

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

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

Plaintiffs,

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,

Plaintiff-Intervenor,

v

ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, in his  
official capacity as governor of  
California; EDMUND G BROWN JR, in  
his official capacity as attorney  
general of California; MARK B  
HORTON, in his official capacity  
as director of the California  
Department of Public Health and  
state registrar of vital  
statistics; LINETTE SCOTT, in her  
official capacity as deputy  
director of health information &  
strategic planning for the  
California Department of Public  
Health; PATRICK O'CONNELL, in his  
official capacity as clerk-  
recorder of the County of  
Alameda; and DEAN C LOGAN, in his  
official capacity as registrar-  
recorder/county clerk for the  
County of Los Angeles,

Defendants,

DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH, GAIL J  
KNIGHT, MARTIN F GUTIERREZ,  
HAKSHING WILLIAM TAM, MARK A  
JANSSON and PROTECTMARRIAGE.COM -  
YES ON 8, A PROJECT OF  
CALIOFORNIA RENEWAL, as official  
proponents of Proposition 8,

Defendant-Intervenors.

No C 09-2292 VRW  
ORDER

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

1           On April 25, 2010, the court ordered the ACLU of Northern  
2 California and Equality California (together the "No on 8 groups")  
3 to show cause why they should not be held in contempt for failing  
4 to produce documents responsive to the court's March 5, Doc #610,  
5 and March 22, Doc #623, orders. Doc #641. On April 27, 2010, the  
6 No on 8 groups represented that they had produced all responsive  
7 non-privileged documents. Doc #649. On April 30, 2010, plaintiffs  
8 and proponents informed the court that they believe the No on 8  
9 groups' production complies with the March 5 and March 22 orders.  
10 Doc #651 (plaintiffs); Doc #652 (proponents).

11           Accordingly, good cause having been shown, the order to  
12 show cause why the No on 8 groups should not be held in contempt  
13 for failing to produce documents as ordered, Doc #641, is hereby  
14 DISCHARGED. The hearing scheduled for May 3, 2010 is VACATED.

15  
16           IT IS SO ORDERED.

17 

18 \_\_\_\_\_  
19 VAUGHN R WALKER  
20 United States District Chief Judge  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28