

1 BINGHAM MCCUTCHEM LLP
 David M. Balabanian (SBN 37368)
 2 david.balabanian@bingham.com
 Frank Busch (SBN 258288)
 3 frank.busch@bingham.com
 Elizabeth Benson (SBN 268851)
 4 elly.benson@bingham.com
 Kathryn Conard (SBN 275094)
 5 kate.conard@bingham.com
 Three Embarcadero Center
 6 San Francisco, California 94111
 Telephone: 1.415.393.2000
 7 Facsimile: 1.415.393.2286

8 Attorneys for Amicus Curiae
 The Bar Association of San Francisco
 9

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 12

13 KRISTIN M. PERRY, et al.,
 14 Plaintiffs,
 15 and
 16 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
 17 Plaintiff-Intervenor,
 18 v.
 19 EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., et al.,
 20 Defendants,
 21 and
 22 PROPOSITION 8 OFFICIAL PROPONENTS
 DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH, et al.,
 23 Defendant-Intervenors.
 24
 25
 26
 27
 28

Case No. 09-CV-2292 JW

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND
 MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE
 BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE
 THE BAR ASSOCIATION OF
 SAN FRANCISCO**

Date: June 13, 2011
 Time: 9:00 a.m.
 Judge: Chief Judge Ware
 Location: Courtroom 5, 17th Floor

1 TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

2 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE THAT The Bar Association of San Francisco hereby moves
3 the Court for leave to file an amicus curiae brief, addressing the Defendant-Intervenors'
4 (“Movants”) motion to vacate the judgment (Doc. No. 768) through disqualification of Chief
5 Judge Walker.

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

8 “District courts frequently welcome amicus briefs from non-parties concerning legal
9 issues that have potential ramifications beyond the parties directly involved or if the amicus has
10 unique information or perspective that can help the court beyond the help that the lawyers for the
11 parties are able to provide.” *Sonoma Falls Devs., LLC v. Nev. Gold & Casinos, Inc.*, 272
12 F. Supp. 2d 919, 925 (N.D. Cal. 2003). This case has great “potential ramifications” for the
13 operation of our judicial system if Movants’ proposed basis for disqualifying Chief Judge
14 Walker is accepted. Accordingly, the standard for submitting an amicus brief has been met.

15 **II. IDENTITY AND INTERESTS OF PROPOSED AMICUS**

16 The Bar Association of San Francisco (“BASF”) is a nonprofit voluntary membership
17 organization of attorneys, law students, and legal professionals in the San Francisco Bay Area.
18 Founded in 1872, BASF enjoys the support of more than 7,300 individuals, law firms, corporate
19 legal departments, and law schools. Through its board of directors, its committees, and its
20 volunteer legal services programs and other community efforts, BASF has worked actively to
21 promote and achieve equal justice for all and oppose discrimination in all its forms, including,
22 but not limited to, discrimination based on race, sex, disability, and sexual orientation. BASF
23 provides a collective voice for public advocacy, advances professional growth and education,
24 and attempts to elevate the standards of integrity, honor, and respect in the practice of law.

25 The members of BASF have a duty to “maintain the respect due to the courts of justice
26 and judicial officers.” Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code § 6068(b); *see also* ABA Model Rules of
27 Professional Conduct, Preamble (“[A] lawyer should further the public’s understanding of and
28

