

# Exhibit B

1 COOPER AND KIRK, PLLC  
 Charles J. Cooper (DC Bar No. 248070)\*  
 2 *ccooper@cooperkirk.com*  
 David H. Thompson (DC Bar No. 450503)\*  
 3 *dthompson@cooperkirk.com*  
 Howard C. Nielson, Jr. (DC Bar No. 473018)\*  
 4 *hnielson@cooperkirk.com*  
 Nicole J. Moss  
 5 *nmoss@cooperkirk.com* (DC Bar No. 472424)  
 Jesse Panuccio  
 6 *jpanuccio@cooperkirk.com* (DC Bar No. 981634)  
 Peter A. Patterson (Ohio Bar No. 0080840)\*  
 7 *ppatterson@cooperkirk.com*  
 1523 New Hampshire Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036  
 8 Telephone: (202) 220-9600, Facsimile: (202) 220-9601

9 LAW OFFICES OF ANDREW P. PUGNO  
 Andrew P. Pugno (CA Bar No. 206587)  
 10 *andrew@pugnotlaw.com*  
 101 Parkshore Drive, Suite 100, Folsom, California 95630  
 11 Telephone: (916) 608-3065, Facsimile: (916) 608-3066

12 ALLIANCE DEFENSE FUND  
 Brian W. Raum (NY Bar No. 2856102)\*  
 13 *braum@telladf.org*  
 James A. Campbell (OH Bar No. 0081501)\*  
 14 *jcampbell@telladf.org*  
 15100 North 90th Street, Scottsdale, Arizona 85260  
 15 Telephone: (480) 444-0020, Facsimile: (480) 444-0028

16 ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT-INTERVENORS DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH,  
 GAIL J. KNIGHT, MARTIN F. GUTIERREZ, HAK-SHING WILLIAM TAM,  
 17 MARK A. JANSSON, and PROTECTMARRIAGE.COM – YES ON 8, A  
 PROJECT OF CALIFORNIA RENEWAL

18 \* Admitted *pro hac vice*

19  
 20 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

21 KRISTIN M. PERRY, SANDRA B. STIER,  
 22 PAUL T. KATAMI, and JEFFREY J.  
 ZARRILLO,

23 Plaintiffs,

24 v.

25 ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, in his offi-  
 26 cial capacity as Governor of California; ED-  
 27 MUND G. BROWN, JR., in his official capacity  
 as Attorney General of California; MARK B.

CASE NO. 09-CV-2292 VRW

**DECLARATION OF RONALD  
 PRENTICE IN SUPPORT OF DE-  
 FENDANT-INTERVENORS' MO-  
 TION FOR A PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Date: September 25, 2009  
 Time: 10:00AM  
 Judge: Chief Judge Vaughn R. Walker  
 Location: Courtroom 6, 17th Floor

1 HORTON, in his official capacity as Director of  
2 the California Department of Public Health and  
3 State Registrar of Vital Statistics; LINETTE  
4 SCOTT, in her official capacity as Deputy Di-  
5 rector of Health Information & Strategic Plan-  
6 ning for the California Department of Public  
7 Health; PATRICK O'CONNELL, in his official  
8 capacity as Clerk-Recorder for the County of  
9 Alameda; and DEAN C. LOGAN, in his official  
10 capacity as Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk for  
11 the County of Los Angeles,

12 Defendants,

13 and

14 PROPOSITION 8 OFFICIAL PROPONENTS  
15 DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH, GAIL J.  
16 KNIGHT, MARTIN F. GUTIERREZ, HAK-  
17 SHING WILLIAM TAM, and MARK A.  
18 JANSSON; and PROTECTMARRIAGE.COM  
19 – YES ON 8, A PROJECT OF CALIFORNIA  
20 RENEWAL,

21 Defendant-Intervenors.

22 Additional Counsel for Defendant-Intervenors

23 ALLIANCE DEFENSE FUND  
24 Timothy Chandler (CA Bar No. 234325)  
25 *tchandler@telladf.org*  
26 101 Parkshore Drive, Suite 100, Folsom, California 95630  
27 Telephone: (916) 932-2850, Facsimile: (916) 932-2851

28 Jordan W. Lorence (DC Bar No. 385022)\*  
*jlorenc@telladf.org*  
Austin R. Nimocks (TX Bar No. 24002695)\*  
*animocks@telladf.org*  
801 G Street NW, Suite 509, Washington, D.C. 20001  
Telephone: (202) 393-8690, Facsimile: (202) 347-3622

\* Admitted *pro hac vice*

I, Ronald Prentice, make the following declaration pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746:

1. I am a resident of California over 18 years of age, and my statements herein are based on personal knowledge.

1           2. The California ballot measure in 2008 known as Proposition 8 had five “Official Pro-  
2 ponents” pursuant to California law, Cal. Elec. Code §342. Those five Proponents are Defendant-  
3 Intervenors in this case: Dennis Hollingsworth, Gail J. Knight, Martin F. Gutierrez, Hak-Shing  
4 William Tam, and Mark A. Jansson (“the Proponents”).

5           3. The Proponents endorsed ProtectMarriage.com – Yes on 8, a Project of California Re-  
6 newal (“Protect Marriage”), a “primarily formed committee” under the California Political Reform  
7 Act, Cal. Gov. Code § 82047.5, as the official Proposition 8 campaign committee. Protect Mar-  
8 riage was designated to receive all contributions and to disburse expenditures for the Proposition 8  
9 campaign.

10           4. For purposes of state law, Protect Marriage has a single officer responsible for filing  
11 required disclosures. David Bauer serves as that officer.

12           5. Unofficially, Protect Marriage was and is supported by many volunteers with varying  
13 levels of involvement and input, including an ad hoc “executive committee” consisting of several  
14 individuals. Some of those individuals served as agents for other organizations with an interest in  
15 the qualification and passage of Proposition 8, and the marriage debate generally. I serve as  
16 chairman of the ad hoc executive committee.

17           6. The ad hoc executive committee was often advised by an attorney, who was retained to  
18 serve as Protect Marriage’s general counsel.

19           7. Protect Marriage employed a public relations firm to serve as the Proposition 8 cam-  
20 paign manager.

21           8. Volunteers of Protect Marriage corresponded with each other, with the public relations  
22 firm, with various vendors and independent contractors, and with other third parties about political  
23 beliefs, campaign strategy, personal beliefs, and much else relating to Proposition 8.

1           9. As chairman of the ad hoc executive committee, I had extensive dealings with Protect  
2 Marriage's donors and volunteers. Many of the donors were quite concerned that publicly-  
3 disclosed affiliation with Protect Marriage would lead to retaliation against them. They were  
4 specifically concerned with the scope of information that would be revealed, and for some donors  
5 the determining factor in favor of donating was that the only information that would be publicly  
6 disclosed was the amount of their contribution and their name, address, occupation and employer.  
7

8           10. I am aware of many instances of harassment and retaliation against Protect Marriage's  
9 donors and volunteers that occurred after their affiliation with Protect Marriage became public.  
10 The names of donors to Proposition 8 were widely distributed on the Internet, and many donors  
11 experienced boycotts of their businesses. I am aware of several individuals who chose to resign  
12 from their employment in order to escape the harassment and intimidation brought upon them and  
13 their employers. Volunteers who made a public stand in support of Proposition 8 by holding signs  
14 or distributing materials were victims of physical assaults such as being spat upon and having hot  
15 coffee thrown on them by passengers in passing automobiles. Several reports of vandalism to  
16 property came from volunteers who placed Yes on 8 bumper strips on their cars.  
17

18           11. Widespread retaliation and harassment against donors and volunteers had a negative ef-  
19 fect on participation in the campaign in favor of Proposition 8. As acts of harassment against  
20 Proposition 8 donors and volunteers became public, donors expressed concern over being publicly  
21 identified and placing themselves, their family members, and their employees at possible risk.  
22 Potential donors contacted me to ask how donations could be made without publicly disclosing  
23 their identity, and when campaign finance disclosure laws were explained to those donors, many  
24 declined to make any contribution. After receiving significant media attention and public protests,  
25 several major donors to the Proposition 8 campaign refused to make further contributions.  
26  
27  
28

1           12. I personally experienced harassment and retaliation due to my affiliation with Protect  
 2 Marriage. While the physical addresses of my residence and office locations were not public , I  
 3 received harassment on a regular basis via E-mails, letters, and phone calls. Derisive name-calling  
 4 and statements of hatred toward me became commonplace. Attacks on my character and integrity  
 5 were also attempted, with bogus claims regarding the fiscal management of the organization I  
 6 direct.  
 7

8           13. Some donors to Protect Marriage conditioned their donation on being privy to the polit-  
 9 ical strategy, polling, opinion research, and internal workings of the campaign in favor of Proposi-  
 10 tion 8. Some donors communicated to Protect Marriage their thoughts about the election, about the  
 11 marriage debate generally, and/or ideas for campaign strategy.  
 12

13           14. If I had known that the non-public communications of Protect Marriage, its donors and  
 14 volunteers would be subject to disclosure, I would have communicated differently with other  
 15 volunteers of Protect Marriage, with its donors, and with others associated with the campaign  
 16 and/or the marriage debate. I would have been more guarded, and fearful that my communications  
 17 could later be distorted, utilized for purposes of intimidation, or utilized to learn my personal  
 18 beliefs of the political strategies I thought advisable. Also, I would have warned donors, volun-  
 19 teers, and affiliates that by nature of participation in the political campaign, anything they commu-  
 20 nicate to any party regarding Proposition 8 or the marriage debate generally could be subject to  
 21 compelled disclosure in a lawsuit.  
 22

23           I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE  
 24 AND CORRECT.

25 Executed on: September 15, 2009

26   
 27 Ronald Prentice  
 28