

1 COOPER AND KIRK, PLLC
 Charles J. Cooper (DC Bar No. 248070)*
 2 *ccooper@cooperkirk.com*
 David H. Thompson (DC Bar No. 450503)*
 3 *dthompson@cooperkirk.com*
 Howard C. Nielson, Jr. (DC Bar No. 473018)*
 4 *hnielson@cooperkirk.com*
 Nicole J. Moss (DC Bar No. 472424)*
 5 *nmoss@cooperkirk.com*
 Peter A. Patterson (Ohio Bar No. 0080840)*
 6 *ppatterson@cooperkirk.com*
 1523 New Hampshire Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
 7 Telephone: (202) 220-9600, Facsimile: (202) 220-9601

8 LAW OFFICES OF ANDREW P. PUGNO
 Andrew P. Pugno (CA Bar No. 206587)
 9 *andrew@pugnotlaw.com*
 101 Parkshore Drive, Suite 100, Folsom, California 95630
 10 Telephone: (916) 608-3065, Facsimile: (916) 608-3066

11 ALLIANCE DEFENSE FUND
 Brian W. Raum (NY Bar No. 2856102)*
 12 *braum@telladf.org*
 James A. Campbell (OH Bar No. 0081501)*
 13 *jcampbell@telladf.org*
 15100 North 90th Street, Scottsdale, Arizona 85260
 14 Telephone: (480) 444-0020, Facsimile: (480) 444-0028

15 ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT-INTERVENORS DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH,
 GAIL J. KNIGHT, MARTIN F. GUTIERREZ, HAK-SHING WILLIAM TAM,
 16 MARK A. JANSSON, and PROTECTMARRIAGE.COM – YES ON 8, A
 PROJECT OF CALIFORNIA RENEWAL

17 * Admitted *pro hac vice*

18 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
 19 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

20 KRISTIN M. PERRY, SANDRA B. STIER, PAUL
 21 T. KATAMI, and JEFFREY J. ZARRILLO,

22 Plaintiffs,

23 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,

24 Plaintiff-Intervenor,

25 v.

26 ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, in his official
 27 capacity as Governor of California; EDMUND G.
 BROWN, JR., in his official capacity as Attorney
 28 General of California; MARK B. HORTON, in his

CASE NO. 09-CV-2292 VRW

**DEFENDANT-INTERVENORS’
 OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE**

Pretrial Conference

Date: December 16, 2009
 Time: 10:00 a.m.
 Judge: Chief Judge Vaughn R. Walker
 Location: Courtroom 6, 17th Floor

Trial Date: January 11, 2010

1 official capacity as Director of the California
2 Department of Public Health and State Registrar of
3 Vital Statistics; LINETTE SCOTT, in her official
4 capacity as Deputy Director of Health Information
5 & Strategic Planning for the California Department
6 of Public Health; PATRICK O'CONNELL, in his
7 official capacity as Clerk-Recorder for the County
8 of Alameda; and DEAN C. LOGAN, in his official
9 capacity as Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk for
10 the County of Los Angeles,

11
12 Defendants,

13 and

14 PROPOSITION 8 OFFICIAL PROPONENTS
15 DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH, GAIL J.
16 KNIGHT, MARTIN F. GUTIERREZ, HAK-
17 SHING WILLIAM TAM, and MARK A.
18 JANSSON; and PROTECTMARRIAGE.COM –
19 YES ON 8, A PROJECT OF CALIFORNIA
20 RENEWAL,

21 Defendant-Intervenors.

22
23 Additional Counsel for Defendant-Intervenors

24 ALLIANCE DEFENSE FUND

25 Timothy Chandler (CA Bar No. 234325)

26 *tchandler@telladf.org*

27 101 Parkshore Drive, Suite 100, Folsom, California 95630

28 Telephone: (916) 932-2850, Facsimile: (916) 932-2851

Jordan W. Lorence (DC Bar No. 385022)*

jlorence@telladf.org

Austin R. Nimocks (TX Bar No. 24002695)*

animocks@telladf.org

801 G Street NW, Suite 509, Washington, D.C. 20001

Telephone: (202) 393-8690, Facsimile: (202) 347-3622

* Admitted *pro hac vice*

**DEFENDANT-INTERVENORS' STATEMENT OF OBJECTIONS
TO EVIDENCE EXPECTED TO BE OFFERED AT TRIAL**

Pursuant to the Court's Pretrial Scheduling Order, Doc # 164, Defendant-Intervenors ("Proponents") respectfully submit that they "anticipat[e] making an objection to" the following "testimony or exhibits expected to be offered":

- On privilege grounds, exhibits or testimony constituting or relating to nonpublic information and/or Proponents' subjective intent and beliefs, the introduction of which would violate the First Amendment Privilege against compelled disclosure of core political speech and association.
- On relevance grounds, exhibits or testimony constituting or relating to nonpublic information not before the electorate at the time Proposition 8 was adopted and/or Proponents' subjective intent and beliefs, to the extent introduced in relation to the voters' intent or motivation in adopting Proposition 8 or the purposes or rationality of that provision.
- On relevance grounds, any exhibits or testimony falling within any of the categories of information that the Court has already deemed irrelevant, not subject to discovery, or both. *See* Doc # 214; Doc # 252.
- On relevance grounds, exhibits or testimony constituting or relating to public documents relating to the intent or motivations of the electorate in adopting Proposition 8—aside from the language of the ballot measure and, if necessary to resolve textual ambiguity, the official ballot arguments—and including advertisements, campaign materials, and other communications and information relating to the adoption of Proposition 8.

Dated: December 7, 2009

COOPER AND KIRK, PLLC
ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT-INTERVENORS
DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH, GAIL J. KNIGHT,
MARTIN F. GUTIERREZ, HAK-SHING WILLIAM TAM,
MARK A. JANSSON, AND PROTECTMARRIAGE.COM –
YES ON 8, A PROJECT OF CALIFORNIA RENEWAL

By: /s/Charles J. Cooper
Charles J. Cooper