



KING'S ACADEMY MODEL UNITED NATIONS 2026

Supreme Court of the United States

Doe v. Meta Platforms

By Omar Rabadi

Original: **English**

No: **SCOTUS-KAMUN-02**

Date: **February 2026**

SITUATION REGARDING THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF SOCIAL MEDIA CONTENT MODERATION AND GOVERNMENT INFLUENCE

IN THE CASE OF

Doe v. Meta Platforms

Before:

Chief Justice Omar Rabadi

Under Seal

CASE DOCUMENTS

KING’S ACADEMY MODEL UNITED NATIONS 2026

CASE SUMMARY

This case arises on a writ of certiorari from the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit. The Plaintiff, John Doe, challenges Meta Platforms’ algorithmic content moderation practices, arguing that these practices violate the First Amendment. Doe further contends that government pressure on Meta to remove certain content constitutes unconstitutional censorship. Meta, as Respondent, maintains that its moderation policies are private decisions protected under the First Amendment and that the company is not a state actor subject to constitutional constraints.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Meta Platforms’ algorithmic content moderation practices constitute protected private speech under the First Amendment.
2. Whether government pressure on Meta to remove or limit content constitutes unconstitutional censorship in violation of the First Amendment.

FACTS OF THE CASE

Meta Platforms operates one of the largest social media networks in the United States. The platform uses automated algorithms to detect and remove content that violates its community standards, including misinformation, hate speech, and content deemed harmful.

Plaintiff John Doe posted content that was removed or suppressed by Meta’s algorithm. Doe alleges that Meta’s actions were influenced by government communications requesting removal of certain posts, arguing that this amounted to unconstitutional censorship. Meta argues that it is a private company making independent editorial decisions and that its moderation practices are protected under the First Amendment. The Ninth Circuit upheld Meta’s actions, and the case is now before the Supreme Court.

KING’S ACADEMY MODEL UNITED NATIONS 2026

RELEVANT CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

First Amendment – Freedom of Speech and Press

“Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances.”

RELEVANT PRECEDENTS

Reno v. American Civil Liberties Union (1997)

Struck down overly broad restrictions on internet speech, recognizing that online platforms carry strong First Amendment protections.

Packingham v. North Carolina (2017)

Held that the government cannot impose broad restrictions on access to social media platforms, emphasizing their central role in public discourse.

Bantam Books, Inc. v. Sullivan (1963)

Found that government coercion to remove content can constitute unconstitutional censorship even when the speech is technically private.

Pruneyard Shopping Center v. Robins (1980)

Addressed private property and public access, relevant to understanding private platforms’ control over speech.

Miami Herald Publishing Co. v. Tornillo (1974)

Held that private entities cannot be compelled by the government to publish content, supporting Meta’s position as a private actor.

KING’S ACADEMY MODEL UNITED NATIONS 2026

ARGUMENTS OF THE PARTIES

Plaintiff (John Doe)

Argues that Meta’s algorithmic moderation constitutes censorship because government pressure influenced the removal of content.

Claims that suppression of lawful content violates the First Amendment, as social media platforms function as the modern public square.

Respondent (Meta Platforms)

Argues that the company is a private actor and its moderation decisions are editorial, not state action, and therefore protected under the First Amendment.

Contends that government communications do not equate to coercion or compulsion sufficient to trigger constitutional liability.

PROCEDURAL MOTIONS

The following motions may be debated before oral arguments. Each side will be given a short amount of time to argue for or against the motion, and the court will rule on each motion. The court’s order is final and dictates what is permitted for the remainder of the trial. Each side will also be given the opportunity to raise ONE other motion of their own if they please.

- 1. The Respondent’s motion to dismiss for lack of state action.**
- 2. The Plaintiff’s motion to include government communications as evidence of unconstitutional coercion.**