

1 DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar #139669
 City Attorney
 2 THERESE M. STEWART, State Bar #104930
 Chief Deputy City Attorney
 3 DANNY CHOU, State Bar #180240
 Chief of Complex and Special Litigation
 4 CHRISTINE VAN AKEN, State Bar #241755
 Deputy City Attorney
 5 MOLLIE M. LEE,* State Bar #251404
 Deputy City Attorney
 6 City Hall, Room 234
 One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
 7 San Francisco, California 94102-4682
 Telephone: (415) 554-4708
 8 Facsimile: (415) 554-4699

9 Attorneys for *Amicus Curiae*
 10 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

11
 12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

14 KRISTIN M. PERRY, SANDRA B. STIER,
 15 PAUL T. KATAMI, and JEFFREY J.
 ZARRILLO,

16 Plaintiffs,

17 vs.

18 ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, in his
 19 official capacity as Governor of California;
 EDMUND G. BROWN JR., in his official
 20 capacity as Attorney General of California;
 MARK B. HORTON, in his official capacity
 21 as Director of the California Department of
 Public Health and State Registrar of Vital
 22 Statistics; LINETTE SCOTT, in her official
 capacity as Deputy Director of Health
 23 Information & Strategic Planning for the
 California Department of Public Health;
 24 PATRICK O'CONNELL, in his official
 capacity as Clerk-Recorder for the County of
 25 Alameda; and DEAN C. LOGAN, in his
 official capacity as Registrar-Recorder/County
 26 Clerk for the County of Los Angeles,

27 Defendants.

Case No. 09-CV-2292 VRW

**MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF OF
 AMICUS CURIAE CITY AND COUNTY OF
 SAN FRANCISCO WITH SUPPORTING
 DECLARATION; [PROPOSED] ORDER**

**AMICUS CURIAE IN SUPPORT OF
 PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR A
 PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Hearing Date: July 2, 2009
 Time: 10:00 a.m.
 Place: Courtroom 6, 17th Fl.,
 450 Golden Gate Ave.

Trial Date: Not set

28 * Admission to the Northern District of California pending.

1 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT the City and County of San Francisco respectfully requests
3 the Court's leave to participate as *amicus curiae* in the above-captioned case in support of Plaintiffs'
4 motion for preliminary injunction. *Amicus* has conferred with counsel for the Defendants and
5 Proposed Intervenors, and all counsel have consented to this motion.

6 **I. STANDARD FOR MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE**

7 The Court has broad discretion to permit third parties to participate in an action as amici curiae.
8 *Gerritsen v. de la Madrid Hurtado*, 819 F.2d 1511, 1514 n.3 (9th Cir. 1987). Participation of amici
9 curiae may be particularly appropriate where the legal issues in a case have potential ramifications
10 beyond the parties directly involved or where amici can offer a unique perspective that may assist the
11 Court. *Sonoma Falls Devs., LLC v. Nev. Gold & Casinos, Inc.*, 272 F. Supp.2d 919, 925 (N.D. Cal.
12 2003).

13 **II. STATEMENT OF IDENTITY AND INTEREST OF AMICI CURIAE**

14 The City and County of San Francisco is a unit of local government charged with the
15 responsibility to issue civil marriage licenses and to solemnize and record marriages. *See* Cal. Fam.
16 Code §§ 67, 300, 350, 359, 400, 401, 423. Proposition 8 presently compels San Francisco to deny
17 lesbian and gay couples the marriage licenses that it issues to similarly situated heterosexual couples,
18 even though San Francisco believes this violates the federal constitutional rights of its lesbian and gay
19 citizens. *See Lockyer v. City and County of San Francisco*, 33 Cal. 4th 1055, 1080–82, 1085–86
20 (2004) (city and county officials may not decline to enforce statutory restrictions on marriage until
21 appellate court holds them unconstitutional). San Francisco therefore has a direct interest in the
22 vindication Plaintiffs seek in this case.

23 The discriminatory marriage regime imposed by Proposition 8 is also at odds with San
24 Francisco's fundamental values, which include the belief that its lesbian and gay citizens should be
25 treated with the same dignity and respect as all other citizens. San Francisco has a large and vibrant
26 lesbian and gay community and is often a leader in political and legal actions to recognize and protect
27 the rights of lesbians and gay men. For this reason, too, San Francisco is keenly interested in the
28 resolution of this case.

III. REASONS WHY *AMICUS CURIAE*'S EXPERTISE WILL BE BENEFICIAL TO THIS COURT

As one of the lead Plaintiffs in *In re Marriage Cases*, 43 Cal. 4th 757 (2008), and *Strauss v. Horton*, 2009 WL 1444594, San Francisco developed extensive knowledge of many of the legal and factual issues raised in the above-captioned matter. In particular, San Francisco has developed expertise in the history of discrimination against gay men and lesbians, the use of initiative measures to repeal advances in equality for gay men and lesbians, and the recent cases regarding marriage equality in California. San Francisco respectfully suggests that its analysis of these issues could assist the Court in its deliberations.

IV. CONCLUSION

Wherefore, San Francisco requests this Court's leave to submit an *amicus* brief in support of Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction.

Dated: June 18, 2009

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney
THERESE M. STEWART
Chief Deputy City Attorney
DANNY CHOU
Chief of Complex & Special Litigation
CHRISTINE VAN AKEN
MOLLIE M. LEE
Deputy City Attorneys

By: _____/s/
THERESE M. STEWART

Attorneys for *Amicus Curiae*
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO