

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 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 11 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

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

Case No. 09-CV-2292 VRW

**DECLARATION OF LAUREN
 WHITTEMORE IN SUPPORT OF
 STIPULATED REQUEST FOR
 ORDER SHORTENING TIME**

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

FENWICK & WEST LLP
 ATTORNEYS AT LAW
 SAN FRANCISCO

22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 I, Lauren Whittemore, hereby declare:

2 1. I am an attorney in the law firm of Fenwick & West LLP, authorized to practice
3 law in the Northern District of California and I am counsel for Equality California (“EQCA”). I
4 make this declaration based upon my own personal knowledge or upon information and belief
5 and, if called upon to testify, would testify competently to the matters contained herein.

6 2. On March 8, 2010 I sent an email to counsel for Defendants-Intervenors
7 (“Proponents”) and to counsel for Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenors. The email requested that
8 Proponents stipulate to a stay of Magistrate Judge Spero’s March 5, 2010 Order. In the
9 alternative, I asked whether Proponents would agree to a shortened briefing schedule in light of
10 the requirement that EQCA and No on Proposition 8, Campaign for Marriage Equality, A Project
11 of the American Civil Liberties Union (“ACLU”) (collectively “Objectors”) produce all
12 documents by March 31, 2010.

13 3. On March 9, 2010 I spoke by phone with Jesse Panuccio, counsel for Proponents.
14 Mr. Panuccio informed me that Proponents would not agree to a stay of Judge Spero’s Order, but
15 would agree to a shortened briefing schedule on Objectors’ objections to the Order and Objectors’
16 contemplated motion to stay the Order if Objectors would agree to a shortened briefing schedule
17 to Proponents’ objections to the Order. After conferring with counsel at ACLU, I informed Mr.
18 Panuccio that Objectors would agree.

19 4. On March 10 I communicated with counsel for Californians Against Eliminating
20 Basic Rights (“CAEBR”) regarding the proposed schedule. Counsel indicated that CAEBR had
21 no objection to a stay or a shortened briefing schedule.

22 5. The proposed schedule requires that Objectors file objections and a Motion to Stay
23 on March 11. Proponents would then file an opposition to Objectors’ objections, an opposition to
24 the motion to stay, and their own objections to the Order on March 15. Objectors would file an
25 opposition to Proponents objections and a reply for the motion to stay on March 17. Objectors
26 intended to request a hearing on March 18 or 19.

27 6. In light of the fact that Chief Judge Walker’s Court Schedule indicates that he will
28 not be available on March 18 or 19, Objectors have chosen to forgo a motion to stay and instead

1 request a hearing on March 16. By March 16, Proponents will have had the opportunity to
2 respond to Objectors’ objections and will have filed their own objections to the Order. If the
3 Court schedules a hearing on March 16, Objectors will conditionally waive their right to oppose
4 Proponents’ objections to the Order. Objectors retain the right to file an opposition to
5 Proponents’ objections at a later time.

6 7. In the event the Court cannot schedule a hearing for March 16, Objectors request a
7 hearing date of March 23. Objectors will complete the briefing as scheduled by March 17.

8 8. On March 11 I spoke with counsel for Proponents. Mr. Panuccio agreed to file an
9 opposition to Objectors’ objections on March 15 and agreed to Objectors’ request for a hearing
10 date of March 16 or 23.

11 9. On March 11 I contacted counsel for CAEBR regarding Objectors’ request for a
12 hearing date. CAEBR does not object to Objectors’ request.

13 10. Objectors have been required to begin producing documents on a rolling basis
14 immediately and to complete production by March 31. Delay of a hearing and resolution of
15 Objectors and Proponents objections to the Order will allow Objectors only a short window in
16 which to review and produce documents. Producing documents before resolution of the
17 objections to the Order would render those objections moot.

18 11. The Court previously ordered a shortened briefing schedule for Proponents’
19 Motion to Compel.

20 //
21 //
22 //
23 //
24 //
25 //
26 //
27 //
28 //

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

12. The Court has held open the end of the trial until the remaining discovery disputes have been resolved. The shortened time for briefing and hearing would not further delay the end of trial. However, Objectors’ request to stay the Order pending resolution of the objections would delay the end of trial. Additionally, in the event the Court does not vacate the March 5 Order, Objectors intend to appeal to the Ninth Circuit and will seek a stay pending appeal. If a stay of the Order is granted by this Court, the stay will have the effect of delaying the end of the trial.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on March 11, 2010 at San Francisco, California.

/s/ Lauren Whitemore
Lauren Whitemore