1 DENNIS J. HERRERA, SB# 139669 City Attorney WAYNE SNODGRASS, SB# 148137 2 MOLLIE LEE, SB# 251404 **Deputy City Attorneys** 3 One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place City Hall, Room 234 4 San Francisco, California 94102-4682 (415) 554-4705 5 Telephone: Facsimile: (415) 554-4745 E-Mail: mollie.lee@sfgov.org 6 7 Attorneys for Defendants Department of Elections - City and County of San Francisco and 8 Dennis J. Herrera, City Attorney for the City and County of San Francisco 9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 10 EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 11 SACRAMENTO DIVISION 12 13 ProtectMarriage.com - Yes on 8, a Project Case No. 2:09-CV-00058-MCE-DAD of California Renewal; National 14 **Organization for Marriage California - Yes** on 8, Sponsored by National Organization 15 for Marriage, John Doe #1, an individual, DECLARATION OF MOLLIE M. LEE IN SUPPORT OF SAN FRANCISCO and as a representative of the **Class of Major** 16 DEFENDANTS' NOTICE OF JOINDER IN Donors. STATE DEFENDANTS' RULE 56(F) MOTION 17 Plaintiffs, 18 VS. 19 Dated: July 16, 2009 Time: **Debra Bowen**, Secretary of State for the State 2:00 p.m. 7, 14th Floor 20 of California, in her official capacity; **Edmund** Courtroom: **G. Brown, Jr.,** Attorney General for the State The Honorable Morrison C. England, Jr. of California, in his official capacity; **Dean C.** 21 **Logan,** Registrar-Recorder of Los Angeles County, California, in his official capacity; Trial Date: March 14, 2011 22 **Department of Elections - City and County** Action Filed: January 7, 2009 23 of San Francisco; Jan Scully, District Attorney for Sacramento County, California, in her official capacity and as a representative of 24 the Class of District Attorneys in the State of 25 California; **Dennis J. Herrera**, City Attorney for the City and County of San Francisco, California, in his official capacity and as a 26 representative of the Class of Elected City Attorneys in the State of California; Ross 27 Johnson, Timothy Hodson, Eugene Huguenin, Jr., Robert Leidigh, and Ray 28

DECLARATION OF MOLLIE M. LEE CASE NO. 2:09-CV-00058-MCE-DAD

28

Remy, members of the California Fair Political Practices Commission, in their official capacities.

Defendants.

I, Mollie M. Lee, declare as follows:

- 1. I am an attorney at law licensed to practice in the State of California. I am an attorney at the Office of the San Francisco City Attorney. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration, and if called as a witness, I can and would testify competently thereto.
- 2. After reviewing Plaintiffs' Memorandum in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment ("Motion"), I believe that, absent a denial of the Motion or continuance thereof, Defendants City and County of San Francisco and City Attorney Dennis J. Herrera ("San Francisco Defendants") will be deprived of a fair and adequate opportunity to obtain and present facts in support of their opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion.
- 3. The parties exchanged initial disclosures on April 1, 2009. Since that date, the parties have not taken any discovery.
- 4. On May 18, 2009, the Court issued a pretrial scheduling order establishing a discovery cut-off date of May 14, 2010.
- 5. Plaintiffs argue that they are entitled to an exemption from disclosure requirements because there is a reasonable probability that disclosure will result in threats, harassment or reprisals. In support of this allegation, Plaintiffs filed nine redacted declarations in support of their motion for preliminary injunction and an additional 49 redacted declarations in support of their motion for summary judgment.
- 6. In each such declaration served on Defendants, Plaintiffs have redacted the name of the declarant. In many of the declarations, Plaintiffs have also redacted other details, such as the amount of a contribution, the name of a group or institution with which the declarant is affiliated, or the date or location of a relevant event.
- 7. Because of the redactions, Defendants do not know the identities of the declarants and, in some instances, details of the facts alleged in the declarations. Without this information, DECLARATION OF MOLLIE M. LEE

1

2

3

4

Defendants cannot assess whether Plaintiffs' assertions have evidentiary support and cannot adequately plan discovery.

- 8. For example, Plaintiffs allege that contributions to the pro-Proposition 8 campaign leads to a risk of retaliatory harassment. But without knowing the identities of the declarants, Defendants cannot investigate whether the declarants who claim to have been harassed took public or vocal positions in support of Proposition 8 in addition to making political contributions.
- 9. Similarly, Plaintiffs claim that the harassment experienced by supporters of Proposition 8 has chilled those supporters' willingness to contribute to the campaign. Without identifying information, Defendants cannot test this assertion by reviewing Plaintiffs' campaign filings to determine whether declarants continued to contribute to the campaign after alleged incidents of harassment.
- 10. Defendants cannot verify the most basic information in the declarations, including whether the declarants made *any* contributions to support Proposition 8.
- 11. San Francisco Defendants are seeking to obtain unredacted versions of the declarations for review by counsel. On Wednesday, June 10, I discussed San Francisco Defendants' need for the redacted information with Plaintiffs' counsel Scott Bieniek. If San Francisco Defendants are unable to resolve this issue through informal discussions with Plaintiffs' counsel or a stipulation, they intend to seek a modified protective order from the Court that would permit counsel to review unredacted declarations, subject to the condition that these declarations are not disclosed to the public.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Dated: June 11, 2009

Attorneys for Defendants DEFENDANTS DEPARTMENT OF ELECTIONS -CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO AND DENNIS J. HERRERA