

1 LYNN H. PASAHOW (CSB NO. 054283)
lpasahow@fenwick.com
 2 CAROLYN CHANG (CSB NO. 217933)
cchang@fenwick.com
 3 LESLIE KRAMER (CSB NO. 253313)
lkramer@fenwick.com
 4 LAUREN WHITTEMORE (CSB NO. 255432)
lwhittemore@fenwick.com
 5 FENWICK & WEST LLP
 555 California Street, Suite 1200
 6 San Francisco, CA 94104
 Telephone: (415) 875-2300
 7 Facsimile: (415) 281-1350

8 Attorneys for Third-Party Equality California

9
10 (Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page)

11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 12 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 13 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

FENWICK & WEST LLP
 ATTORNEYS AT LAW
 SAN FRANCISCO

14 KRISTIN M. PERRY, *et al.*,
 15 Plaintiffs,
 16 and
 17 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
 Plaintiff-Intervenor,
 18 v.
 19 ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, *et al.*,
 20 Defendants,
 21 and
 22 PROPOSITION 8 OFFICIAL PROPONENTS
 DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH, *et al.*,
 23 Defendant-Intervenors.

Case No. 09-CV-2292 VRW

**EQUALITY CALIFORNIA AND NO
 ON PROPOSITION 8, CAMPAIGN
 FOR MARRIAGE EQUALITY: A
 PROJECT OF THE AMERICAN
 CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF
 NORTHERN CALIFORNIA'S
 MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE
 RELIEF**

Trial: January 11, 2010
 Judge: Chief Judge Vaughn R. Walker
 Location: Courtroom 6, 17th Floor

TO THE PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that pursuant to Local Rule 7-11, before The Honorable Vaughn R. Walker, United States District Court, Northern District of California, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California, Equality California ("EQCA") and No on Proposition 8, Campaign for Marriage Equality, A Project of the American Civil Liberties Union ("ACLU") (collectively "Objectors") will and do hereby move the Court for administrative relief. EQCA and ACLU request the Court set a hearing on Objectors' and Defendants-Intervenors' objections to Magistrate Judge Joseph Spero's March 5, 2010 Order on March 16, or in the alternative, on March 23.

On March 5, 2010, Magistrate Judge Spero granted, to the extent specified in a written opinion (Doc # 610), the motion of Defendants-Intervenors ("Proponents") to compel Objectors to produce certain documents on a rolling basis with production to be completed by March 31. Proponents did not agree to a stay of the Order, but Proponents and Objectors have agreed to an expedited schedule for the filing and briefing of objections which both sides intend to file to that Order. *See* Stipulated Request for Order Shortening Time. Pursuant to that agreed-upon schedule, Objectors have today filed their objections. Proponents have agreed to file their opposition to those objections as well as their own objections to Magistrate Judge Spero's Order on March 15 and Objectors will file any opposition to Proponents' objections not later than March 17.

The Objectors would ask that the Court set this matter for hearing on either March 18 or 19. However, it appears that the Court may not be available on either of those dates. If that is true, then Objectors are willing to waive conditionally the filing of any written response to Proponents' objections, and to hold a hearing on March 16. By "conditionally," Objectors mean that they would like to reserve the right to request an opportunity to file a further written response to Proponents' March 15 objections following the hearing. Alternatively, Objectors request that the hearing be set for March 23 and that the stipulated briefing schedule, as described above, be maintained. Proponents have agreed to a March 16 or March 23 hearing date. *See* Stipulated Request for Order Shortening Time.

1 In the event the Court does not grant Objectors' request to vacate the Magistrate Judge's
2 March 5 Order, Objectors will promptly seek a stay pending appeal of that Order from this Court.
3 In the interim, Objectors do not intend to produce documents for the obvious reason that were
4 they to do so, it would render moot their objections. Since it is our hope that this matter will be
5 promptly heard and resolved, we do not intend to file a formal motion for an interim stay of the
6 Magistrate Judge's Order pending hearing of our objections unless the Court wishes us to do so.

7 Wherefore, Objectors request that the Court set a hearing either for March 16 or
8 March 23, 2010.

9
10 Dated: March 11, 2010

FENWICK & WEST LLP

11
12 By: /s/ Lauren Whittemore
13 Lauren Whittemore

14 Attorneys for Third Party, Equality California

15
16 STEPHEN V. BOMSE
17 JUSTIN M. ARAGON
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP

18 ALAN L. SCHLOSSER
19 ELIZABETH O. GILL
ACLU Foundation Of Northern California

20 Attorneys for No on Proposition 8, Campaign
21 for Marriage Equality: A Project of the
22 American Civil Liberties Union of Northern
23 California

FENWICK & WEST LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO