

**No. 10-16696**

CIRCUIT JUDGES STEPHEN REINHARDT, MICHAEL HAWKINS, & N.R. SMITH  
ORAL ARGUMENT SCHEDULED FOR DECEMBER 6, 2010

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

---

KRISTIN PERRY, et al.,  
*Plaintiffs-Appellees,*

v.

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, et al.  
*Defendants,*

and

DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH, et al.,  
*Defendant-Intervenors-Appellants.*

---

Appeal from United States District Court  
for the Northern District of California  
Civil Case No. 09-CV-2292 VRW (Honorable Vaughn R. Walker)

---

**APPELLANTS' MOTION FOR DISQUALIFICATION**

---

Andrew P. Pugno  
LAW OFFICES OF ANDREW P. PUGNO  
101 Parkshore Drive, Suite 100  
Folsom, California 95630  
(916) 608-3065; (916) 608-3066 Fax

Brian W. Raum  
James A. Campbell  
ALLIANCE DEFENSE FUND  
15100 North 90th Street  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85260  
(480) 444-0020; (480) 444-0028 Fax

Charles J. Cooper  
David H. Thompson  
Howard C. Nielson, Jr.  
Peter A. Patterson  
COOPER AND KIRK, PLLC  
1523 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 220-9600; (202) 220-9601 Fax

*Attorneys for Defendant-Intervenors-Appellants Hollingsworth, Knight,  
Gutierrez, Jansson, and ProtectMarriage.com*

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<b><u>Page</u></b>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	ii
STATEMENT .....	1
ARGUMENT .....	5
I. DISQUALIFICATION IS REQUIRED BECAUSE JUDGE REINHARDT’S IMPARTIALITY MIGHT REASONABLY BE QUESTIONED .....	5
II. DISQUALIFICATION IS REQUIRED BECAUSE THE INTERESTS OF JUDGE REINHARDT’S SPOUSE COULD BE SUBSTANTIALY AFFECTED BY THE OUTCOME OF THIS CASE.....	9
CONCLUSION .....	10

## **TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

<b><u>Cases</u></b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
<i>Buono v. Kempthorne</i> , 527 F.3d 758 (9th Cir. 2008) .....	10
<i>Davis v. Xerox</i> , 811 F.2d 1293 (9th Cir. 1987).....	9
<i>Herrington v. County of Sonoma</i> , 834 F.2d 1488 (9th Cir. 1987).....	7
<i>In re Marriage Cases</i> , 43 Cal. 4th 757, 768-69 (2008) .....	2
<i>Khatib v. County of Orange</i> , 622 F.3d 1074 (9th Cir. 2010).....	10
<i>Liljeberg v. Health Services Acquisition Corp.</i> , 486 U.S. 847 (1988) .....	5
<i>Liteky v. United States</i> , 510 U.S. 540 (1994).....	5
<i>Potashnick v. Port City Constr. Co.</i> , 609 F.2d 1101 (5th Cir. 1980) .....	10
<i>Preston v. United States</i> , 923 F.2d 731 (9th Cir. 1991).....	6, 8
<i>Southwest Voter Registration Educ. Project v. Shelley</i> , 344 F.3d 913 (9th Cir. 2003) .....	10
<i>Strauss v. Horton</i> , 46 Cal. 4th 364 (2009) .....	2
<i>United States v. Holland</i> , 519 F.3d 909 (9th Cir. 2008).....	6
<i>Valeria v. Davis</i> , 320 F.3d 1014 (9th Cir. 2003) .....	10
 <b><u>Other</u></b>	
28 U.S.C. § 455(a) .....	1, 5
28 U.S.C. § 455(b)(4).....	9, 10
28 U.S.C. § 455(b)(5)(i).....	7
28 U.S.C. § 455(b)(5)(ii).....	7
28 U.S.C. § 455(b)(5)(iii) .....	1, 7, 9
ACLU Hails Historic Decision and Urges Efforts in Other States to Ensure Success on Appeal, at <a href="http://www.aclu-sc.org/releases/view/103036">http://www.aclu-sc.org/releases/view/103036</a> .....	4, 5, 7
ACLU/SC 2007-2008 Annual Report 24, at <a href="http://www.aclu-sc.org/downloads/9/204927.pdf">http://www.aclu-sc.org/downloads/9/204927.pdf</a> .....	1
ACLU/SC 2008-2009 Annual Report 8, at <a href="http://www.aclu-sc.org/documents/view/223">http://www.aclu-sc.org/documents/view/223</a> .....	2, 9

CHARLES ALLEN WRIGHT ET AL., 13D FED. PRAC. & PROC. § 3547 (3d ed., current through 2010 update) .....	10
Chuleenan Svetvilas, <i>Challenging Prop 8: The Hidden Story</i> , CALIFORNIA LAWYER, Jan. 2010, at <a href="http://www.callawyer.com/story.cfm?eid=906575&amp;evid=1">http://www.callawyer.com/story.cfm?eid=906575&amp;evid=1</a> .....	3
Circuit Advisory Committee Note to Rule 29-2 .....	8
Corporate Entities of the ACLU of Southern California, at <a href="http://www.aclu-sc.org/pages/tax_info">http://www.aclu- sc.org/pages/tax_info</a> .....	1
Daniel B. Wood, <i>Proposition 8: Federal Judge Overturns California Gay Marriage Ban</i> , CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, Aug. 4, 2010, at <a href="http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Justice/2010/0804/Proposition-8-federal-&lt;br/&gt;judge-overturns-California-gay-marriage-ban">http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Justice/2010/0804/Proposition-8-federal- judge-overturns-California-gay-marriage-ban</a> .....	4
Prop 8: Focusing on the Wrong Question (July 14, 2009), at <a href="http://www.aclu-sc.org/news_stories/view/102830/">http://www.aclu- sc.org/news_stories/view/102830/</a> .....	3, 8
Ramona Ripston, Executive Director, ACLU/SC, at <a href="http://www.aclu-sc.org/documents/view/224">http://www.aclu- sc.org/documents/view/224</a> .....	1, 6, 9
Statement by ACLU/SC Executive Director Ramona Ripston on California Supreme Court Decision (May 26, 2009), at <a href="http://www.aclu-sc.org/contents/view/8">http://www.aclu- sc.org/contents/view/8</a> .....	2

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 455(a) and 28 U.S.C. § 455(b)(5)(iii), Appellants Hollingsworth, Knight, Gutierrez, Jansson, and ProtectMarriage.com (hereinafter, “Proponents”), respectfully move for Judge Reinhardt to disqualify himself from participating in this proceeding.

## STATEMENT

On November 28, 2010, this Court identified Circuit Judges Reinhardt, Hawkins, and N.R. Smith as the members of the panel assigned to this case. Judge Reinhardt is married to Ramona Ripston, the long-time Executive Director of the ACLU of Southern California (hereinafter, “ACLU/SC”).<sup>1</sup> See Ramona Ripston, Executive Director, ACLU/SC, at <http://www.aclu-sc.org/documents/view/224>.<sup>2</sup> As Executive Director, Ms. Ripston is “responsible for all phases of the organization’s programs, including litigation, lobbying and education.” *Id.*

Under Ms. Ripston’s leadership, “ACLU/SC has taken a lead role” in what it calls “the fight to end marriage discrimination” in California. ACLU/SC 2007-2008 Annual Report 24, at <http://www.aclu-sc.org/downloads/9/204927.pdf>.

---

<sup>1</sup> As the citations in this motion indicate, the information we relate concerning Ms. Ripston and ACLU/SC is based on material contained in published, publicly available sources.

<sup>2</sup> ACLU/SC is “comprised of three separate corporate entities” that all “are part of the same overall organization”—American Civil Liberties Union of Southern California, ACLU Foundation of Southern California, and ACLU Foundation of Southern California, LLC. See Corporate Entities of the ACLU of Southern California, at [http://www.aclu-sc.org/pages/tax\\_info](http://www.aclu-sc.org/pages/tax_info). As the organization itself does on its website, we refer to these entities collectively as ACLU of Southern California or ACLU/SC. See *id.*

ACLU/SC represented several same-sex couples and organizations in *In re Marriage Cases*, in which the California Supreme Court held that California's pre-Proposition 8 statutory definition of marriage as the union of a man and a woman violated the State Constitution. *See In re Marriage Cases*, 43 Cal. 4th 757, 768-69, 786 (2008).

Following that decision, ACLU/SC put Proposition 8 "at the forefront of [its] civil-rights agenda, sparing no effort to defeat Prop. 8 [and] challenge its passage." ACLU/SC 2008-2009 Annual Report 8, at <http://www.aclu-sc.org/documents/view/223>. After Proposition 8's passage ACLU/SC represented petitioners before the California Supreme Court in *Strauss v. Horton*, the unsuccessful state-law challenge to the validity of Proposition 8. 46 Cal. 4th 364, 374 (2009).

The same day the California Supreme Court issued its decision in *Strauss*, Ms. Ripston issued a public statement on behalf of ACLU/SC, vowing that "[a] renewed effort to overturn Proposition 8 begins today." *Statement by ACLU/SC Executive Director Ramona Ripston on California Supreme Court Decision* (May 26, 2009), at <http://www.aclu-sc.org/contents/view/8>. Ms. Ripston later signed a letter on behalf of ACLU/SC explaining that as part of that effort, "LGBT people and our closest allies are first going to have to talk to close friends and family about ... why this fight [for same-sex marriage] matters. Even if those people are

already on our side, we need to talk to them to convince them to join the fight.”

*Prop 8: Focusing on the Wrong Question* (July 14, 2009), at [http://www.aclu-sc.org/news\\_stories/view/102830/](http://www.aclu-sc.org/news_stories/view/102830/).

ACLU/SC has taken an active role in this litigation. It appears that Plaintiffs’ attorneys engaged in “confidential discussions” with Ms. Ripston and ACLU/SC’s legal director before filing this lawsuit. *See* Chuleenan Svetvilas, *Challenging Prop 8: The Hidden Story*, CALIFORNIA LAWYER, Jan. 2010, at <http://www.callawyer.com/story.cfm?eid=906575&evid=1>. And ACLU/SC has been actively involved *in this very case*. Indeed, it represented, as counsel in the court below, parties seeking to intervene as plaintiffs, *see* Our Family Coalition et al. Motion to Intervene as Party Plaintiffs, Doc. No. 79 at 2 (July 8, 2009), and amici urging the court to decide the case in favor of Plaintiffs and to rule that Proposition 8 is unconstitutional. *See* Brief of Amici Curiae American Civil Liberties Union et al., Doc. No. 62 at 2 (June 25, 2009); Brief of Amici Curiae American Civil Liberties Union et al., Doc. No. 552 at 2 (Feb. 3, 2010).<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> Indeed, in the accompanying motions for leave to file these amicus briefs, the statement of amici interest specifically lists ACLU/SC as an affiliate of an amicus curiae. *See* Motion for Leave to File Brief of Amici Curiae American Civil Liberties Union et al., Doc. No. 61 at 3 (June 25, 2009) (identifying “the ACLU Foundation of Southern California” as one of “the three California affiliates of the ACLU”); Motion for Leave to File Brief of Amici Curiae American Civil Liberties Union et al., Doc. No. 551 at 3 (Feb. 3, 2010) (same).

When the district court issued the ruling under review in this Court, the ACLU issued a public statement praising the decision and emphasizing that the ACLU, along with two other groups, had “filed two friend-of-the-court briefs in the case supporting the argument that Proposition 8 is unconstitutional.” *ACLU Hails Historic Decision and Urges Efforts in Other States to Ensure Success on Appeal* (August 4, 2010), at <http://www.aclu-sc.org/releases/view/103036>.<sup>4</sup> The press release quoted Ms. Ripston as “rejoic[ing]” in the decision striking down Proposition 8, asserting that it “affirms that in America we don’t treat people differently based on their sexual orientation.” *Id.* Ms. Ripston’s statement was reported in the national media. *See, e.g.,* Daniel B. Wood, *Proposition 8: Federal Judge Overturns California Gay Marriage Ban*, CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR, Aug. 4, 2010, at <http://www.csmonitor.com/USA/Justice/2010/0804/Proposition-8-federal-judge-overturns-California-gay-marriage-ban>.

At the same time, Ms. Ripston stated that the district court’s ruling was not the end of the matter, emphasizing that “it’s a long road ahead until final victory.” *ACLU Hails Historic Decision and Urges Efforts in Other States to Ensure Success on Appeal* (August 4, 2010), at <http://www.aclu-sc.org/releases/view/103036>. Specifically, as one of her colleagues put it in the same public statement, “[i]n order to give this case the best possible chance of

---

<sup>4</sup> This statement is reproduced on the ACLU/SC’s website, but on its face appears to be issued by the national ACLU organization.



success *as it moves through the appeals courts*, we need to show that America is ready for same-sex couples to marry by continuing to seek marriage and other relationship protections in states across the country.” *Id.* (emphasis added).<sup>5</sup>

## **ARGUMENT**

### **I. DISQUALIFICATION IS REQUIRED BECAUSE JUDGE REINHARDT’S IMPARTIALITY MIGHT REASONABLY BE QUESTIONED**

Section 455(a) requires a judge to “disqualify himself in any proceeding in which his impartiality might reasonably be questioned.” 28 U.S.C. § 455(a). “The goal of section 455(a) is to avoid even the appearance of partiality,” *Liljeberg v. Health Services Acquisition Corp.*, 486 U.S. 847, 860 (1988) (quotation marks omitted), and thus “what matters is not the reality of bias or prejudice but its appearance,” *Liteky v. United States*, 510 U.S. 540, 548 (1994). In other words, so long as a judge’s impartiality might reasonably be questioned, recusal is required “even though no actual partiality exists ... because the judge actually has no interest in the case or because the judge is pure in heart and incorruptible.” *Liljeberg*, 486 U.S. at 860 (quotation marks omitted).

The standard for assessing whether section 455(a) requires disqualification is thus “an objective one” that “involves ascertaining whether a reasonable person

---

<sup>5</sup> That colleague was “James Esseks, Director of the ACLU Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual and Transgender Project.” *ACLU Hails Historic Decision and Urges Efforts in Other States to Ensure Success on Appeal* (August 4, 2010), at <http://www.aclu-sc.org/releases/view/103036>.

with knowledge of all the facts would conclude that the judge's impartiality might reasonably be questioned." *Preston v. United States*, 923 F.2d 731, 734 (9th Cir. 1991) (quotation marks omitted). And because of its "fact-driven" nature, analysis "must be guided, not by comparison to similar situations addressed by prior jurisprudence, but rather by an independent examination of the unique facts and circumstances of the particular claim at issue." *United States v. Holland*, 519 F.3d 909, 913 (9th Cir. 2008) (quotation marks omitted). In performing this analysis, the Court "must bear in mind that ... outside observers are less inclined to credit judges' impartiality and mental discipline than the judiciary itself will be," and in "a close case, the balance tips in favor of recusal." *Id.* at 912, 914 (quotation marks omitted).

The facts of this case would plainly lead a reasonable person to conclude that Judge Reinhardt's impartiality might reasonably be questioned. His wife and the organization she leads have not only been active in seeking to redefine marriage in California and active in opposition to Proposition 8, but they have been active participants in this very lawsuit: Plaintiffs' attorneys consulted with Ms. Ripston before filing suit; ACLU/SC represented amici and proposed intervenors in the court below urging the court to decide the case in favor of Plaintiffs; Ms. Ripston, as Executive Director of ACLU/SC, "is responsible for all phases of the organization's programs, *including litigation*," see Ramona Ripston, Executive

Director, ACLU/SC, at <http://www.aclu-sc.org/documents/view/224> (emphasis added); and Ms. Ripston publicly “rejoice[d]” over the district court decision that is before this Court for review, praise that was tempered only by the concern that “it’s a long road ahead until final victory.” *ACLU Hails Historic Decision and Urges Efforts in Other States to Ensure Success on Appeal* (August 4, 2010), at <http://www.aclu-sc.org/releases/view/103036>. That “road” obviously passes through this Court, and Ms. Ripston’s colleague emphasized the importance of working “to give this case the best possible chance of success as it moves through the appeals courts.” *Id.*

It is instructive that section 455(b) (which also requires disqualification here, as we explain below), contains several provisions mandating recusal on the basis of the connection of a judge’s spouse to a case. *See, e.g.*, 28 U.S.C. § 455(b)(5)(i) (mandating recusal when spouse “[i]s a party to the proceeding, or an officer, director, or trustee of a party”); *id.* § 455(b)(5)(ii) (mandating recusal when spouse “[i]s acting as a lawyer in the proceeding”); *id.* § 455(b)(5)(iii) (mandating recusal when spouse “[i]s known by the judge to have an interest that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding”). These *per se* recusal rules “provide[] examples of situations in which a judge’s ‘impartiality might reasonably be questioned’ pursuant to section 455(a),” *Herrington v. County of Sonoma*, 834 F.2d 1488, 1502 (9th Cir. 1987), *overruled on other grounds*, *Nitco*

*Holding Corp. v. Boujikian*, 491 F.3d 1086, 1090 (9th Cir. 2007), and demonstrate that a spouse's actual participation in a case amounts to such a situation.

Finally, it is of no moment that neither Ms. Ripston nor ACLU/SC is a named party to this litigation, for the “Supreme Court has never limited recusal requirements to cases in which the judge’s conflict was with the parties named in the suit. Rather, the focus has consistently been on the question whether the relationship between the judge and an interested party was such as to present a risk that the judge’s impartiality in the case at bar might reasonably be questioned by the public”—a risk that is manifestly present here. *Preston*, 923 F.2d at 735 (citation omitted). Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to this Court’s rules recognize that participation as an amicus will give rise to the need to recuse. *See* Circuit Advisory Committee Note to Rule 29-2 (“The court will ordinarily deny motions and disallow stipulations for leave to file an amicus curiae brief where the filing of the brief would result in the recusal of a member of the en banc court. Any member of the court who would be subject to disqualification in light of the amicus curiae brief may, of course, voluntarily recuse, thereby allowing the filing of the amicus curiae brief.”).

## **II. DISQUALIFICATION IS REQUIRED BECAUSE THE INTERESTS OF JUDGE REINHARDT’S SPOUSE COULD BE SUBSTANTIALLY AFFECTED BY THE OUTCOME OF THIS CASE**

As is often the case, disqualification is required under section 455(b) as well as section 455(a). *See Davis v. Xerox*, 811 F.2d 1293, 1295 (9th Cir. 1987) (“Frequently, an overlap will occur—an act will appear to create a conflict [under section 455(a)] and will fall within the per se rule [of section 455(b)].”). In particular, Judge Reinhardt must recuse because “his spouse ... [i]s known by the judge to have an interest that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding.” 28 U.S.C. § 455(b)(5)(iii); *see also id.* § 455(b)(4) (similar). Ms. Ripston is “responsible for all phases of [ACLU/SC’s] programs,” *see* Ramona Ripston, Executive Director, ACLU/SC, at <http://www.aclu-sc.org/documents/view/224>, and under her direction the organization has put Proposition 8 “at the forefront of [its] civil-rights agenda, sparing no effort to defeat Prop. 8 [and] challenge its passage,” *see* ACLU/SC 2008-2009 Annual Report 8, at <http://www.aclu-sc.org/documents/view/223>. Most importantly, as we have explained, the ACLU/SC’s effort to invalidate Proposition 8 has extended to advocating that result in this very case.

It is thus plain that Ms. Ripston has an avowed interest in seeing Proposition 8 invalidated, an interest that unquestionably will be substantially affected by the outcome of this proceeding. Because this is so, it is immaterial whether or not Ms.

Ripston's interest is financial, and Judge Reinhardt must recuse. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 455(b)(4) (requiring recusal when judge knows spouse "has a financial interest in the subject matter in controversy or in a party to the proceeding, or any *other* interest that could be substantially affected by the outcome of the proceeding") (emphasis added); *Potashnick v. Port City Constr. Co.*, 609 F.2d 1101, 1113 (5th Cir. 1980) (holding that interest under section 455(b)(5)(iii) need not be financial and recognizing that "[t]he outcome of any proceeding handled by a law firm may affect partners' ... noneconomic interests, including the reputation and goodwill of the firm"); *see also* CHARLES ALLEN WRIGHT ET AL., 13D FED. PRAC. & PROC. § 3547 (3d ed., current through 2010 update).

## CONCLUSION

Judge Reinhardt frequently and properly recuses himself from cases that involve ACLU/SC. *See, e.g., Khatib v. County of Orange*, 622 F.3d 1074 (9th Cir. 2010); *Buono v. Kempthorne*, 527 F.3d 758, 760 (9th Cir. 2008); *Southwest Voter Registration Educ. Project v. Shelley*, 344 F.3d 913, 914 n.1 (9th Cir. 2003); *Valeria v. Davis*, 320 F.3d 1014, 1015 n.\*\* (9th Cir. 2003). For the reasons we have explained, we respectfully submit that the same result must obtain here. Accordingly, Proponents' motion should be granted.

Dated: December 1, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Charles J. Cooper

Charles J. Cooper

Andrew P. Pugno  
LAW OFFICES OF ANDREW P. PUGNO  
101 Parkshore Drive, Suite 100  
Folsom, California 95630  
(916) 608-3065; (916) 608-3066 Fax

Brian W. Raum  
James A. Campbell  
ALLIANCE DEFENSE FUND  
15100 North 90th Street  
Scottsdale, Arizona 85260  
(480) 444-0020; (480) 444-0028 Fax

Charles J. Cooper  
David H. Thompson  
Howard C. Nielson, Jr.  
Peter A. Patterson  
COOPER AND KIRK, PLLC  
1523 New Hampshire Ave., N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036  
(202) 220-9600; (202) 220-9601 Fax

*Attorneys for Defendant-Intervenors-Appellants Hollingsworth, Knight,  
Gutierrez, Jansson, and ProtectMarriage.com*

9th Circuit Case Number(s) 10-16696

**NOTE:** To secure your input, you should print the filled-in form to PDF (File > Print > *PDF Printer/Creator*).

\*\*\*\*\*

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

#### When All Case Participants are Registered for the Appellate CM/ECF System

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system on (date) .

I certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the appellate CM/ECF system.

Signature (use "s/" format)

\*\*\*\*\*

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

#### When Not All Case Participants are Registered for the Appellate CM/ECF System

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system on (date)  Dec 1, 2010.

Participants in the case who are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the appellate CM/ECF system.

I further certify that some of the participants in the case are not registered CM/ECF users. I have mailed the foregoing document by First-Class Mail, postage prepaid, or have dispatched it to a third party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days to the following non-CM/ECF participants:

Please see attached service list.

Signature (use "s/" format)

s/Charles J. Cooper



## **SERVICE LIST**

Arthur N. Bailey, Jr., Esq.  
HAUSFELD LLP  
44 Montgomery Street, Suite 3400  
San Francisco, California 94104

Thomas Brejcha  
THOMAS MORE SOCIETY  
29 S. La Salle Street, Suite 440  
Chicago, IL 60603

Suzanne B. Goldberg  
Clinical Professor of Law & Director  
SEXUALITY & GENDER LAW  
CLINIC  
COLUMBIA LAW SCHOOL  
435 West 116<sup>th</sup> Street  
New York, NY 10027

Maura T. Healey  
Assistant Attorney General  
One Ashburton Place  
Boston, MA 02108

Von G. Keetch  
KIRTON & McCONKIE, PC  
Eagle Gate Tower  
60 E. South Temple  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Jeffrey Mateer  
LIBERTY INSTITUTE  
2001 W Plano Parkway, Suite 1600  
Plano, TX 75075

Jeffrey Hunter Moon  
Anthony R. Picarello, Jr.  
Michael F. Moses  
UNITED STATES CATHOLIC  
CONFERENCE  
3211 Fourth Street, N.E.  
Washington, DC 20017

Lincoln C. Oliphant  
COLUMBUS SCHOOL OF LAW  
The Catholic University of America  
3600 John McCormack Road, NE  
Washington, DC 20064

Stuart J. Roth  
AMERICAN CENTER FOR LAW  
AND JUSTICE  
201 Maryland Avenue, N.E.  
Washington, DC 20002

Anita L. Staver  
LIBERTY COUNSEL  
P.O. Box 540774  
Orlando, FL 32854

Mathew D. Staver  
LIBERTY COUNSEL  
1055 Maitland Center Commons  
2nd Floor  
Maitland, FL 32751

James F. Sweeney  
SWEENEY & GREENE LLP  
8001 Folsom Boulevard, Suite 101  
Sacramento, CA 95826

M. Edward Whelan, III  
ETHICS AND PUBLIC POLICY  
CENTER  
1730 M Street N.W., Suite 910  
Washington, DC 20036