

Cooper & Kirk

Lawyers

A Professional Limited Liability Company

Charles J. Cooper
ccooper@cooperkirk.com

1523 New Hampshire Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

(202) 220-9600
Fax (202) 220-9601

January 14, 2010

The Honorable Vaughn R. Walker
Chief Judge
United States District Court for the
Northern District of California
450 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: *Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, No. C-09-2292 VRW (N.D. Cal.)

Dear Chief Judge Walker:

I write on behalf of Defendant-Intervenors (“Proponents”) to respectfully request that the Court halt any further recording of the proceedings in this case, and delete any recordings of the proceedings to date that have previously been made.

As the Court will recall, on Monday morning, just before trial commenced, the Court noted that its orders concerning public dissemination had been temporarily stayed by the Supreme Court. In response, Plaintiffs nonetheless asked the Court to record the proceedings for the purpose of later public dissemination if the stay was subsequently lifted:

Since the stay is temporary and the Supreme Court is going to be considering these issues, and given the importance of the issues in this case, we would request that the Court permit recording and preservation of the proceedings today and through Wednesday [G]iven the fact that this is a temporary stay, and the stay order does not mention anything about restricting the ability of the court to capture the images on the cameras and preserve them in the event the stay is lifted and Judge Kozinski issues his order, we think that would be a good solution so then the materials could be posted when those -- those things happen.

Tr. of Proceedings at 14-15 (Jan. 11, 2010) (Attachment A). In response, Proponents objected to the recording of the proceedings as inconsistent with the Supreme Court’s temporary stay, *see id.* at 16, but the Court accepted Plaintiffs’ proposal.

The Honorable Vaughn R. Walker
January 14, 2010
Page 2 of 2

The Supreme Court yesterday extended the stay indefinitely. *Hollingsworth v. Perry*, 558 U.S. ___, No. 09A648, slip op. (Jan. 13, 2010) (*per curiam*). The Supreme Court's ruling removes all question that recording of the proceedings is prohibited. As the Supreme Court explained, prior to this Court's amendment to Local Rule 77-3 (which amendment, the Court concluded, was not properly adopted), Local Rule 77-3 "banned the *recording* or broadcast of court proceedings." *Hollingsworth*, slip op. at 4 (emphasis added). Unamended Local Rule 77-3 thus governs these proceedings, and, as the Supreme Court held, it has "the force of law." *Id.* at 8 (quotation marks omitted).

In short, it is now clear that the Supreme Court's stay will remain in place indefinitely, and the prohibition against the recording of these proceedings remains binding. For these reasons, Proponents renew their objection to any further recording of the proceedings in this case, and request that the Court order that any recordings previously made be deleted.

Sincerely,

/s/ Charles J. Cooper

Charles J. Cooper
Counsel for Defendant-Intervenors

Cc: Counsel of Record