

1 DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar #139669
 City Attorney
 2 WAYNE SNODGRASS, State Bar #148137
 JONATHAN GIVNER, State Bar #208000
 3 TARA M. STEELEY, State Bar #231775
 Deputy City Attorney
 4 City Hall, Room 234
 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
 5 San Francisco, California 94102-4682
 Telephone: (415) 554-4694
 6 Facsimile: (415) 554-4699
 E-Mail: jon.givner@sfgov.org

7 Attorneys for Defendants

8
 9 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
 FREDERICK K. LOWELL #66641
 10 BRUCE A. ERICSON #76342
 bruce.ericson@pillsburylaw.com
 11 ANITA D. STEARNS MAYO #142749
 MARC H. AXELBAUM #209855
 12 marc.axelbaum@pillsburylaw.com
 50 Fremont Street
 13 Post Office Box 7880
 San Francisco, CA 94120-7880
 14 Telephone: (415) 983-1000
 Facsimile: (415) 983-1200

15 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

16
 17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 18 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 19

20 COMMITTEE ON JOBS CANDIDATE
 21 ADVOCACY FUND, et al.,

22 Plaintiffs,

23 vs.

24 DENNIS J. HERRERA, in his official
 capacity as City Attorney of the City and
 County of San Francisco, et al.

25 Defendants.

Case No. C07-3199 JSW

**JOINT STATUS REPORT;
~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER**

JOINT STATUS REPORT

Pursuant to the Joint Status Report and the Order filed June 25, 2010 (Dkt. 64), Plaintiffs Committee on JOBS Candidate Advocacy Fund and Building Owners and Managers Association of San Francisco Independent Expenditure PAC (collectively, "Plaintiffs"), and Defendants Dennis J. Herrera, Kamala D. Harris, the Ethics Commission of the City and County of San Francisco, and the City and County of San Francisco (collectively, "Defendants"), jointly file this Status Report.

In this case, Plaintiffs contend that Sections 1.114(c)(1) and 1.114(c)(2) of the San Francisco Campaign Finance Reform Ordinance ("CFRO"), codified in the San Francisco Campaign and Governmental Conduct Code, and Regulation 1.114-2 of the Regulations to the CFRO, violate the First Amendment to the United States Constitution by imposing limits on contributions to political committees for the purpose of making independent expenditures. The Court granted Plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction on September 20, 2007 (Dkt. 37), and that order has remained in effect since then pursuant to a series of stipulated orders. At the parties' request, the Court stayed the litigation while the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals considered a case presenting similar issues, *Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce et al. v. City of Long Beach* ("Long Beach," USCA Dkt. 07-55691). As described in the parties' May 12, 2010 status report (Dkt. 61), the Ninth Circuit issued an opinion in *Long Beach* this April, holding that the contribution limit in that case was unconstitutional as applied to some of the plaintiffs, and that the remaining plaintiff lacked standing to challenge the law. *See* 603 F.3d 684 (9th Cir. 2010), *petition for cert. filed*, 79 U.S.L.W. 3077 (U.S. July 28, 2010) (No. 10-155).

In light of the Ninth Circuit's decision, counsel for Plaintiffs and Defendants have initiated discussions regarding potential settlement of this matter. The parties continue to believe that settlement discussions could be fruitful. Negotiations will be time-consuming because any settlement of this matter would likely require approval of the organizational plaintiffs and the San Francisco Board of Supervisors and Ethics Commission. For that reason, the parties have agreed that an extension of the current stay until November 5, 2010 should allow them sufficient time to pursue the possibility of settlement.

1 During that period, the parties agree that it would be most efficient and would best preserve
2 the interests of judicial economy to continue the current stay. Subject to agreement by this Court, the
3 parties agree that, by November 5, 2010, they will meet and confer to discuss how best to proceed
4 with this case and submit a joint status report or request for a case management conference. The
5 parties agree that no case management conference is necessary at this time.

6
7 Dated: August 20, 2010

8 DENNIS J. HERRERA
9 City Attorney
10 WAYNE SNODGRASS
11 JONATHAN GIVNER
12 TARA M. STEELEY
13 Deputy City Attorneys

14 By: /s/ Jonathan Givner
15 JONATHAN GIVNER
16 Attorneys for Defendants

17 Dated: August 20, 2010

18 PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
19 FREDERICK K. LOWELL
20 BRUCE A. ERICSON
21 ANITA D. STERNS MAYO
22 MARC H. AXELBAUM

23 *By: /s/ Marc H. Axelbaum
24 MARC H. AXELBAUM
25 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

26
27 *Pursuant to GO 45, the electronic signatory has
28 obtained approval from this signatory.

~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER


Pursuant to the agreement of the parties set forth in the foregoing Joint Status Report, and good cause appearing, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:

1. Unless otherwise ordered by the Court, the Order Granting Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction (Dkt. 37) and the Stipulation and Order Staying Litigation entered by the Court on October 26, 2007 (Dkt. 51) shall remain in effect.

2. By November 5, 2010, the parties shall meet and confer and submit a joint status report or request for a case management conference.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: August 23, 2010



Hon. Jeffrey S. White
United States District Judge