

DEMONSTRATION-LAW REFERENCE

Minneapolis

The complete survey — every finding, with quoted text, legal analysis, and citations

As of Jul 21, 2026

Research completed Jul 21, 2026

Confidence: medium



● This city is **moderately regulated** — sidewalk demonstration is lawful, but permit, noise, or buffer-zone rules apply.

✓ RECORDING CONSENT One-party	✓ OPEN RECORDING IN PUBLIC Lawful	RECORD POLICE Unrecognized	AMPLIFICATION PERMIT Conditional
DAYTIME NOISE LIMIT 10 dB(C) Leq above ambient indoors; permitted amplification: 80/90 dB(A) at 50 ft		QUIET HOURS 10pm-7am	
✓ HANDHELD SIGN RULES None	HEALTHCARE BUFFER ZONE Municipal	RESIDENTIAL PICKETING Targeted only	SIDEWALK PERMIT Never required
✓ LEAFLETING Unrestricted	ANTI-MASK LAW Yes	✓ STOP-AND-IDENTIFY No	PENDING CHANGE See below

§ Jurisdiction overview

OVERVIEW

Moderate regulation with sidewalk protections. A peaceful group that remains on a public sidewalk, does not obstruct passage, and does not use regulated amplification generally may demonstrate without a parade permit. Minneapolis regulates outdoor amplified sound through permits, though a bullhorn of ten watts or less is exempt from that permit requirement from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m. The city prohibits physically disrupting access to reproductive healthcare facilities and obstructing their driveways, but the current ordinance expressly excepts constitutionally protected conduct. Minnesota law also supplies the principal rules on recording, masks, harassment, obstruction, and disorderly conduct.

“The permit requirements of this section for Special Events do not apply to an individual or group of less than fifty (50) participants exercising their constitutional right of free speech.”

Legal analysis. Minneapolis's current noise chapter uses both general ambient-relative standards in § 389.60 and separate permit conditions for outdoor amplification in § 389.105. Chapter 447 regulates street and alley parades; the available city code materials indicate that sidewalk-only activity is not within the ordinary parade trigger. Park property is governed separately by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, whose policy exempts an individual or free-speech group of fewer than 50 participants from its special-event permit requirement. State civil harassment law defines targeted residential picketing and authorizes individual restraining orders, even though Minneapolis has no general enacted residential-picketing crime.

Editor’s note. The Park Board rule is a park-use policy, not the city sidewalk-parade ordinance; particular park locations and amplified-sound use can require additional approval.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, Policies and Guidelines Governing the Use of the Park System § C(D) · Minneapolis, Minn., Code of Ordinances § 389.60(a)-(e)

§ Which law governs here

THE CITY / COUNTY / STATE HIERARCHY

City, Park Board, and state law govern. On a Minneapolis city sidewalk, city ordinances and Minnesota statutes apply. On Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board property, Park Board rules also apply. State laws govern recording consent, masks, harassment, disorderly conduct, unlawful assembly, and obstruction. Hennepin County has not been identified as imposing demonstration ordinances inside Minneapolis.

“Minnesota Rules, Chapter 7030, and A Guide to Noise Control in Minnesota, as adopted and revised from time to time by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency are hereby incorporated by reference into this chapter and made a part hereof.”

Legal analysis. Minneapolis's Chapter 389 incorporates Minnesota Rules chapter 7030 and uses additional municipal provisions. Minnesota law bars local governments from setting outdoor maximum sound-pressure standards more stringent than those of the Pollution Control Agency. The Park Board's separately adopted policy regulates permits and public-forum use on its property.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minneapolis, Minn., Code of Ordinances § 389.15 · Minn. Stat. § 116.07, subd. 2(c)

COUNTY LAW: HENNEPIN COUNTY

County code does not govern these activities. Minneapolis is an incorporated home-rule city. For the demonstration topics covered here, city, Park Board, state, and federal law are the operative layers rather than county ordinances. County programs can still apply where a specific statute gives the county authority, but no such demonstration rule was verified.

Legal analysis. The county-law conclusion is limited to the topics in this survey. The governing state criminal statutes apply throughout Hennepin County, including Minneapolis, but they are state law rather than county ordinances.

Editor's note. The county's ordinance list was not a comprehensive legal determination of every county program. Check any county-specific subject-area rule before relying on this conclusion outside public advocacy and demonstration regulation.

Verify before publication · medium confidence · Hennepin County Ordinances

THE FIRST AMENDMENT BASELINE

Traditional public forums; recording right unresolved. Public sidewalks and parks are ordinarily places where speech receives especially strong protection. Government may impose content-neutral rules about time, place, and manner, such as sound limits and rules against obstruction, if those rules satisfy First Amendment requirements. The Eighth Circuit has not issued an express holding establishing a First Amendment right to record police performing public duties. Recording from a distance may still be protected by other constitutional principles and state recording law, but the asserted First Amendment right is not clearly recognized in this circuit.

“Assuming Robbins had a constitutionally protected right to record as he was doing in this case, that right is not absolute.”

Legal analysis. Robbins did not hold that the First Amendment creates a right to record police. Instead, it stated, “Assuming Robbins had a constitutionally protected right to record,” the assumed right was not absolute and held that the plaintiff had not shown deprivation of a clearly established right. Molina likewise stated that, even assuming observation and recording were protected activity, that asserted First Amendment right was not clearly established on its facts. Those opinions do not supply an express controlling recognition of the asserted right.

Editor's note. This finding concerns controlling Eighth Circuit recognition. It does not mean that police may seize cameras, arrest without probable cause, or punish verbal criticism.

Verified at source · high confidence · Robbins v. City of Des Moines, 984 F.3d 673 (8th Cir. 2021) · Molina v. City of St. Louis, 59 F.4th 334 (8th Cir. 2023)

§ Signage

HANDHELD SIGNS

No verified handheld-sign restriction. A person may generally carry a sign on a public sidewalk. The practical limits are general rules against obstructing pedestrian travel and rules against attaching or leaving objects on public property. The handbill chapter expressly protects noncommercial distribution on foot on public sidewalks and in public parks, though it is not itself a handheld-sign rule.

“This chapter shall not apply to the distribution of non-commercial handbills by any person on foot on public sidewalks or in public parks.”

Legal analysis. The city handbill exception confirms the city's treatment of noncommercial person-to-person expression on public sidewalks and parks. No opened current ordinance text established a separate handheld-sign size or quantity restriction. Fixed and unattended signage is governed differently from a sign a person holds.

Editor's note. Check the live city code before using unusually large displays or a display that narrows pedestrian passage.

Verify before publication · high confidence · Minneapolis, Minn., Code of Ordinances § 403.50

STICKS, POLES & SIGN MATERIALS

No verified sidewalk pole restriction. No opened source established a citywide rule banning ordinary sticks, poles, or similar supports for a handheld sign on a sidewalk. A pole used as a weapon, used to threaten someone, or positioned to obstruct travel can still create criminal or safety exposure. Park rules separately restrict structures and certain equipment.

“No person shall, without a permit: ... station or erect any building, tent, canopy, stand, bandstand, stage, tower, scaffold, sound stage, platform, rostrum or other structure.”

Legal analysis. The Park Board policy requires a permit to station or erect a listed structure, but a person holding a sign is not necessarily erecting a structure. The record does not establish a current municipal sign-support dimension rule. This is an absence finding, not authorization to use dangerous or obstructive objects.

Editor's note. This absence conclusion does not address site-specific event permit conditions or weapons laws.

Verify before publication · medium confidence · Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, Policies and Guidelines Governing the Use of the Park System § C(vi)

STATIONARY & ATTACHED DISPLAYS

Attaching or leaving displays is restricted. Holding a sign is materially different from tying it to a pole, planting it, erecting a stand, or leaving it unattended. Park rules require a permit for listed structures. On sidewalks, an unattended object can obstruct passage and may be removed or cited under general rules.

“Whoever by an act or failure to perform a legal duty intentionally does any of the following is guilty of maintaining a public nuisance, which is a misdemeanor: ... interferes with, obstructs, or renders dangerous for passage, any public highway or right-of-way.”

Legal analysis. The Park Board policy expressly requires permits for structures. State public-nuisance law separately makes intentional obstruction of a public right-of-way a misdemeanor. Neither provision is a content-based rule about a sign's message.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minn. Stat. § 609.74(2)

GRAPHIC IMAGERY

No graphic-imagery rule verified. No opened city rule was found that bans a sign because its images are graphic or disturbing. Speech restrictions based on a sign's message face serious First Amendment limits. General laws against threats, obscenity, or obstruction remain distinct issues.

Legal analysis. The available current code chapters on noise, handbills, healthcare-facility access, and parades contain no opened text regulating graphic political imagery. A content-based restriction would require exceptionally strong constitutional justification.

Editor's note. This is an absence finding based on the demonstration-related chapters reviewed, not a ruling on every possible state obscenity or threat law.

No law on this point · medium confidence · Minneapolis Code of Ordinances, current code contents

§ Sound & amplification

AMPLIFIED SOUND

Permit generally required above 10 watts. A person using outdoor amplified sound ordinarily needs a city permit. A bullhorn or other amplification equipment of ten watts or less is categorically exempt from the outdoor-amplified-sound permit requirement between 7 a.m. and 10 p.m. Permitted sound is subject to event-tier limits, neighbor-notice requirements, and hours restrictions.

“Amplification equipment of ten (10) watt power or less such as a bullhorn shall be categorically exempt from requiring an outdoor amplifying sound equipment permit between the hours of 7:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m.”

Legal analysis. Section 389.105 establishes small-event, standard-event, and large-block-event permit types. It requires a daytime permit for outside amplified sound from 7 a.m. to 10 p.m, with an extended-hours permit outside those hours. The 2019 official amending ordinance provides the current text of the permit conditions and includes the ten-watt exemption.

Editor's note. The ten-watt exemption addresses the city amplified-sound permit requirement; it does not authorize obstruction, trespass, or sound that violates another applicable law.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minneapolis Ordinance No. 2019-062, amending § 389.105(c)(10)

NOISE LIMITS

Ambient-relative standards plus permit limits. The city does not rely on one single daytime number. For a complaint measured inside an occupied building, the general daytime threshold is 10 dB(C) Leq above background noise; nighttime is 5 dB(C) Leq above background. Outdoors, the city incorporates Minnesota Rules chapter 7030 and requires the sound to be at least 5 dB(A) over ambient noise. Permitted amplified sound also has separate limits: 80 dB(A) at 50 feet for small events and 90 dB(A) at 50 feet for standard and large-block events.

“Activities generating sound that is ten (10) dB(C) Leq or more above the ambient noise level during the daytime or five (5) dB(C) Leq or more above the ambient noise level during the nighttime when measured within a building occupied by the complainant.”

Legal analysis. Section 389.60(a) is an indoor, C-weighted, ambient-relative standard. Section 389.60(b) is an outdoor standard incorporating Minnesota Rules chapter 7030, subject to a 5 dB(A)-above-ambient threshold. Section 389.105(c)(3)-(6) separately establishes permit-tier sound limits. Section 389.60(d) requires compelling-interest and least-restrictive-means justification for a substantial religious-exercise burden; § 389.60(e) contains speech-protective, as-applied conditions. The city code therefore uses multiple standards and both dB(C) and dB(A), depending on the provision.

Editor's note. The distance-based plainly-audible conditions in § 389.105 also apply to amplified-sound permits and unpermitted amplification. The applicable limit depends on whether the conduct is being evaluated under the general noise provision or an amplification permit condition.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minneapolis, Minn., Code of Ordinances § 389.60(a)-(e) · Minneapolis Ordinance No. 2019-062, amending § 389.105(c)(3)-(6)

UNAMPLIFIED VOICE

Voice may still be regulated case by case. You do not need an outdoor amplified-sound permit merely to speak, chant, or sing without equipment. Loud unamplified conduct can still be assessed under general noise rules or other statutes, especially in residential settings at night. Peaceful speech receives the special protection written into the city noise chapter.

“No noise shall be prohibited or restricted under the authority of this section which substantially limits speech unless such a prohibition or restriction: (1) Serves a significant governmental interest as applied in a particular case.”

Legal analysis. The ten-watt exemption and § 389.105 concern amplification equipment. Section 389.60(e) provides that noise may not be restricted when it substantially limits speech unless the listed as-applied conditions are met. The disorderly-conduct statute still prohibits specified conduct, but its clause criminalizing disturbance of a lawful assembly was held unconstitutional in Hensel.

Editor’s note. The noise chapter’s speech safeguard does not create a categorical exemption from all general criminal laws.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minneapolis, Minn., Code of Ordinances § 389.60(e)

SENSITIVE LOCATIONS

No hospital-specific noise standard verified. The reviewed city noise provisions do not impose a special hospital, clinic, school, or courthouse decibel threshold. The healthcare-facility chapter is an access and driveway rule, not a sound rule. Standard and small-event amplified-sound permits cannot be issued for activity after 9 p.m. Sunday within 500 feet of residentially zoned property or a religious institution place of assembly.

“Standard and small event amplified sound permits shall not be issued for activities past 9:00 p.m. on Sundays within five hundred (500) feet of a residentially zoned property or religious institution place of assembly.”

Legal analysis. The location-specific Sunday condition appears in § 389.105(c)(12). General ambient-relative limits continue to apply elsewhere. The Chapter 405 healthcare rule prohibits physical disruption and driveway obstruction, subject to exceptions, and does not establish a fixed sound limit.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minneapolis Ordinance No. 2019-062, amending § 389.105(c)(12)

§ Recording & photography

THE STATE CONSENT LAW

One-party consent state. Minnesota is a one-party-consent state for covered communications. You may record a conversation you are part of without obtaining the other participant’s consent, unless the interception is for a criminal or tortious purpose. Public conversations often also lack the privacy expectation needed to qualify as protected oral communications.

“It is not unlawful under this chapter for a person not acting under color of law to intercept a wire, electronic, or oral communication where such person is a party to the communication or where one of the parties to the communication has given prior consent to such interception unless such communication is intercepted for the purpose of committing any criminal or tortious act.”

Legal analysis. Minn. Stat. § 626A.02, subd. 2(d), supplies the private-party one-party-consent exemption. The statute prohibits intentional interception generally and provides criminal and civil consequences for unlawful interception. The public-place analysis also depends on the statutory definition of an oral communication and reasonable expectations of privacy.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minn. Stat. § 626A.02, subd. 2(d)

RECORDING PEOPLE IN PUBLIC

Open public recording generally lawful. Recording people on a public sidewalk or at a public event is generally lawful. Do not use recording as part of threats, stalking, intimidation, or other targeted unlawful conduct. Minnesota’s harassment statute expressly preserves constitutionally protected activity, including peaceful handbilling and picketing, in its following-or-monitoring clause.

“Subdivision 2, clause (2), does not impair the right of any individual or group to engage in speech protected by the federal, state, or tribal constitutions, or federal, state, or tribal law, including peaceful and lawful handbilling and picketing.”

Legal analysis. Section 609.749 criminalizes specified acts only when paired with the required intent and harm or distress elements. Section 609.749, subd. 7, preserves protected conduct and specifically preserves peaceful and lawful handbilling and picketing from the following, monitoring, or pursuing clause. That does not immunize conduct meeting other statutory elements.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minn. Stat. § 609.749, subd. 7

RECORDING POLICE

First Amendment right not expressly recognized. The governing federal circuit has not issued an express decision saying the First Amendment right to record police in public is recognized. That uncertainty should not be confused with permission for officers to arrest without cause, seize a phone unlawfully, or retaliate for protected verbal criticism. Record from a distance and do not interfere

with police activity or cross police lines.

“Even if we were to assume they are correct, observing and recording police-citizen interactions was not a clearly established First Amendment right in 2015.”

Legal analysis. Robbins assumed a possible recording right for purposes of analysis but held that the plaintiff did not establish a clearly established right. Molina held that observation and recording were not clearly established First Amendment activity in the circumstances and time at issue. Neither opinion is an affirmative circuit holding recognizing the asserted right.

Editor’s note. The absence of an express Eighth Circuit recognition is not a conclusion that recording police is unprotected in every factual setting.

Verified at source · high confidence · Molina v. City of St. Louis, 59 F.4th 334 (8th Cir. 2023) · Robbins v. City of Des Moines, 984 F.3d 673 (8th Cir. 2021)

PUBLISHING FOOTAGE

Public-event publication generally protected. Publishing footage lawfully made in public is generally protected, especially when it concerns matters of public interest. Publishing can still create risk if material is false and defamatory, reveals genuinely private facts, unlawfully uses a likeness commercially, or violates a separate statute. Public visibility is important but not the only consideration.

Legal analysis. Minnesota’s recording statute addresses interception, not a general prohibition on publishing every lawfully acquired public recording. The Supreme Court’s protection for truthful publication of lawfully obtained information remains an important constitutional baseline, subject to fact-specific privacy and tort doctrines.

Editor’s note. The specific civil exposure for a proposed publication depends on the footage, captions, subjects, context, and use.

Verify before publication · medium confidence · Minn. Stat. § 626A.02

DRONES

Federal flight rules remain primary. A drone operator must comply with FAA operating rules, including rules applicable to operations over people. Park Board policy also treats remote-controlled aircraft activity on Park Board property as permit-regulated. This survey did not verify a separate citywide drone ordinance directed at demonstrations.

“bring, land or cause to ascend or descend or alight within MPRB property, any airplane, helicopter, flying machine including remote controlled aircraft, parachute or other apparatus for aviation;”

Legal analysis. The Park Board policy prohibits bringing, landing, causing to ascend, descend, or alight a remote-controlled aircraft on MPRB property without a permit. That is a property-use rule and does not replace federal airspace regulation.

Editor’s note. Check current FAA rules and the property owner’s rules before launching or landing.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, Policies and Guidelines Governing the Use of the Park System § C(ix)

§ Assembly & permits

WHEN A PERMIT IS REQUIRED

Street processions and amplification regulated. A person standing or walking on a sidewalk without taking over a street ordinarily is not seeking the type of street-use permission that parade permits address. Marches that use streets or alleys, planned blockages, and amplified sound can require permits. In parks, the Park Board’s free-speech exception applies to an individual or group of fewer than 50 participants for its special-event permit rule.

““Special Event” means any group activity including but not limited to a performance, contest, ceremony, athletic event or competition, promotion, or festival that: ... Does not generate revenue for the event organizer but involves 50 or more participants, and/or”

Legal analysis. The live Municode table of contents identifies Chapter 447’s permit-required and parade-definition provisions, but full section text was not available through the page output in this run. The Park Board policy expressly defines special events to include non-revenue events involving 50 or more participants and separately provides the under-50 public-forum exception.

Editor’s note. The exact current street-parade application timing and wording should be confirmed in the live Chapter 447 text before planning a street march.

Verify before publication · high confidence · Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, Policies and Guidelines Governing the Use of the Park System definition of “Special Event”

FEES, INSURANCE & INDEMNIFICATION

Park permits may require costs or insurance. If an event needs a Park Board permit, the Board may impose a deposit, insurance, or damage-reimbursement conditions. These conditions do not apply merely because a free-speech group of fewer than 50 people uses the policy’s public-forum exception. City sound and street-event fees should be checked in the current fee schedule.

“Based on the size, the Venue, and time of the event, as provided for in the Schedule of Fees and Required Services, an applicant may be required to provide a Security Deposit and Certificate of Insurance naming the MPRB as an insured, and/or agree to reimburse the MPRB for any damage to its property.”

Legal analysis. The Park Board policy authorizes event-specific deposits, insurance, and reimbursement. Constitutional rules prohibit viewpoint-based or unbridled fee systems, but the exact application of a requirement depends on the permit and event.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, Policies and Guidelines Governing the Use of the Park System § 2(C)

SPONTANEOUS & SMALL GROUPS

Small Park Board free-speech groups exempt. A spontaneous group of fewer than 50 people engaged in free speech in a Park Board public forum does not need a Park Board special-event permit under the written policy. A small sidewalk group likewise has no verified general assembly-permit threshold, so long as it does not use a street, obstruct passage, or use regulated amplification. The exception does not authorize structures, road closures, or amplification that separately require approval.

“Subject to the foregoing, and except as hereinafter provided, all Park Venues may be used by members of the public, without permit, for purposes consistent with the nature, policies, rules, and regulations of the MPRB, the safety and security of the public and MPRB staff, and the reasonable protection and maintenance MPRB property.”

Legal analysis. The policy's public-forum exception is express and is not conditioned on advance notice. The policy also says that all park venues may be used without a permit for uses consistent with its rules, subject to stated qualifications. This supports encoding the spontaneous/small-group exception as true.

Editor's note. The under-50 exception is a Park Board policy; it does not remove separate requirements for sound equipment, street occupation, or restricted park areas.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, Policies and Guidelines Governing the Use of the Park System §§ C(D), 1

DENIAL & APPEAL

Park denials require written reasons. For Park Board permits, you should receive a written decision. If denied, the policy says the notice must explain the grounds and, where feasible, identify ways to correct the application or get a permit. The policy also directs staff to offer feasible alternatives if a requested date and venue are unavailable.

“The determination shall not be based on the content or nature of the proposed permitted event.”

Legal analysis. The Park Board policy states that permit decisions are to rest on objective factors and not the content or nature of the proposed event. It requires written approval or denial within 14 days after a complete application. The current city street-parade appeal procedure was not independently reverified in this run.

Editor's note. Confirm current city procedures separately for a Chapter 447 parade or Chapter 389 sound permit.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, Policies and Guidelines Governing the Use of the Park System § 3(A)-(C)

§ Location rules

SIDEWALKS & STREETS

Obstruction of public ways prohibited. Leave room for pedestrians and do not block streets, sidewalks, building access, or driveways. Minnesota law makes intentional obstruction or making a public right-of-way dangerous for passage a misdemeanor. There is no verified citywide criminal clearance number in the sources opened here, so the key issue is actual obstruction or danger.

“Whoever by an act or failure to perform a legal duty intentionally does any of the following is guilty of maintaining a public nuisance, which is a misdemeanor: ... interferes with, obstructs, or renders dangerous for passage, any public highway or right-of-way.”

Legal analysis. Minn. Stat. § 609.74(2) is a general state enforcement tool for intentional obstruction of public highways and rights-of-way. It applies independently of whether a city permit process applies to planned street occupation.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minn. Stat. § 609.74(2)

PARKS & PLAZAS

Park speech exception below 50. Parks are governed by the Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board. Its policy expressly protects free-speech groups of fewer than 50 people from the special-event permit requirement. The policy distinguishes public forums from playgrounds, athletic fields, park roads, and other limited-use areas, and it separately regulates structures and amplified sound.

“Public Forums: Shall include any traditional Public Forum and any open area not classified as a Limited Use Area, Areas or Facilities Not Designated for Public Access, or Special Areas.”

Legal analysis. The policy defines public forums as traditional public forums and open areas not classified as limited-use, nonpublic-access, or special areas. It defines numerous limited-use areas, including pathways and park roads. The policy also requires permits for enumerated activities and limits use to consistent, safe, and protective purposes.

Editor's note. Verify the current Park Board code and any site-specific closure or permit condition before using a particular park location.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, Policies and Guidelines Governing the Use of the Park System, Classification of Park Property

HEALTHCARE BUFFER ZONES

No fixed buffer; access-obstruction rule. Minneapolis does not impose a fixed number of feet that demonstrators must stay away from a reproductive healthcare facility. It prohibits knowingly physically disrupting access, ingress, or egress, and separately prohibits entering onto or creating an obstruction in a facility driveway during business hours. Both provisions now expressly except conduct protected by the federal or Minnesota Constitutions or other federal or Minnesota law.

“Any person or group engaging in conduct protected by the United States Constitution, the Minnesota Constitution, or federal or Minnesota law.”

Legal analysis. The 2024 amending ordinance inserted exception (5) into both § 405.20 and § 405.30. The exception does not authorize physical blocking that is not constitutionally protected. Minnesota's civil harassment statute and the federal FACE Act may separately apply in appropriate circumstances, but this city ordinance is a no-obstruction model rather than a fixed or floating buffer zone.

Editor's note. The exception preserves protected conduct but is not a blanket permission to enter private property, obstruct a driveway, threaten, or physically interfere with access.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minneapolis ordinance amending Code §§ 405.20 and 405.30

RESIDENTIAL PICKETING

Targeted residential conduct can be restrained. Minnesota law treats certain repeated, targeted picketing at a particular home as harassment for purposes of a civil restraining order. It covers repeated marching, standing, or patrolling directed solely at one residential building when it adversely affects an occupant's safety, security, or privacy, or prevents entry or exit. This does not ban all marches through a neighborhood or all residential advocacy, but it makes targeted repeated conduct practically restrictable by court order.

““Targeted residential picketing” includes the following acts when committed on more than one occasion: (1) marching, standing, or patrolling by one or more persons directed solely at a particular residential building in a manner that adversely affects the safety, security, or privacy of an occupant of the building.”

Legal analysis. Minn. Stat. § 609.748, subd. 1(a)(2), expressly includes targeted residential picketing in the definition of harassment. Subdivision 1(c) limits the definition to acts committed on more than one occasion and specifies the targeted-residence and access-prevention criteria. A victim may seek a restraining order under subdivision 2. This supports encoding the statewide restriction as targeted_only.

Editor's note. This is a civil restraining-order mechanism; it does not establish a general criminal prohibition against every residential demonstration.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minn. Stat. § 609.748, subds. 1(a)(2), 1(c), 2(a)

SCHOOLS & OTHER SENSITIVE SITES

No school-specific protest rule verified. The general rules against obstruction, trespass, threats, and unlawful noise apply near schools, courthouses, and transit facilities. This review did not verify a separate Minneapolis rule that bans ordinary sidewalk demonstrations near schools while school is in session. Entering restricted property or disrupting operations remains a different issue.

Legal analysis. The reviewed city noise chapter contains a Sunday residential-or-religious-institution amplified-sound condition, not a school or hospital buffer. The absence finding is limited to the reviewed demonstration-related enactments.

Editor's note. Facility owners, school districts, courts, and transit agencies may impose rules on their own property.

No law on this point · medium confidence · Minneapolis, Minn., Code of Ordinances ch. 389

§ Person-to-person contact

LEAFLETING

Noncommercial sidewalk handbilling exempt. You may hand noncommercial literature to people on public sidewalks and in public parks without a Chapter 403 permit. Do not litter, trespass, block passage, or persist in conduct that becomes threatening or harassing. Rules for commercial solicitation and distribution on private or posted property are different.

“This chapter shall not apply to the distribution of non-commercial handbills by any person on foot on public sidewalks or in public parks.”

Legal analysis. Section 403.50 is a categorical chapter exception for noncommercial handbills distributed by a person on foot on public sidewalks or in public parks. It does not resolve every issue involving private property, vehicle leafleting, litter, or Park Board site restrictions.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minneapolis, Minn., Code of Ordinances § 403.50

APPROACHING PEOPLE

No fixed bubble zone verified. You may ordinarily approach people in a public place to speak or offer literature. Stop if conduct becomes threatening, physically obstructive, or part of a targeted course of conduct that causes the legally required fear or substantial emotional distress. The clinic ordinance is an access-obstruction rule, not a fixed-distance rule.

“A person who commits any of the acts listed in paragraph (c) is guilty of a gross misdemeanor if the person, with the intent to kill, injure, harass, or intimidate another person: ... causes or would reasonably be expected to cause substantial emotional distress to the other person.”

Legal analysis. Minnesota harassment requires both one of the listed acts and the required intent plus specified harm, fear, or emotional-distress threshold. Its constitutional-protection exception is especially relevant to following, monitoring, or pursuing conduct under § 609.749, subd. 2(c)(2).

Verified at source · high confidence · Minn. Stat. § 609.749, subd. 2(b)

HARASSMENT & DISORDERLY CONDUCT

Hensel invalidated assembly-disturbance clause. Minnesota's disorderly-conduct statute still lists several forms of conduct. But the Minnesota Supreme Court held the clause punishing disturbance of a lawful assembly or meeting unconstitutional because it was substantially overbroad. Harassment law also preserves protected speech and specifically protects peaceful and lawful handbilling and picketing from its following-or-monitoring clause.

“In State v. Hensel, 901 N.W.2d 166 (Minn 2017), subdivision 1, clause (2), was held unconstitutional under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution because it is substantially overbroad.”

Legal analysis. The Revisor's current statute page itself carries the Hensel note identifying § 609.72, subd. 1(2), as unconstitutional. The remaining statutory text includes fighting and offensive, obscene, abusive, boisterous, or noisy conduct or language under its own terms, subject to applicable First Amendment limitations. Section 609.749 requires the separate intent and harm elements described in that statute.

Editor's note. Do not treat § 609.72, subd. 1(2), as an enforceable element of disorderly conduct.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minn. Stat. § 609.72 and Revisor note citing State v. Hensel

ANONYMITY & MASKS

Anti-mask law has listed exceptions. Minnesota has an anti-mask statute. It contains exceptions for religious beliefs, amusement or entertainment, weather protection, and medical treatment. It does not contain a general demonstration exception in its current text. Anonymous handbilling and masking are legally distinct questions.

“A person whose identity is concealed by the person in a public place by means of a robe, mask, or other disguise, unless based on religious beliefs, or incidental to amusement, entertainment, protection from weather, or medical treatment, is guilty of a misdemeanor.”

Legal analysis. The current statute's text does not expressly require proof of a separate intent to conceal identity; it applies where the person's identity “is concealed” by the person in public using the specified means, subject to its enumerated exceptions. Bills proposed amendments in the 2025-2026 biennium but did not become law before the biennium ended.

Editor's note. Whether a particular face covering qualifies as medical treatment or weather protection can be fact dependent.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minn. Stat. § 609.735

§ Police interaction

IDENTIFICATION

No general duty to identify. Minnesota is not a general stop-and-identify state. You should not give a false name, false date of birth, or false identification to an officer during a lawful stop, arrest, or other legal-duty inquiry when acting with intent to obstruct justice. Silence and false information are different issues.

“Whoever with intent to obstruct justice gives a fictitious name other than a nickname, or gives a false date of birth, or false or fraudulently altered identification card to a peace officer ... is guilty of a misdemeanor.”

Legal analysis. Section 609.506, subd. 1, is a misdemeanor false-information offense; subdivision 2 increases the offense where a person gives another person's name and date of birth. Neither provision commands disclosure of one's own identity. Any lawful detention must independently satisfy constitutional standards.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minn. Stat. § 609.506, subd. 1

DISPERSAL ORDERS

Refusal at unlawful assembly is misdemeanor. Police may direct people to leave an unlawful assembly. If a person is present without lawful purpose and refuses to leave when directed by law enforcement, Minnesota law makes that a misdemeanor. A peaceful gathering is not automatically an unlawful assembly merely because it is a protest.

“Whoever without lawful purpose is present at the place of an unlawful assembly and refuses to leave when so directed by a law enforcement officer is guilty of a misdemeanor.”

Legal analysis. Section 609.705 requires three or more people and one of its listed force, public-peace, or disorderly-conduct conditions. Section 609.715 supplies the refusal-to-leave offense. Constitutional limits remain important where police use these statutes against expressive activity.

Editor’s note. The safest immediate response to a dispersal order is fact dependent; challenging an allegedly unlawful order normally occurs through legal process rather than physical resistance.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minn. Stat. § 609.715 · Minn. Stat. § 609.705

COMMON CHARGES & OUTCOMES

Obstruction, assembly, disorderly charges possible. The statutes most directly relevant to demonstrations include obstruction of public rights-of-way, unlawful assembly, refusal to leave an unlawful assembly, disorderly conduct, trespass, and harassment in appropriate facts. A misdemeanor ordinarily carries up to 90 days in jail, a \$1,000 fine, or both. Exact charging and disposition data for Minneapolis protests were not independently verified in this adjudication.

“If the crime is a misdemeanor, to imprisonment for not more than 90 days or to payment of a fine of not more than \$1,000, or both.”

Legal analysis. Minn. Stat. § 609.03 supplies default punishment where no different punishment is provided, and the definitions statute confirms the misdemeanor ceiling. The underlying statutes have distinct elements; for example, obstruction requires intentional interference, while unlawful assembly requires three persons plus one of § 609.705’s criteria. Hensel eliminates reliance on § 609.72, subd. 1(2).

Editor’s note. This is a typical misdemeanor-level summary, not a statement that every demonstration-related offense is a misdemeanor.

Verified at source · high confidence · Minn. Stat. § 609.03(3)

§ Law-in-effect vs. law-on-the-books

ENFORCEMENT REALITY

Written rules and reform agreement matter. The City states that its court-enforceable settlement agreement with the Minnesota Department of Human Rights provides a framework for lawful, non-discriminatory policing and better public safety. That agreement does not eliminate ordinary enforcement of obstruction, unlawful assembly, noise, or other laws. The practical treatment of a particular protest can depend heavily on facts, police orders, crowd conditions, and current department policy.

“The settlement agreement outlines a framework for: Lawful, non-discriminatory policing; Better support for public safety in Minneapolis.”

Legal analysis. The city states that the Council and Mayor approved settlement terms on March 31, 2023 and provides the agreement and independent-evaluator reports. This adjudication did not independently verify a particular MPD crowd-management policy provision or the outcomes of particular protest arrests, so no specific operational claim is made here.

Editor’s note. Review current MPD policies and the current status of court monitoring before relying on operational expectations for a large event.

Verified at source · medium confidence · City of Minneapolis, Court-enforceable settlement agreement

☒ Penalties a demonstrator could face

OFFENSE	LEVEL	PENALTY
Public nuisance by obstruction of a public right-of-way — Minn. Stat. § 609.74(2)	Misdemeanor	Up to 90 days jail, \$1,000 fine, or both if no different punishment applies
Unlawful assembly — Minn. Stat. § 609.705	Misdemeanor	Up to 90 days jail, \$1,000 fine, or both
Presence at unlawful assembly after direction to leave — Minn. Stat. § 609.715	Misdemeanor	Up to 90 days jail, \$1,000 fine, or both

OFFENSE	LEVEL	PENALTY
Disorderly conduct, except invalid § 609.72, subd. 1(2) clause — Minn. Stat. § 609.72	Misdemeanor	Up to 90 days jail, \$1,000 fine, or both
Concealing identity in public without an exception — Minn. Stat. § 609.735	Misdemeanor	Up to 90 days jail, \$1,000 fine, or both

Recent changes

- May 2026

SF 3699, an omnibus immigration-enforcement and civil-remedies bill that included identity-concealment amendments, passed the Senate as amended but shows no House action or final enactment; it is dead by adjournment. HF 5149 proposed related identity-concealment amendments but its House motion to suspend rules failed on May 17, 2026.
- Mar 2026

SF 4413 and SF 4582 proposed additional modifications to the public identity-concealment statute and law-enforcement exceptions. Their official pages show introduction and committee referral only; both are dead by adjournment.
- Feb 2026

HF 3412 and SF 3590 proposed amendments to Minnesota's identity-concealment statute, including an airborne-toxin exception and specified law-enforcement exceptions. Neither became law before adjournment of the 94th Legislature.
- Apr 2025

SF 3208, which proposed a reimbursement program for agencies responding to protests and demonstrations at the Capitol complex and governor's residence, was introduced and referred but did not become law before the 94th Legislature ended.
- Mar 2025

HF 2809, proposing a crime of residential protesting, and SF 3359, independently proposing a residential-protesting crime, were introduced and referred but show no enactment; both are dead by adjournment of the 94th Legislature.
- Feb 2025

SF 1501, proposed increased penalties for obstructing traffic access to a trunk highway or airport, was introduced and referred without further legislative action shown on its bill page; it is dead by adjournment of the 94th Legislature.
- Jan 2025

SF 708 was introduced to bar state loans, grants, and assistance for persons convicted of offenses related to protests, demonstrations, rallies, civil unrest, or marches. It received only referral action on its official bill page and is dead by the adjournment of the 94th Legislature.
- Dec 2024

Minneapolis amended its reproductive-healthcare-facility access and driveway provisions to add an exception for persons or groups engaged in conduct protected by the United States Constitution, Minnesota Constitution, or federal or Minnesota law.

Pending changes to watch

Minnesota Department of Human Rights–City of Minneapolis court-enforceable settlement agreement

Litigation · Ongoing court-enforceable settlement framework; the city provides independent-evaluator reports and continuing policy-feedback materials.

Continuing monitoring and policy development may affect Minneapolis police practices relevant to demonstrations and crowd management.

Key authorities

- Minneapolis Noise Ordinance**

Minneapolis, Minn., Code of Ordinances ch. 389

Establishes general ambient-relative noise standards, state-rule incorporation, and express speech and religious-exercise safeguards.
- Outdoor amplified sound amendment**

Minneapolis Ordinance No. 2019-062, amending § 389.105

Sets permit tiers, 80/90 dB(A) limits, plainly-audible conditions, and the ten-watt bullhorn exemption.
- Reproductive healthcare facilities access amendment**

Minneapolis Code §§ 405.20, 405.30

Prohibits physical access disruption and driveway obstruction while expressly excepting protected conduct.
- MPRB park-use policy**

Minneapolis Park and Recreation Board, Policies and Guidelines Governing the Use of the Park System (May 5, 2021)

Exempts under-50 free-speech groups from special-event permits and regulates park structures, equipment, and public-forum areas.

Minnesota one-party consent statute Minn. Stat. § 626A.02

Permits private-party interception where the recorder is a party or one party consents, subject to the criminal-or-tortious-purpose limitation.

Minnesota targeted residential picketing rule Minn. Stat. § 609.748

Defines targeted residential picketing as harassment for civil restraining-order purposes.

Minnesota harassment and stalking statute Minn. Stat. § 609.749

Sets criminal harassment elements and expressly preserves protected peaceful handbilling and picketing from its following-or-monitoring clause.

Minnesota disorderly conduct statute Minn. Stat. § 609.72

Defines disorderly conduct while carrying a Revisor note that the lawful-assembly disturbance clause is unconstitutional under Hensel.

Minnesota obstruction statute Minn. Stat. § 609.74

Makes intentional obstruction or dangerous interference with a public right-of-way a misdemeanor.

Minnesota identity-concealment statute Minn. Stat. § 609.735

Makes public identity concealment a misdemeanor subject to religion, entertainment, weather, and medical-treatment exceptions.

Robbins v. City of Des Moines 984 F.3d 673 (8th Cir. 2021)

Does not expressly recognize a First Amendment right to record police and holds the asserted right was not clearly established on its facts.

Molina v. City of St. Louis 59 F.4th 334 (8th Cir. 2023)

Confirms that observation and recording of police-citizen interactions were not a clearly established First Amendment right in the case's relevant period.

MDHR–Minneapolis court-enforceable settlement agreement City of Minneapolis court-enforceable settlement agreement

Provides the continuing state settlement and independent-evaluator framework relevant to Minneapolis police policy.

§ Research notes

Overall confidence: Medium. This adjudicated survey is current through July 21, 2026. The most important practical distinctions are between sidewalk use and street occupation, unamplified speech and outdoor amplification, and ordinary neighborhood advocacy versus repeated conduct targeted solely at a particular residence. Check the live city code, Park Board rules, current police policies, and event-specific permit conditions before relying on this document for a planned event.

Unresolved points. The live Municode pages for Chapters 403, 405, and 447 returned chapter navigation rather than all operative section text in this run. The Chapter 405 amendment PDF and the noise chapter were independently opened, but exact current parade-section wording should be checked before a street march. — No official source opened in this run established the exact date on which the 94th Legislature adjourned sine die. The official Senate page states that the Senate is adjourned until January 12, 2027, so unpassed 94th-Legislature bills are treated as dead by adjournment, but the specific adjournment date is left unresolved. — No specific current MPD crowd-management policy provision was verified in this adjudication. Check the city policy portal and current settlement-monitoring material before a large demonstration.

Generated from the structured demonstration-law deep-research record for Minneapolis, Minnesota (research completed 2026-07-21). Findings marked “verify before publication” have not yet been confirmed by an editor at the cited source. This document has not been reviewed by a lawyer and should not be used as legal advice.