

Nos. 14-14061-AA & 14-14066-AA

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ELEVENTH CIRCUIT

JAMES DOMER BRENNER, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. JOHN ARMSTRONG, et al., Defendants-Appellants.	SLOAN GRIMSLEY, et al., Plaintiffs-Appellees, v. JOHN ARMSTRONG, et al., Defendants-Appellants.
--	---

Appeals from the United States District Court for the Northern District of Florida

**BRIEF OF 256 CALIFORNIA HIPPIES
AS AMICI CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS-APPELLEES**

January 07, 2015

256 CALIFORNIA HIPPIES*
Proceeding *Pro Se*

*Amici, California Hippies do not have a lawyer
representing them; all their lawyers are stoned

Counsel for Amici Curiae

Proof reader for brief: Gordon W. Watts#:
www.GordonWatts.com
www.GordonWayneWatts.com

www.PRWeb.com/releases/2014/12/prweb12361433.htm
www.GordonWatts.com/DOCKET-GayMarriageCase.html
www.GordonWayneWatts.com/DOCKET-GayMarriageCase.html

#Mr. Watts is not a lawyer either, but he did stay in a Holiday Inn Express...

STATEMENT OF INTEREST ¹

Amici are hippies, beatniks, California stoners, and scholar-wanna-be's who teach and write about... well, not too much: we're too stoned to even finish this sentence! But, we're knowledgeable about the history of the Free Market sales dynamics of weed, pot, marijuana, and other green herbs, and understand the importance of marketing, courting a whole new audience, and making sure to not alienate this new customer base. Therefore, in order to clinch the sale, we're filing an amicus brief in support of ...well, whatever their gripe is... we're not exactly sure, but, like... dude, yeah, we support you; plus, you kinda seem 'liberal' like us, so we must be on the right side.

¹ No parties have consented to the filing of this amici brief: we were too stoned to even inquire. No person other than the amici or their counsel authored this brief or contributed money intended for the funding of this brief. Heck, we barely had enough money to fund it ourselves left over after after our last weed run.

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

Dude... we're too stoned to even begin to make an argument, but by way of introduction, we notice that Rule 32.(a)(1)(C) (Form of Briefs, Appendices, and Other Papers) states that: "Photographs, illustrations, and tables may be reproduced by any method that results in a good copy of the original; a glossy finish is acceptable if the original is glossy." So, if we're allowed to, like, uh... yeah, insert photos, illustrations, and other cool drawings, I think we'll give it the "old college try," *so here ya go:*

