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) 220-96	
8	LAW OFFICES OF ANDREW P. PUGNO Andrew P. Pugno (CA Bar No. 206587)	
9	andrew@pugnolaw.com 101 Parkshore Drive, Suite 100, Folsom, California	95630
10	Telephone: (916) 608-3065, Facsimile: (916) 608-30	
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) 444-00	
15	ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT-INTERVENORS DENNIS GAIL J. KNIGHT, MARTIN F. GUTIERREZ, MARK A. JA	
16	PROTECTMARRIAGE.COM – YES ON 8, A PROJECT OF CALIFORNIA RENEWAL	,
17	* Admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>	
18	UNITED STATES DI	
19	NORTHERN DISTRIC	T OF CALIFORNIA
20	KRISTIN M. PERRY, SANDRA B. STIER, PAUL T. KATAMI, and JEFFREY J.	
21	ZARRILLO,	CASE NO. 09-CV-2292 VRW
22	Plaintiffs,	DEFENDANT-INTERVENORS DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH, GAIL
23	v.	KNIGHT, MARTIN GUTIERREZ, MARK JANSSON, AND
24	ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, in his official	PROTECTMARRIAGE.COM'S MOTION TO SHORTEN TIME FOR
25	capacity as Governor of California; EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., in his official capacity as	RESPONSE TO AND HEARING OF MOTION TO COMPEL
26	Attorney General of California; MARK B.	Trial Date: January 11, 2010
27	HORTON, in his official capacity as Director of the California Department of Public Health and	Judge: Chief Judge Vaughn R. Walker Location: Courtroom 6, 17th Floor
28	State Registrar of Vital Statistics; LINETTE	

1 2 3 4 5	SCOTT, in her official capacity as Deputy Director of Health Information & Strategic Planning for the California Department of Public Health; PATRICK O'CONNELL, in his official capacity as Clerk-Recorder for the County of Alameda; and DEAN C. LOGAN, in his official capacity as Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk for the County of Los Angeles,
6	Defendants,
7	and
<ul><li>8</li><li>9</li><li>10</li><li>11</li></ul>	PROPOSITION 8 OFFICIAL PROPONENTS DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH, GAIL J. KNIGHT, MARTIN F. GUTIERREZ, HAK- SHING WILLIAM TAM, and MARK A. JANSSON; and PROTECTMARRIAGE.COM – YES ON 8, A PROJECT OF CALIFORNIA RENEWAL,
12	Defendant-Intervenors.
13	
14	Additional Counsel for Defendant-Intervenors
15 16 17 18	ALLIANCE DEFENSE FUND Timothy Chandler (CA Bar No. 234325) tchandler@telladf.org 101 Parkshore Drive, Suite 100, Folsom, California 95630 Telephone: (916) 932-2850, Facsimile: (916) 932-2851
19 20 21	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
22	* Admitted <i>pro hac vice</i>
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

## TO THE PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that pursuant to Local Rule 6-3 Defendant Intervenors Dennis
Hollingsworth, Gail J. Knight, Martin F. Gutierrez, Mark A. Jansson, and ProtectMarriage.com
("Proponents") will and hereby do move this Court for an Order shortening the time within which the
Court may hear Proponents Motion to Compel Compliance with Nonparty Document Subpoenas.

Proponents have moved for an order compelling production of documents by non-parties

Californians Against Eliminating Basic Rights ("CAEBR"), Equality California, and No on Proposition

8, Campaign for Marriage Equality, A Project of the American Civil Liberties Union of Northern

California ("ACLU") (collectively, "the No on 8 groups"). Proponents have so moved because they wish to have these documents available for use at trial, which has already commenced.

This motion is based upon this Notice of Motion; the following Memorandum of Points and Authorities; the concurrently filed declaration of Jesse Panuccio in support; the complete files in these actions; the concurrently filed Motion to Compel; argument of counsel; and such other and further matters as this Court may consider.

## MEMORANDUM AND POINTS OF AUTHORITIES

The parties have engaged in a long dispute over the permissible scope of discovery in this action. Plaintiffs propounded sweeping document requests on Proponents, seeking nearly every document in Proponents' possession. Proponents objected on burden, relevance, and First Amendment grounds, but made clear that—in order to build a complete record in this case—to whatever extent they are required to produce such documents, they would seek similar documents from the No on 8 groups. *See, e.g.*, Doc # 187 at 3-4. To that end, Proponents served Rule 45 document subpoenas on the No on 8 groups. On January 6, the Court conducted the latest in a series of hearings regarding the scope of permissible discovery. Following that hearing, the Court ruled on the permissible scope of discovery and the bounds of the First Amendment privilege in this case. *See* Doc # 372. Proponents apprised the No on

8 groups of this new ruling and its implications for the scope of documents now discoverable in this case. The No on 8 groups have objected and are refusing to produce documents that are relevant and nonprivileged under this Court's January 8 order. Because trial has already commenced, Proponents require immediate production of these documents so that they may review them and potentially enter them into evidence. Accordingly, counsel for the No on 8 groups were notified by email on the morning of January 15 of Proponents' intention to seek relief in the form of this motion to shorten time. *See* Decl. of Jesse Panuccio in Supp. of Defendant-Intervenors' Mot. to Shorten Time.

I. Substantial Prejudice Will Occur If Proponents Are Not Permitted to Obtain, Review, and Potentially Introduce Documents In the Possession of the No on 8 Groups.

Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 6(e) allows the Court to order a motion to be heard on an accelerated basis "for good cause." Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(c)(1)(C). Moreover, N.D. Cal. Civ. L.R. 6-3(a)(3) provides that a court may shorten time if "substantial harm or prejudice ... would occur if the Court did not change the time ...."

Proponents have kept the No on 8 groups continually apprised of both this Court's and the Ninth Circuit's rulings regarding the permissible scope of discovery in this case. The Court's most recent ruling was not announced until January 8, just a few days before the start of trial. Doc # 372.

Proponents stand ready to review production from the No on 8 groups as soon as it comes in, so as to be able to introduce the documents into evidence to build the "complete record," Doc # 76 at 5, of "the mix of information before and available to the voters," Doc # 214 at 14. Allowing the normal timeline for response and hearing on this motion would not allow this matter to be resolved while the trial is still ongoing and thus would preclude the Court's ability to review a "complete record" and prejudice

Proponents' ability to plan and present their case. It is imperative that Proponents receive a determination as to whether the No on 8 groups must comply with the subpoenas. Accordingly,

Proponents respectfully request that the Court order the No on 8 groups to file a response, if any, to the motion to compel by 5 p.m. on January 18, 2010, and that the Court hear the motion as soon as is

## 

1	practicable given the trial schedule.	
2	CONCLUSION	
3	For the foregoing reasons, Proponents respectfully request that the Court grant this motion to	
4	shorten time.	
5		
6	Dated: January 15, 2009 COOPER AND KIRK, PLLC	
7	Attorneys for Defendants-Intervenors Dennis Hollingsworth, Gail J. Knight,	
8	Martin F. Gutierrez, Mark A. Jansson, and	
9	ProtectMarriage.com – Yes on 8, A Project of California Renewal	
10	By: /s/ Charles J. Cooper	
11 12	Charles J. Cooper	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	3	
	DEFENDANT INTERMENORS ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO SHORTEN TIME	