

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

United States District Court
For the Northern District of California

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

On April 25, 2010, the court ordered the ACLU of Northern California and Equality California (together the "No on 8 groups") to show cause why they should not be held in contempt for failing to produce documents responsive to the court's March 5, Doc #610, and March 22, Doc #623, orders. Doc #641. On April 27, 2010, the No on 8 groups represented that they had produced all responsive non-privileged documents. Doc #649. On April 30, 2010, plaintiffs and proponents informed the court that they believe the No on 8 groups' production complies with the March 5 and March 22 orders. Doc #651 (plaintiffs); Doc #652 (proponents).

Accordingly, good cause having been shown, the order to show cause why the No on 8 groups should not be held in contempt for failing to produce documents as ordered, Doc #641, is hereby DISCHARGED. The hearing scheduled for May 3, 2010 is VACATED.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



VAUGHN R WALKER
United States District Chief Judge