

BOOM! LAWYERED: THE CASE OF THE CURSING CHEERLEADER REACHES THE SUPREME COURT

- Imani Gandy: Hello, fellow law nerds! Welcome to another episode of Boom! Lawyered, a Rewire News Group podcast, hosted by the legal journalism team that would like to wish a very, very happy birthday to one Jessica Mason Pieklo.
- Jessica Pieklo: Aw, thanks Imani. And I'm that Jessica Mason Pieklo. Rewire News Group is dedicated to inspiring you to own your relationship to sex, abortion, parenthood, and power and The Team Legal Podcast is part of that mission. So a big thanks to our subscribers and a welcome to our new listeners!
- Imani Gandy: Today. We're going to be talking about a case that the Supreme Court decided to take up, and it's about a cheerleader with a potty mouth.
- Jessica Pieklo: A cheerleader with a potty mouth?
- Imani Gandy: Yeah, you should know what I'm talking about since you were a cheerleader and you probably had a potty mouth.
- Jessica Pieklo: Okay. First of all, I don't know what fuck you think that I would have a potty mouth when I was a cheerleader. But this is my day, Imani. Hold on!
- Imani Gandy: Oh dear. Here we go. Oh God. Something's happening. Oh yeah.
- Jessica Pieklo: [cheering] Gimme an F! Gimme a U! Gimme a C! Gimme a K! [laughter]
- I was definitely a cheerleader with a potty mouth, and I have been waiting maybe 25 years for that.
- Imani Gandy: It's very exciting. I'm honestly never going to get over the fact that you were a cheerleader because obviously I didn't know you then and you don't seem very cheerleadery right now. But the fact that you were basically Jessica Wakefield when you were in high school cracks me up.
- Jessica Pieklo: Okay. So for the young ones who don't know Sweet Valley High, first of all, thank you. I have also been waiting about 25 years for that. I however, do not have aquamarine eyes. These are very brown.
- Imani Gandy: That's true. Francine Pascal loves talking about the Wakefield twins, Jessica and Elizabeth Wakefield and how they had aquamarine eyes and were a perfect size six. And then one of them dated a dude who drove a Porsche, but I digress. This is already so hostile. Remember Bruce Patman? Come on. He had a Porsche!
- Jessica Pieklo: I've got those books in my basement. I'm not going to lie.

Imani Gandy: I do too. And I'm Black, which is more embarrassing. Not the fact that I'm Black, but the fact that I'm Black and was reading Sweet Valley High in high school. Oh God.

Jessica Pieklo: Oh cheerleaders. What are we talking about? That's right. Cheerleaders with a potty mouth. The Court heard a case apparently today. What's going on Imani?

Imani Gandy: Yeah. So the case is called Mahanoy Area School District v. B.L. And this case may determine the boundaries of free speech in high schools. The case involves a former high school student named Brandi Levy who tried out for the varsity cheer squad. Didn't make it and ended up on the JV squad.

Jessica Pieklo: Oh yeah. I'm guessing she probably wasn't very happy about that.

Imani Gandy: No, no. She was not. And she made it known. She took the Snapchat one weekend where she posted a photo of herself and her friend with their middle fingers raised up and the caption read, "Fuck school, fuck softball, fuck cheer, fuck everything."

Jessica Pieklo: Okay. Hold on. I've got a lot of respect for that. I 1000%, as a teenager, who would have tried out for varsity cheer and gotten placed on JV cheer, that 1000% would have been my reaction. Fuck all of this.

Imani Gandy: Right. And well, the school's cheerleading coaches caught wind of it and suspended her from cheerleading for a year.

Jessica Pieklo: A year?

Imani Gandy: Yeah. For a year. So her father filed a lawsuit with the help of the ACLU, alleging that the school had violated his daughter's First Amendment rights. And so this case has really big implications when it comes to student First Amendment rights. What free speech rights do students have outside of school? Can their free speech rights be abridged 24 hours a day, 365 days a year?

Jessica Pieklo: I mean, it seems like that answer should be, "No," right? If they're not in school, if they're on their own time, it's the weekend or whatever, then I don't know, Imani, what right does a school have to tell students what they can and can't say? That's just like that... I don't know.

Imani Gandy: That's a good question and we should talk about it.

[interlude]

Imani Gandy: So, the first big issue is, how does the First Amendment apply in schools? And to talk about that issue, we need to talk about the seminal case on the issue called Tinker vs Des Moines Independent Community School District. The case was about high school students who wore black armbands to school to protest the

Vietnam War. The Supreme Court ruled, 7-2 in favor of plaintiff, Mary Beth Tinker, and held that these students had a First Amendment right to wear these black armbands in protest because quote, "The record does not demonstrate any facts which might reasonably have led school authorities to forecast substantial disruption of or material interference with, school activities."

Jessica Pieklo: God bless lawyers and their tests. What I would say is that Tinker is to First Amendment student speech cases as what Roe vs. Wade is to abortion rights jurisprudence. Tinker versus Des Moines is like the big case that when people talk about like, "What can you say as a public school student," the first case that people go to is Tinker. So this is like the fact that this Supreme Court is even thinking about Tinker is something that we all need to take a minute with.

Imani Gandy: So in Tinker, the Supreme Court held that public students do not quote, "Shed their constitutional rights to freedom of speech or expression at the school house gate." But the court said that, "Students free speech rights are diminished in the school context in some way." So for example, a public school may punish its students for speech that quote, "Would materially and substantially disrupt the work and discipline of the school." And so Tinker's holding that the First Amendment is diminished, but not eliminated when a student enters a school setting has been the rule for decades, but courts haven't really been able to figure out what constitutes a school setting and what doesn't.

Jessica Pieklo: Ahh. This is so messy. My brain already hurts because I mean, so like I've got kids in school. I have a lot of sympathy with the fact that that's like the wild west in terms of it's just like people saying things and like... So I have some sympathy for administrators and for teachers in terms of just like trying to make sure that learning continues, however, like this, as we know, tests are subject to the people who apply them. And so while I have some sympathy for that, I also have some hesitancy because I don't like the idea of teachers deciding what is diminished and what is not in certain capacities. This is why speech stuff is always just such a mess.

Imani Gandy: And especially now that we're living in an age of social media where everything is connected and a student can post content on Snapchat or Instagram that could potentially disrupt the quote, "Work and discipline of the school," it's important that the court figure out what those boundaries are, right? Because it used to be, like back in the day, let's say little Jessica Wakefield Pieklo didn't make the varsity squad and was like, "Fuck cheer." That's something you probably would have said to your best friend when you were 14 or 15 or whatever.

Jessica Pieklo: Totally.

Imani Gandy: It would have been a private conversation, maybe over the phone and then that would have been that. You would have expressed your feelings and moved on. But Snapchat is public, even though it's temporary because those posts disappear ostensibly after 24 hours, but still it's public. But even though

Snapchat is public and stuff posted on Snapchat could disrupt school, the rule cannot be that kids can't post anything that they want to on Snapchat.

Imani Gandy: The rule also can't be that kids can post whatever they want on Snapchat. Right. It's got to be a line there. So for example, let's say a student is bullying another student on Snapchat. I'm going to post my bullying on the Chatsnap.

[laughter, like a lot of it lol]

Jessica Pieklo: That's like a 47 year old thing to say!

Imani Gandy: I don't know. I got to go on the Instagram supposed to snatch chaps or whatever.

Jessica Pieklo: Let me go log into Myspace. Beep boop brrrt. [laughter]

Imani Gandy: For those who don't know, that's the sound of a modem dialing up? You probably don't remember that because you weren't born yet. You didn't live in the wild west of the early days of the internet.

Jessica Pieklo: Sweet Valley High.

Imani Gandy: Go read Sweet Valley High, exactly.

So, if a student is bullying another student on Snapchat on the weekends, that could still disrupt the work and discipline of the school. Right? Because you're yeah, totally.

Jessica Pieklo: And that makes sense to me. But what if a student is criticizing school policy on the weekend? For example, what if the student is criticizing the fact that in their English class, they're not learning any books written by authors of color and they decide to protest that in some way? Are students free to do that? Well, it depends.

Imani Gandy: I would think so.

Jessica Pieklo: Or, one of the things that came up in arguments today, what if a student posts a message on Snapchat while at school?

Imani Gandy: Mm yeah.

Jessica Pieklo: I'm too old for this, Imani. That's it, show's over.

Imani Gandy: Happy birthday. I'm going to go get some drinks. Well, the Supreme Court has already said that Tinker can be applied outside of school. And so that makes sense. We're in an age of social media now, but even back in 2007, for example, there's this case called Morris vs. Frederick and usually when you think about

school's free speech cases, you think about Tinker, and then you think about this case because this is the Bong Hits for Jesus case. Right? And so-

Jessica Pieklo: That was my reaction. I love this case. It's specifically because it's Bong Hits for Jesus because I mean, who wouldn't want to take a bong hit for Jesus?

Imani Gandy: I take Bong Hits for Jesus every day, but in Morse vs. Frederick, this Bong Hits for Jesus case, the court upheld the school district suspension of a student who held up a banner reading, "Bong Hits for Jesus," during an off-campus, but school sponsored event.

Jessica Pieklo: This is just a jurisdiction test. Isn't it?

Imani Gandy: Right. That's what we're getting to. So like jurisdiction is the place where something happens. So the place where learning happens, where education happens is what seems to be going on here because Bong Hits For Jesus is an off-campus, but school sponsored event.

Jessica Pieklo: Okay. So that makes some sense. Right. And like the whole thing when I was on cheer squad or like when I was playing soccer, we were school ambassadors. Right. So there was a big question of like whether or not, and it came up in the arguments today too. There should be different standards for different students, right. But this is ungovernable, Imani. The thing with Bong Hits for Jesus was at least the court drew a line there that was like, "All right. Yes. We recognize that it's off campus, but it's school sponsored. So the students should reasonably think that they're basically in a school-like environment." Right? Or like the disciplinary arm of the school can reach that far because it's sponsored. As a parent, as a lawyer, that just makes sense to me, but like, I don't know. But then I hear the argument against it. And I'm like, "That also makes sense to me." First Amendment law. I am a fickle bitch. It is true. I'm calling it.

Imani Gandy: Alright, you fickle bitch. Well, John Roberts wasn't having any of these Bong Hits for Jesus literally or figuratively.

Jessica Pieklo: Maybe he should though.

Imani Gandy: He really might want to try an edible or two. I'm just saying. But he said in that case, "Schools may take steps to safeguard those entrusted to their care from speech that can reasonably be regarded as encouraging illegal drug use." I mean, I don't really think that a sign that says Bong Hits for Jesus is, "Come on, man, need to take a bong hit for Jesus right now." I mean, it's just come on, but fine. It's a silly case. It's not a big deal. But this next case that I'm going to talk about is not a silly case.

Imani Gandy: So this is a case called Wisniewski versus Board of Education and in that case, the Second Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed that it was legal for a school to suspend a student who had posted an image online of a pistol firing a bullet into

a man's head. And under that picture, the student posted the words, "Kill Mr. VanderMolen." Mr. VanderMolen was his English teacher.

Imani Gandy: Okay. I mean, that's a different case than Bong Hits for Jesus. Right? You can't be posting, "Kill my English teacher," and expect to not get in trouble for that.

Jessica Pieklo: Right. I mean, so that's a threat. Right? Even if he was saying like that's a whole different category of speech. And we talked about that this way eons ago on this podcast with a different First Amendment case where that guy posted rap lyrics. I rapped on this show.

Imani Gandy: You did, and it was beautiful. And some of our most avid fans still call, still like we'll tweet you about it, shake the mother fucking streets. And it's my favorite thing ever.

Jessica Pieklo: But like, I'm sorry. When it comes to speech, context matters and that kind of message, I think it's reasonable for the school to be like, "Hmm. Yeah, we don't allow that. That's not okay."

Imani Gandy: Right, right.

Jessica Pieklo: But saying, Fuck cheer, fuck school, fuck soccer. Or like—

Imani Gandy: That just an expression or emotion or Bong Hits for Jesus. Like there's no threat there. Even if I could conceivably agree that Bong Hits for Jesus might be considered encouraging drug use, saying, "Fuck cheer," isn't encouraging anyone to do anything. It's not encouraging bullying. It's not a true threat. It's just an expression of a 14 year old JV cheerleaders emotion's. You know what I mean? And it's just like sounded like... It's just the problem here is that lower courts have not been able to come up with a legal rule that encompasses both the cheerleader posting a Snapchat that says, "Fuck cheer," and the student posting a Snapchat threatening to murder a teacher. They're vastly different things, but courts aren't so great at figuring them out.

Jessica Pieklo: Amy Coney Barrett is really [crosstalk 00:14:50] I feel super about this.

Imani Gandy: Yeah. Justice kingdom of God.

Jessica Pieklo: Well, the Biden administration hopefully has something to say about this.

Imani Gandy: They do. The DOJ actually filed a brief in the case and argued that there are different rules that should apply to different kinds of speech.

Jessica Pieklo: Okay. So I think I can get on board with that.

Imani Gandy: We all should be able to, especially because this DOJ actually is doing things that make sense, which is nice, but-

Jessica Pieklo: So what'd they say?

Imani Gandy: So they said that certain forms of off-campus speech would be subject to Tinker. Number one, speech that threatens the school community, right. "I'm going to blow up the school, I'm going to take a gun and shoot everyone." That's obviously speech that should be regulated. Two, "Speech that intentionally targets specific individuals or groups in the school community." Right? So like if you're in the Klan, if you're in like a, I don't know, a teenage Klan and you're out there talking about burning crosses on Black students' lawn and posting crazy shit on Snapchat, that's speech that can be regulated by the school, can be diminished to use the legal term. And then three, their speech, "That intentionally targets specific school functions or programs regarding matters essential to, or inherent in the functions or programs themselves."

Imani Gandy: And that's where we get into just legal speak that really doesn't make a whole lot of sense. Right. What does that even mean? What does that mean? I'm going to say that again, "Speech that intentionally targets specific school functions or programs regarding matters essential to, or inherent in the functions or programs themselves."

Jessica Pieklo: I've got a couple of degrees and I honestly don't know what any of that means.

Imani Gandy: I don't know what that means it all. Like, I don't know. So yeah.

Jessica Pieklo: So moving on.

Imani Gandy: Moving on from that word salad. So, what do you think? I feel like there's just a lot of give right between like what the school district wants to do and what the cheerleader wants to do and should be able to do.

Jessica Pieklo: Yeah. And I mean, we got to encourage kids to be able to express themselves, but again, like we've been wrestling with this whole episode in a way that's not threatening or substantially disruptive to the folks around them.

Imani Gandy: All right, so.

Jessica Pieklo: We've got so many pitfalls here, Imani. This is like, right. So we have the fact that Tinker was context specific, right? I mean, one of the things that I really love about Supreme Court history is that it is so dependent on the culture that is happening at the time. And so Tinker is going on with these massive uprising and protests against the backdrop of the Vietnam War and wearing an arm band at school might not have been substantially disruptive. I mean, that was part and parcel of what the youth protest movement was doing at the time. And when you read about Tinker, that was all part of it. So this is very much like what would be considered maybe more mainstream protest, something along those lines. So that wasn't substantially disruptive, but what if it was? What if it was... Because the protests that we have for our context now are actually,

maybe they're not more divisive, maybe they just feel more divisive, but they certainly are producing some really extreme reactions.

Jessica Pieklo: What if we have a student who wears a Black Lives Matter shirt to school? We've seen folks really not have appropriate and okay responses to that. What do we do then? Right. We've had some examples of this, like Texas. In 2015, a Texas student wore a shirt emblazoned with the Black Lives Matter hashtag and that prompted school officials to send her home. The Dean of students blamed her for disrupting the school environment, told her all lives mattered and yelled at her until she cried because that's how adults should behave. Let me just say that. It's not an isolated incident though.

Imani Gandy: I was going to say. I was going to say, "That's the only one. Let's all go home. It's not going to get..." okay. Go ahead.

Jessica Pieklo: No. So then in 2016, a different student, Alyssa Carter, a junior at Victoria West High School says the assistant principal gave her an ultimatum to either remove her Black Lives Matter mask or to go home. Meanwhile, kids at her school were walking around with Trump 2020 shirts. And I mean, look, if you Google "Students sent home for wearing Black Lives Matter shirt," a lot of articles pop up, which raises the question, who's getting policed, right? Ultimately we know where this goes. But that's the subjective part of speech that gets this extra fucking messy.

Imani Gandy: Right. And considering just the racial tension that is in this country right now, and that has been ongoing since the onset of Black Lives Matter, five, six years ago now, the fact that people who believe that Black Lives Matter, people who are somehow associated with the organization Black Lives Matter, and those are two different things, that is seen as really divisive. And especially with this new conversation about critical race theory and these rich Hamptons-bred white people who are very concerned about their kids in private school in New York who were being taught, "Critical race theory," which by the way, they are not because critical race theory is a legal theory that you're taught in law school. What these parents and what people are complaining about is really just anti-racism. They don't want their kids to learn about anti-racism in school.

Imani Gandy: And so wearing a shirt that says Black Lives Matter is seen as somehow having to do something with this critical race theory that everybody hates and that it's somehow divisive just to say, "Hey, my life matters." And so I think we know who's going to get policed. We can look and like you said, you could Google it. You can see who's getting policed. White kids who are wearing Confederate flag shirts aren't really being sent home, white kids wearing MAGA hats aren't being sent home. And sure you can argue, one is a political statement and one is just support of a campaign. But I don't think you can really make that argument when it comes to Donald Trump and his supporters, because that whole movement is far beyond just a regular political campaign or just, "Oh, hey, I support this guy for the election." It's so way beyond that.

Imani Gandy: So it raises a lot of concerns for me, especially when Black students already tend to feel really marginalized in public schools. You got a lot of school teachers who... For example, how are you going to say to a Black student, "Your shirt's divisive. And by the way, all lives matter." That's just, for me, that is grossly offensive. But for most, for some people, and probably not people listening to this podcast, but for some people they would say, "Well, that's too political. You can't get that political. I'm trying to send my kid to school to learn math, not to learn about Black Lives Matter or like the actual history of slavery in this country. I want the whitewashed, happy go lucky "Martin Luther King is Santa" education when it comes to civil rights. And that's just very concerning. But you mentioned that there was an oral arguments in this case today and you listened to them. So can you give a sense of how the court might rule on this case?

Jessica Pieklo: Completely. Because what I was going to say is, to like yes, and everything that you just said about the policing of Black students here, because the other layer of context that I think is important to distinguish what happened at arguments today from Tinker is that the right has just moved so far into bad faith trollism when it comes to political debate that it's like you know that any rule is going to be employed in a bad faith manner by conservatives. How do we know this? Justice Alito in oral arguments gave all of the signaling for that is just clear as day. His concern with a bright line rule in a speech case is whether or not it could be used to punish students and teachers who deadname and mis-gender trans students.

Imani Gandy: Oh Christ.

Jessica Pieklo: So effectively, he is out there using this case as a way to search around for First Amendment protections for anti-trans discrimination. And this is such a huge point because we see conservatives weaponize the First Amendment all the time, right? They did it with religious refusals in Masterpiece Cake Shop. And I have a free speech right to turn people away based on my religious objections to their marriage. And so we are seeing conservatives really extend this doctrine in this logic to create legal insulation to allow them to discriminate. We have active litigation right now with teachers who are defending themselves from deadnaming students, from misgendering them and saying, "I don't care what it says on your record. That's not what who you were biologically born as and I have a free speech right to dictate that." It's madness. And in Tinker, there was a debate about good faith political arguments. I don't think we see good faith political arguments from the right anymore.

Jessica Pieklo: And so that context to me matters, and we saw that come out a little bit, Justice Sotomayor, unsurprisingly got to some of those points and Justice Kagan was really good on it too. But really that's the thing that just jumped right out to me from today's arguments is once again, conservatives will use a messy space that we could just have good faith, arguments about it being messy and find a way to make it bad faith and to weaponize it to hurt people who are already marginalized. And it doesn't feel great.

Imani Gandy: And just to add to that is the fact that the First Amendment protection seemed to only apply to certain people, right? They certainly don't apply to abortion providers where in states across the country, they're being required to basically read state-mandated scripts to patients before they're permitted to treat the, to provide them abortion, which is just good medicine. Abortion is health care. And so this idea and I know, I would bet my left boob that when a First Amendment case, when it comes to abortion providers appears before Alito, he will have no problem forcing doctors to speak things, to say thing they otherwise would not choose to say, and to therefore interfere in the doctor, patient relationship in that way. So, nothing that comes out of these people is in good faith.

Jessica Pieklo: Nope.

Imani Gandy: Just it's very frustrating. And it makes you wonder, is there ever going to be a time when there are going to be conservatives on the court that don't make me want to just go out and stab myself in the neck? Where are the conservatives that you can have a discussion about issues, about constitutional law in a way that makes sense and in a way that is not just trolling? Like you said, you said Alito's a troll. I don't want a Supreme Court justice to be trolling trans people in a case about free speech in schools, whether a high school student can post, "Fuck cheerleading" on Snapchat. What does a trans person's name have to do with someone who posts, "Fuck cheer" on Snapchat?

Jessica Pieklo: Well, exactly. And this is like the point about the political speech too. Because it's not like the political debates that people are getting into are on tax brackets, right? It's not like we're having a vigorous debate on capital gains tax. Conservatives are debating people's identities, their fundamental humanity. And that is a different flavor of politics. And we can't just be like, "No." It's political speech and people disagree. If your political speech is denying my humanity, that's not actually a disagreement. No, That's a bigger fucking problem.

Imani Gandy: Yeah. It's a civil rights violation, is what it is.

Jessica Pieklo: Right.

Imani Gandy: I don't know. When do you think we're going to get a ruling on this case?

Jessica Pieklo: Well, this summer. I think we're going to have a busy June. This is a really messy area and it was clear that the justices themselves were struggling with this. So I expect this is going to be a later one. I honestly have no real good sense of what the lineup is going to be on this, other than I expect to see Justice Alito, regardless of how the case breaks, writing something that can be picked up and used by conservatives to further insulate themselves in the name of the First Amendment. And so that is just the big flag I want on everybody's radar.

Imani Gandy: It makes my stomach hurt. It really does. I don't understand why they can't just come out with a ruling that says, "In this specific content, it's not a big deal." But yeah, it's going to be context specific. If you're going to post something on Snapchat saying, "You're going to murder someone, hey, maybe don't do that." But if you're just going to write, 'School fucking sucks,' how is that disrupting school activity?

Jessica Pieklo: It don't. It doesn't make any sense.

Imani Gandy: And on that note, I'm going to wish you a happy birthday again, it's your birthday today. It's also Justice Elena Kagan's birthday. So happy birthday Justice Kagan. And before we go, I do want to point out that we are doing a content drop on Monday called Re-imagining Motherhood. And it's a really, it's just a great package. It's focused on storytellers, on people who have had abortions, people who have had abortions and become mothers, people have become mothers and then had abortions. It's just really all about how we can re-imagine motherhood, how fraught the term motherhood has become. And what does it look like if we connect motherhood to abortion, right? Because 57% of people who have abortions already have kids. It's not just a, "Keep your legs closed, you dumb slut," situation anymore and people need to stop regarding it as that. So please check rewirenewsgroup.com on Monday for this package. It's going to be really amazing and throughout the week we are going to be publishing stuff.

Imani Gandy: We're going to be doing Instagram lives. There's going to be Instagram content. It's going to be fantastic.

Jessica Pieklo: It's super exciting.

Imani Gandy: Super exciting. I just wrote an editor's note and that is also super exciting because she never writes anymore and I miss reading her writing. Why am I saying this? Okay, if you would like to talk to us about any of this stuff, or if you would like to reminisce about Sweet Valley High and Bruce Patton and what was Elizabeth boyfriend's name? Todd Wilkinson or something?

Jessica Pieklo: Totally a Todd. I don't know if it was Wilkinson, but it was totally a Todd.

Imani Gandy: And then he got a motorcycle and he crashed it? Why do I remember all this stuff?

Jessica Pieklo: That was such drama.

Imani Gandy: Well, look, they totally played the like Madonna whore dichotomy with Elizabeth and Jessica. We're going to do an entire episode and breakaway on the Wakefield twins because they were 5'6" and a size 6 and aquamarine eyes.

Imani Gandy: Dear God, on Twitter. I'm Imani Gandy... No, I'm not. I'm @AngryBlackLady on Twitter. I don't even know who I am anymore. @AngryBlackLady on Twitter.

Jess is @Hegemommy. H-E-G-E-M-O-M-M-Y. You should follow @RewireNewsGroup on Twitter and on Instagram. And like I said, please check out our content drop on Re-imagining Motherhood on Monday, May 3rd. And what else did we have, Jess?

Jessica Pieklo: I don't know. I just totally off-

Imani Gandy: I guess we'll just see you on the tube. Jess is already gone.

Jessica Pieklo: Goodbye.

Speaker 3: Boom! Lawyered is created and hosted by Jessica Mason Pieklo and Imani Gandy. Marc Faletti produces the show.