

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 (OH 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’  
 MEMORANDUM IN OPPOSITON TO  
 PLAINTIFFS’ AND PLAINTIFF-  
 INTERVENOR’S MOTION IN  
 LIMINE TO EXCLUDE THE EXPERT  
 REPORT, OPINION, AND  
 TESTIMONY OF KENNETH P.  
 MILLER**

**Pretrial Conference**

Date: December 16, 2009  
 Time: 10:00 a.m.  
 Judge: Chief Judge Vaughn R. Walker

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*

Location: Courtroom 6, 17th Floor

Trial Date: January 11, 2010

1 Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenor (collectively, “Plaintiffs”) contend that certain paragraphs  
 2 contained in Dr. Kenneth P. Miller’s expert rebuttal report do not present rebuttal information and  
 3 are improperly duplicative of another expert’s report. Defendant-Intervenors (“Proponents”)
 4 respectfully submit that Plaintiffs’ claims lack merit, and thus that their motion *in limine* to exclude  
 5 Dr. Miller’s expert report, opinion, and testimony should be denied.

### 6 **FACTS**

7 In an August 19, 2009 Minute Entry the Court established October 2, 2009, as the deadline  
 8 for producing expert reports pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(2)(B). *See* Doc #  
 9 160. The parties accordingly exchanged expert reports on that date; among the reports submitted  
 10 by Proponents was one written by Dr. Paul Nathanson, *see* Doc # 280-4; among those submitted  
 11 by Plaintiffs was one written by Dr. Gary M. Segura, *see* Doc # 280-3. The parties agreed to  
 12 exchange rebuttal expert reports on November 9. On that date, Proponents produced an expert  
 13 rebuttal report written by Dr. Kenneth P. Miller. *See* Doc # 280-6.

14 Plaintiffs filed a motion *in limine* on December 7 asking this Court to exclude paragraphs  
 15 53-72 of Dr. Miller’s expert rebuttal report on the grounds that the information (a) is not rebuttal  
 16 information and (b) duplicates Dr. Nathanson’s report. Doc # 280 at 5. A recounting of the  
 17 relevant expert reports demonstrates that Plaintiffs’ claims are without merit.

#### 18 **Report of Dr. Paul Nathanson**

19 Dr. Nathanson’s report examines the views of religious organizations, religious people,  
 20 and gay rights advocates in California to answer three questions:

- 21 (1) Is religion inherently incompatible with the redefinition of marriage to include gay  
 couples?
- 22 (2) Does religious support for the historical definition of marriage necessarily entail  
 animus toward gay people, thus amounting to bigotry and “bad faith?”
- 23 (3) Do secular advocates for gay marriage ignore religion?

24 Doc # 280-4 at 6. Dr. Nathanson’s report answers each of the questions it poses in the negative. As  
 25 these questions indicate, the “material aspect” of Proponents’ case that Dr. Nathanson’s report  
 26 “logically advances” is that Proposition 8 should not be invalidated on the ground that it was driven  
 27 by animus or any other improper motivation. *Daubert v. Merrell Dow Pharm.*, 43 F.3d 1311, 1315  
 28 (9th Cir. 1995).

1 **Report of Dr. Gary M. Segura**

2 Dr. Segura's report addresses "the relative political power of gays and lesbians as a class of  
3 citizens, and their level of political vulnerability." Doc # 280-3 at 3. The report, among other  
4 things, identifies several purported manifestations of gays' and lesbians' political powerlessness, *id.*  
5 at 5-9, and alleged factors contributing to such powerlessness, *id.* at 9-13. Among the contributing  
6 factors Dr. Segura identifies are "moral and political condemnation" and "powerful, numerous, and  
7 well-funded opposition." *Id.* at 13. In his discussion of each of these factors, set out in full below,  
8 Dr. Segura assigns a primary role to religious beliefs:

9 **Moral and Political Condemnation:** While the pluralist framework envisions  
10 shifting majorities and rotation in office, Old Testament prohibitions of  
11 homosexuality serve to create, in many of America's religious communities, a  
12 permanent majority that believes homosexual conduct is sinful and immoral and that  
13 it should be condemned and discouraged. The General Social Survey (downloadable  
14 from the National Opinion Research Center) regularly asks a representative sample of  
15 Americans to evaluate whether homosexual relations are "wrong." In 2008, those data  
16 show that 51.5% of Americans still report that sex between two persons of the same  
17 sex is "always wrong" while another 10.3% agree that it is "sometimes" or "almost  
18 always" wrong. Moreover, the shift in the direction of tolerance is neither large nor  
19 rapid. A decade ago, a module from the same survey shows the comparable numbers  
20 as 56% and 11.8% respectively.

21 **Powerful, Numerous, and Well-Funded Opposition:** The moral condemnation of  
22 homosexual acts fuels and supports political opposition to protections and benefits for  
23 gays and lesbians. Campbell and Robinson (2007) found that opposition to same-sex  
24 marriages united leadership and core believers across religious traditions. Similarly,  
25 the San Francisco Chronicle reported that the campaign in favor of Proposition 8 was  
26 conceived and funded by a cooperative effort of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of  
27 San Francisco and the senior leadership of the Mormon Church. Churches provide a  
28 well-funded, widely spread, untaxed medium in which individuals opposed to gay  
and lesbian policy goals can disseminate political messages and campaign materials,  
as well as engage in fundraising. Moreover, national religious movements like Focus  
on the Family, the Traditional Values Coalition, the Family Research Council, and  
other groups provide a national network for pressuring elected officials, fundraising,  
message testing, media dissemination and publication, mobilization and coordination  
across states and jurisdictions. This nationwide co-ordination, for example, explains  
how 14 statewide initiatives appeared in a single year, 2004. Cahill (2007) documents  
the vast economic resources of these organizations and their willingness to provide  
them to political efforts to prevent or reverse rights, benefits, or protections for gays  
and lesbians. Gays and lesbians lack the resources, numbers, and reach to counter this  
kind of committed, organized opposition to their interests.

*Id.*

26 Dr. Segura's report concludes that gays and lesbians do not have political power in the sense  
27 that they have not demonstrated that they can "compel" favorable outcomes from the political  
28 system. *Id.* at 5.

1 **Rebuttal Report of Dr. Kenneth P. Miller**

2 Dr. Miller’s rebuttal report expressly sets out to “address[] issues raised by plaintiffs’ expert  
3 witness, Dr. Gary M. Segura.” Doc # 280-6 at 2. To do so, his report “present[s] evidence that  
4 gays and lesbians ... have achieved significant political power in California and elsewhere in the  
5 United States.” *Id.* Part of this evidence consists of “the expanding coalition supporting LGBT  
6 rights” in California. *Id.* at 12. As Dr. Miller explains, gays and lesbians have strong allies in  
7 organized labor, corporations, professional associations, newspapers, political parties, state and  
8 local elected officials, and churches and other faith-based organizations. *Id.* at 12-31. Paragraphs  
9 53 through 72, part of this discussion of gays’ and lesbians’ political coalition, address churches and  
10 other faith-based organizations. They show, among other things, that religious groups were on both  
11 sides of the debate over Proposition 8.

12 **ARGUMENT**

13 **I. Dr. Miller’s Report Rebutts Dr. Segura’s**

14 Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(a)(2) provides that parties are not only to disclose the  
15 identities of their expert witnesses but also that in many circumstances they are required to  
16 accompany this disclosure with “a written report ... prepared and signed by the witness.” For  
17 experts whose “evidence is intended solely to contradict or rebut evidence on the same subject  
18 matter identified by another party[‘s]” initial expert disclosures, the rules establish a default  
19 deadline of 30 days following those initial disclosures for a party to disclose their identity and  
20 reports. FED. R. CIV. P. 26(a)(2)(C)(ii). Plaintiffs’ claim that the challenged paragraphs of Dr.  
21 Miller’s report was not timely disclosed rests on their contention that they do not consist of  
22 rebuttal material; Plaintiffs in other words do not challenge the timeliness of the disclosure if it is  
23 properly deemed rebuttal information—as is clearly the case.

24 As we have explained, Dr. Segura’s report aims to provide evidence on the subject of the  
25 “relative political power of gays and lesbians.” Doc # 280-3 at 3. The challenged discussion in  
26 Dr. Miller’s report would rebut Dr. Segura’s evidence on this “same subject matter” even if Dr.  
27 Segura did not discuss religion *at all*. FED. R. CIV. P. 26(a)(2)(C)(ii); *see TC Sys. Inc. v. Town of*  
28 *Colonie*, 213 F. Supp. 2d 171, 180 (N.D.N.Y 2002) (declining to “narrowly construe the phrase

1 ‘same subject matter’ beyond its plain language” because to do so “would impose an additional  
 2 restriction on parties that is not included in the Rules”); *Lindner v. Meadow Gold Dairies, Inc.*,  
 3 249 F.R.D. 625, 636 (D. Haw. 2008) (explaining that so long as a rebuttal report contradicts or  
 4 rebuts the “subject matter” of principal reports it does not matter that a rebuttal expert did not  
 5 review those reports). As Dr. Miller’s report explains, religious groups form part of the political  
 6 coalition that champions the gay and lesbian rights movement in California. This growing political  
 7 coalition “helps explain why the movement has been so successful in achieving legislative  
 8 victories in California over the past decade, and why it can continue to rely on democratic  
 9 institutions to pursue its goals.” Doc # 280-6 at 12. Evidence of the membership and activities of  
 10 this political coalition serves to “explain, repel, counteract or disprove” Segura’s claim that gays  
 11 and lesbians are politically powerless—even apart from of his discussion of religion—and is thus  
 12 “properly admissible” as rebuttal evidence. *Crowley v. Chait*, 322 F. Supp. 2d 530, 551 (D. N.J.  
 13 2004).

14 Dr. Segura’s report, however, *does* discuss religion’s role in affecting the political power of  
 15 gays and lesbians. And as the lengthy excerpt from his report included above demonstrates, it does  
 16 so extensively. His bottom line assertion is that “[g]ays and lesbians lack the resources, numbers,  
 17 and reach to counter [the] kind of committed, organized opposition to their interests” inspired by  
 18 religion. Doc # 280-3 at 13.

19 Plaintiffs, not Dr. Miller, have “seized upon a single line” and attempted to make it the sum  
 20 and substance of Dr. Segura’s testimony.<sup>1</sup> Doc # 280 at 10-11. While the implications of that

---

22 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs’ reference to *United States v. Southern California Edison Co.*, 1:01-CV-5167,  
 23 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 24592, at \*14-16 (E.D. Cal. Sept. 23, 2005) is thus inapposite. The other  
 24 cases Plaintiffs’ cite likewise fail to advance their cause. In *Jarritos, Inc. v. Los Jarritos*, 05-02380,  
 25 2007 U.S. Dist LEXIS 32245 (N.D. Cal. May 2, 2007), *rev’d on other grounds, Jarritos, Inc. v.*  
 26 *Reyes*, No. 07-16083, 2009 U.S. App. LEXIS 18225 (9th Cir. Aug. 14, 2009), the Court excluded  
 27 rebuttal reports that “fail[ed] to consider or address the substance” of the expert-in-chief’s report,  
 28 *id.* at \*19. Dr. Miller’s report, however, is entirely keyed to rebutting Dr. Segura’s. In *J.W. v. City*  
*of Oxnard*, 07-06171, 2008 WL 4810298 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 27, 2009) the Court excluded rebuttal  
 testimony on a subject—police procedures—that was not the subject of *any* expert testimony by the  
 opposing party, *id.* at \*4. That is plainly not the case here. Finally, in *Lindner v. Meadow Gold*  
*Dairies, Inc.*, 249 F.R.D. 625 (D. Haw. 2008), although Court did exclude a portion of a rebuttal  
 (Continued)

1 line—“that the campaign in favor of Proposition 8 was conceived and funded by a cooperative  
 2 effort of the Roman Catholic Archbishop of San Francisco and the senior leadership of the Mormon  
 3 Church,” Doc # 280-3 at 13—are rebutted by Dr. Miller’s evidence that religious groups were on  
 4 both sides of the debate over Proposition 8, Dr. Miller’s evidence also repudiates Dr. Segura’s  
 5 broader arguments that gays and lesbians are politically powerless in the face of a coordinated  
 6 movement allegedly fueled by religiously-inspired moral and political condemnation of gays and  
 7 lesbians.<sup>2</sup>

## 8 **II. Dr. Miller’s Report Does Not Improperly Duplicate Dr. Nathanson’s Report**

9 Plaintiffs also contend that Dr. Miller’s report improperly duplicates Dr. Nathanson’s report,  
 10 insinuating that “Proponents are likely violating the rules governing rebuttal reports in an attempt to  
 11 substitute a new expert for a prior expert with whom they may now not wish to proceed.” Doc #  
 12 280 at 12. Plaintiffs have no basis for this charge. As an initial matter, Proponents’ pretrial  
 13 disclosures indicate that they “expect to present” Dr. Nathanson’s testimony at trial. Doc # 292 at 3  
 14 & n.1. Moreover, there is nothing improper about the fact that Dr. Miller’s report contains  
 15 information similar to that contained in Dr. Nathanson’s.

16 First, while Dr. Miller and Dr. Nathanson present similar evidence about religious attitudes  
 17 toward Proposition 8 and same-sex marriage, they employ that evidence for different reasons. Dr.  
 18 Nathanson’s report, as we have explained, is intended primarily to demonstrate that religion played a  
 19 role on both sides of the Proposition 8 campaign, that religious opposition to Proposition 8 is not  
 20 tantamount to animus against gays and lesbians and, in short, that Proposition 8 is not tainted by  
 21 animus or any other improper motivations. Dr. Miller’s rebuttal report, on the other hand, addresses  
 22 a different subject—the political power of gays and lesbians. The challenged paragraphs of his

23 (Cont’d)

24 report, the excluded part did not “contradict or rebut *anything*” in the reports it was allegedly  
 25 countering, *id.* at 637 (emphasis added).

26 <sup>2</sup> Plaintiffs also complain that the challenged section of Dr. Miller’s rebuttal report takes up  
 27 “six single-spaced pages.” Doc # 280 at 6. Those six pages, however, are all in service of rebutting  
 28 Dr. Segura’s expert report regarding the political power of gays and lesbians. Dr. Miller’s “expert  
 rebuttal report does exactly what it says: it rebuts, in the form of a *complete statement* of all of the  
 opinions expressed by the author, the report of the opposing party’s expert.” *Long Term Capital  
 Holdings v. United States*, 3:01-CV-1290, 2003 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 13256, \*7-8 (D. Conn. May 15,  
 2003) (emphasis added).

1 report are contained under the broader heading of “The Expanding LGBT Rights Coalition,” Doc #  
2 280-6 at 12, and they help to demonstrate that members of the religious community are a part of this  
3 coalition.<sup>3</sup>

4 Second, it is of no moment that Proponents could have anticipated that a rebuttal to  
5 Plaintiffs’ political power expert may include a discussion of the California religious community’s  
6 position on Proposition 8 and same-sex marriage generally. In order to prevail on their claim that  
7 gays and lesbians are a “suspect class” under the Equal Protection Clause, Plaintiffs must show that  
8 gays and lesbians are politically powerless. *See City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Ctr.*, 473 U.S.  
9 432, 445 (1985); *High Tech Gays v. Defense Indus. Sec. Clearance Office*, 895 F.2d 563, 573 (9th  
10 Cir. 1990). “In most cases,” the rule writers have explained, “the party with the burden of proof on  
11 an issue should disclose its expert testimony on that issue before other parties are required to make  
12 their disclosures with respect to that issue.” Notes of Advisory Committee on 1993 Amendments,  
13 FED. R. CIV. PROC. 26. The Court surely did nothing in this case to upset the default rule that  
14 rebuttal reports are not due until after the parties make their initial expert disclosures. *See* FED. R.  
15 CIV. PROC. 26(a)(2)(C)(ii). And Plaintiffs’ have pointed to no authority for the argument that  
16 Proponents should have disclosed the challenged paragraphs of Dr. Miller’s rebuttal report with  
17 their initial expert disclosures if they knew or suspected there would be a need for the evidence.  
18 *See* Doc # 280 at 12. To the contrary, “[a]ll that is required is for the [rebuttal] information to repel  
19 other expert testimony.” *Crowley*, 322 F. Supp. 2d at 551. If Plaintiffs’ position were the rule, it  
20 “would lead to the inclusion of vast amounts of arguably irrelevant material in an expert’s report on  
21 the off chance that failing to include any information in anticipation” of another expert’s testimony  
22 would prevent the expert from introducing the information at all. *Id.*

23  
24 <sup>3</sup> *Scientific Components Corp. v. Sirenza Microdevices, Inc.*, 03-CV-1251, 2008 U.S. Dist.  
25 LEXIS 92703 (E.D.N.Y. Nov. 13, 2008), is thus off-point. Indeed, while in that case the district  
26 court held that one part a rebuttal expert’s report was improperly repetitive, it rejected a similar  
27 challenge with respect to two other parts of the rebuttal expert’s report. *Id.* at \*9. In one of those  
28 instances, both the initial expert and the rebuttal expert discussed low frequency oscillation in  
amplifiers, but for different purposes. The initial report offered “a general overview” of the subject,  
while the rebuttal report contrasted it to “noise” in response to an alleged confusion of these  
phenomena in an expert report submitted by the opposing party. *Id.* at \*10 & n.2. The Court held  
that this was “appropriate rebuttal testimony.” *Id.* at \*10.



1 **CONCLUSION**

2 For these reasons, Plaintiffs' Motion *in Limine* to Exclude the Expert Report, Opinion, and  
3 Testimony of Kenneth P. Miller should be denied.

4  
5 Dated: December 11, 2009

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

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
By: /s/Charles J. Cooper  
Charles J. Cooper