

## Communication from Public

**Name:** Matt Fisher

**Date Submitted:** 01/15/2020 03:56 PM

**Council File No:** 00-9999

**Comments for Public Posting:** The supreme Court decided to not hear the case of Martin v Boise because the lower courts fulfilled their duty by deciding the constitutionality of the effects of enforcement not the effectiveness of enforcement as a tool. There has been a clear legal precedent previously set with marginalized groups rights being defended in public space, from racial segregation to the public behavior of same sex partners. But because the 8th amendment and homelessness were never connected, homeless rights as a marginalized group have always suffered. Now that they are connected through Martin v Boise, we must define the constitutional rights of those exposed in public spaces without the afforded right to privacy, we must define the local right to move freely as well as the right to stay. And in order to not tie our hands we must separate the lack of rights to the Fourth amendment while complying with the 8th, and the only way to do so, is to build housing. In order to end homelessness we must make extinct the marginalized groups reason of existence and that is not having an option for a home. But until then, we must address the local laws and enforcements effect on those without due process until now and resist the previous temptations to ignore the rights of a misunderstood marginalized group without a choice.