLAPP statute conflicts with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and could not be applied in federal court in a diversity case.

<sup>5</sup> In Doe v. Burke, 133 A.3d 569, 576 (D.C. 2016), the court held that a successful SLAPP movant is presumptively entitled to recover attorney's fees, without any additional showing of frivolousness or wrongful motivation.

<sup>6</sup> "Free speech in connection with public issues" means any written or oral statement that is protected under applicable law and is made before a governmental entity in connection with an issue under consideration or review by a governmental entity, or is made in or in connection with a play, movie, television program, radio broadcast, audiovisual work, book, magazine article, musical work, news report, or other similar work.

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Statute or Case Law?</b>	<b>Any Forum?</b>	<b>Any Public Issue?</b>	<b>Mandatory Attorney Fees/Costs?</b>	<b>Additional Burden?</b>	<b>Amendment After Grant?</b>	<b>Amendment While Pending?</b>	<b>Immediate Appeal?</b>
<b>Louisiana</b>	La. Code. Civ. Proc. Ann. art 971 (2010)	✓	✓	✓		?	X	✓
<b>Maine</b>	Me. Rev. Stat. tit. 14 section 556 (2011)	✓	✓			?	?	✓
<b>Maryland</b>	Md. Code Ann., Cts. & Jud. Proc. 5-807 (2011)	✓	✓		✓	?	✓	?
<b>Massachusetts</b>	Mass. Gen. Laws ch. 231 section 59H (2011)	✓		✓		?	✓ <sup>7</sup>	✓
<b>Michigan</b>	N/A							
<b>Minnesota</b>	Minn. Stat. section 554.01 - .05 (1994)	✓		✓		?	?	✓
<b>Mississippi</b>	N/A							
<b>Missouri</b>	Mo. Rev. Stat. section 537.528 (2004)			✓		?	?	X
<b>Montana</b>	N/A							
<b>Nebraska</b>	Neb. Rev. Stat. section 25-21, 243 -6	✓				?	?	?
<b>Nevada</b>	Nev. Rev. Stat. section 41.635-670 (1993)	✓		✓	✓	?	?	X
<b>New Hampshire</b>	N/A							
<b>New Jersey</b>	N/A							
<b>New Mexico</b>	N.M. Stat. section 38-2-9.1 -2 (2001)			✓		?	?	?
<b>New York</b>	N.Y. CLS Civ. R. § 70-a & 76-a (2008); NY CLS CPLR R 3211	✓				?	✓	?

<sup>7</sup> Yes, a pleading can be amended while an anti-SLAPP motion is pending, but denying leave to amend is proper “when the proposed claim will not withstand a motion to dismiss, thus rendering amendment futile.”

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Statute or Case Law?</b>	<b>Any Forum?</b>	<b>Any Public Issue?</b>	<b>Mandatory Attorney Fees/Costs?</b>	<b>Additional Burden?</b>	<b>Amendment After Grant?</b>	<b>Amendment While Pending?</b>	<b>Immediate Appeal?</b>
<b>North Carolina</b>	N/A							
<b>North Dakota</b>	N/A							
<b>Ohio</b>	N/A							
<b>Oklahoma</b>	2013 OK. HB 2366, the Oklahoma Citizens Participation Act (2014)					?	?	?
<b>Oregon</b>	Or. Rev. Stat. section 31.150 et seq (2001)	✓	✓	✓		✓	?	?
<b>Pennsylvania</b>	27 Pa. Cons. Stat. section 7707 and section 8301-3 (2000)	✓		✓	✓	?	?	✓
<b>Rhode Island</b>	R.I. Gen. Laws section 9-33-1 – 9-33-4 (1995)	✓	✓	✓		?	✓	?
<b>South Carolina</b>	N/A							
<b>South Dakota</b>	N/A							
<b>Tennessee</b>	Tenn. Code. Ann. section 4-21-1001 – 21-1004 (1997)			✓	✓	?	?	?
<b>Texas</b>	Tex. Civ. Prac. & Rem. Code section 27.002-9	✓	✓	✓		?	✓	✓
<b>Utah</b>	Utah Code Ann. section 78B-6-1401 – 5(2001)	✓				?	?	✓
<b>Vermont</b>	12 VSA section 1041	✓	✓	✓		?	? <sup>8</sup>	✓
<b>Virginia</b>	N/A							
<b>Washington</b>	RCW 4.24.510 <sup>9</sup>			✓		?	?	?

<sup>8</sup> Undecided, but amendment may not be used to avoid responsibility for costs and fees incurred in making a justified anti-SLAPP motion.

<sup>9</sup> Washington Supreme Court struck down a stronger anti-SLAPP statute, RCW 4.24.525, in 2015 as invalid on its face for violating the state constitutional's right to a jury trial. The previous law remains intact.

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Statute or Case Law?</b>	<b>Any Forum?</b>	<b>Any Public Issue?</b>	<b>Mandatory Attorney Fees/Costs?</b>	<b>Additional Burden?</b>	<b>Amendment After Grant?</b>	<b>Amendment While Pending?</b>	<b>Immediate Appeal?</b>
<b>West Virginia</b>	Case Law Only <sup>10</sup>							
<b>Wisconsin</b>	N/A							
<b>Wyoming</b>	N/A							

---

<sup>10</sup> Leading Case: Harris v. Adkins, 432 S.E.2d 549 (W.Va. 1993).