1

t M

Declaration of Mollie M. Lee

CASE NO. 2:09-CV-00058-MCE-DAD

a

g

8

n:\govlit\li2010\090774\00625079.doc

o c k e t

Ø

n

е

1 2 3 4 5	EDMUND G. BROWN JR., State Bar # 37100 Attorney General of California ZACKERY P. MORAZZINI, State Bar # 204237 Supervising Deputy Attorney General 1300 I Street, Suite 125 P. O. Box 944255 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 445-8226 Facsimile: (916) 324-5567 Zackery.Morazzini@doj.ca.gov
6 7	Counsel for Defendants Debra Bowen, California Secretary of State, and Edmund G. Brown, Jr., California Attorney General
8 9	SCOTT HALLABRIN, State Bar # 76662 General Counsel LAWRENCE T. WOODLOCK, State Bar # 137676 Fair Political Practices Commission
10	428 J Street, Suite 620 Sacramento, CA 95814 Telephone: (916) 322-55660
12	Facsimile: (916) 327-2026 Lwoodlock@fppc.ca.gov  Counsel for Defendants Month are of the Frin Political Practices Counsission
13	Counsel for Defendants Members of the Fair Political Practices Commission
14   15	
16	
17	
l8   l9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

Declaration of Mollie M. Lee CASE NO. 2:09-CV-00058-MCE-DAD

Declaration of Mollie M. Lee CASE NO. 2:09-CV-00058-MCE-DAD

## 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, which represents Defendants City and County of San Francisco and San Francisco City Attorney Dennis J. Herrera in this matter. 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. Defendant Edmund G. Brown, California Attorney General, served his first sets of interrogatories and requests for production of documents ("RFPs") in this matter on October 30, 2009. On November 30, 2009, Plaintiffs responded to the requests, but Plaintiffs produced no documents in response to the RFPs and no privilege log with regard to either discovery demand. In a conference call between the parties' counsel on February 2, 2010, following correspondence from Defendants' counsel, Plaintiffs' counsel agreed to produce documents responsive to the RFPs, as well as a privilege log, by March 1, 2010. However, on February 24, 2010, Plaintiffs informed Defendants that they would not be able to produce responsive documents by the agreed-upon date, and Defendants agreed to allow a rolling production. Over the next five weeks, Plaintiffs ultimately produced some documents apparently responsive to three of the Attorney General's 13 RFPs.
- 3. On or about March 23, 2010, my office received Plaintiffs' final responses to the discovery requests propounded by the Attorney General in this matter. On April 12, 2010, I spoke with Plaintiffs' counsel Sarah Troupis and requested dates that witnesses Ron Prentice and Brian Brown would be available for deposition. Ms. Troupis informed me that she would contact her clients and contact me with possible dates. On April 13, 2010, I sent a follow-up e-mail confirming this request, a true and correct copy of which is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.
- 4. I did not receive a response from Ms. Troupis by April 15, 2010. Because the Court's pre-trial order provides that fact discovery will close on May 14, 2010, I caused to be served on April 15, 2010 notices for the following depositions: deposition of ProtectMarriage.com under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(b)(6) commencing on April 29, 2010; deposition of Ron Prentice commencing on April 29, 2010; depositions of National Organization for Marriage California and National Organization for Marriage California PAC under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 30(b)(6)

commencing on April 30, 2010; and deposition of Brian Brown commencing on April 30, 2010. A true and correct copy of these notices is attached as **Exhibit B**.

- 5. On April 19 and 20, 2010, I received e-mails from Ms. Troupis stating that Plaintiffs' witnesses are not available for depositions on any day before the close of fact discovery on May 14, 2010. A true and correct copy of these e-mails is attached as **Exhibit C**. Ms. Troupis proposed that the witnesses could be available on May 27 and 28, but she offered these dates only "on the condition that there be no requests to change the deadlines set forth in the scheduling order because these depositions would fall outside the set time for discovery."
- 6. On April 22, 2010, I contacted Ms. Troupis to discuss Plaintiffs' position on extending discovery deadlines. Ms. Troupis informed me that Plaintiffs were not open to any extension of discovery deadlines and would not consent to a motion to shorten time on a hearing on Defendants' request to extend discovery deadlines. A true and correct copy of an e-mail documenting this communication is attached hereto as **Exhibit D**.
- 7. On April 22, 2010, Supervising Deputy Attorney General Zackery Morazzini circulated a Joint Statement re Discovery Disagreement for Plaintiffs' review and response, with a request that Plaintiffs respond by April 29, 2010. On information and belief, I expect that the Attorney General will file this Joint Statement with the assigned magistrate judge within the next several days.

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

Executed April 27, 2010, at San Francisco, California.

s/Mollie Lee	
Mollie M. Lee	