

**Nos. 10-16696 & 11-16577**

DECIDED FEBRUARY 7, 2012

(CIRCUIT JUDGES STEPHEN REINHARDT, MICHAEL HAWKINS & N.R. SMITH)

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

---

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

v.

EDMUND G. BROWN, Jr., et al.,  
*Defendants,*

and

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

---

On Appeal from United States District Court for the Northern District of California  
Civil Case No. 09-CV-2292 JW (Honorable James Ware)

---

**DECLARATION OF PETER A. PATTERSON**

---

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  
*Counsel of Record*  
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*

I, Peter A. Patterson, declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney at the law firm of Cooper & Kirk, PLLC, and I am one of the attorneys for Appellants Dennis Hollingsworth, Gail J. Knight, Martin F. Gutierrez, Mark A. Jansson, and ProtectMarriage.com (collectively, “Proponents”). I make this declaration in support of Appellants’ Unopposed Motion for Leave to Exceed Type-Volume Limitations. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein.

2. The panel majority decision holds that Proposition 8, a voter-initiated amendment to the California Constitution that defines marriage as the union of a man and a woman, CAL. CONST. art. 1, § 7.5, violates the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. It is difficult to overstate the importance of the outcome of this case to the people of California. As this Court has recognized, “in our social and legal traditions the institution of marriage has been considered to be an integral part of the foundation of a well-ordered and viable society,” and it is thus “difficult to imagine an area more fraught with sensitive social policy considerations in which federal courts should not involve themselves if there is an alternative.” *Smelt v. County of Orange*, 447 F.3d 673, 679, 681 (9th Cir. 2006). The gravity of the panel majority’s decision is only heightened by the fact that it invalidates a provision of the California

Constitution adopted through an exercise of the “fundamental right” of “the sovereign people’s initiative power.” *Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, 628 F.3d 1191, 1196 (9th Cir. 2011) (quotation marks omitted); *see also Coalition for Economic Equity v. Wilson*, 122 F.3d 718, 719 (9th Cir. 1997). For these reasons, it is imperative that the members of this Court have the information necessary for careful consideration of whether this case should be reheard en banc.

3. The importance and complexity of the issues presented by this case are reflected by the briefing to date. In the merits appeal, for example, the combined length of Proponents’ opening and reply briefs and Plaintiffs’ response brief exceeds 300 pages containing more than 80,000 words. Plaintiff-Intervenor City and County of San Francisco and nearly 50 amici submitted briefs spanning hundreds of additional pages.

4. In deciding the exceedingly important questions presented by this case, the panel majority affirmed the decision below, but for different reasons than those relied on by the district court. Accordingly, the panel majority’s reasoning rests on grounds only partially addressed in the briefing to date.

5. The panel’s ultimate ruling that Proposition 8 is unconstitutional embraces rulings on several subsidiary issues that Proponents believe are erroneous and that

misapply or conflict with the decisions of the Supreme Court, this Court, and other courts. Proponents' petition for rehearing thus encompasses multiple issues.

6. In addition to addressing Proponents' appeal on the merits, the panel's decision also disposes of Proponents' separate appeal of the district court's denial of their motion to vacate the judgment on account of former Chief Judge Walker presiding over this case in violation of 28 U.S.C. § 455. Proponents are seeking rehearing en banc of this issue as well as of the merits.

7. The importance, complexity, and number of the issues presented by this case are amply demonstrated by the length of the panel's opinions: the panel majority's opinion is about 75 pages and 19,700 words; the dissent is about an additional 38 pages and 9,000 words.

8. Counsel for the other parties to this appeal have stated that they will not oppose Proponents' motion to exceed the type-volume limitations.

I declare, under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States, that these facts are true and correct and that this Declaration is executed this 21st day of February 2012 in Cincinnati, Ohio.



---

Peter A. Patterson