

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

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

Plaintiffs,

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,

Plaintiff-Intervenor,

v

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, in his
official capacity as governor of
California; EDMUND G BROWN JR, in
his official capacity as attorney
general of California; MARK B
HORTON, in his official capacity
as director of the California
Department of Public Health and
state registrar of vital
statistics; LINETTE 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 of the County of
Alameda; and DEAN C LOGAN, in his
official capacity as registrar-
recorder/county clerk for the
County of Los Angeles,

Defendants,

DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH, GAIL J
KNIGHT, MARTIN F GUTIERREZ,
HAKSHING WILLIAM TAM, MARK A
JANSSON and PROTECTMARRIAGE.COM -
YES ON 8, A PROJECT OF
CALIOFORNIA RENEWAL, as official
proponents of Proposition 8,

Defendant-Intervenors.

No C 09-2292 VRW

ORDER DENYING WITHOUT
PREJUDICE MOTIONS TO QUASH
[Docket Nos. 404 and 407]

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California


1 On January 11, 2010, James L Garlow and Miles McPherson
2 ("movants") moved to quash subpoenas issued by plaintiffs in the
3 above-captioned case. Docs #404, 407. The matter was referred to
4 the undersigned judge and heard on January 20, 2010.

5 At the hearing, plaintiffs' counsel represented that his
6 current intention is to question movants only on issues related to
7 authentication of certain documents and video. In light of that
8 representation, counsel for Messrs Garlow and McPherson stated that
9 he does not object to such a line of inquiry. Accordingly, the
10 motions to quash brought by Garlow (Doc #404) and McPherson (Doc
11 #407) are DENIED WITHOUT PREJUDICE.

12 Furthermore, the parties informed the court that movants
13 had objected to the introduction of certain evidence - which was
14 not obtained from movants - during examination of witnesses other
15 than Garlow and McPherson. Counsel for Messrs Garlow and McPherson
16 indicated that going forward he would not raise such an objection.

17
18 IT IS SO ORDERED.

19
20 Dated: January 20, 2010

21 
22 _____
23 JOSEPH C SPERO
24 United States Magistrate Judge
25
26
27
28