

EXHIBIT D

1 ALLIANCE DEFENSE FUND
Timothy Chandler (CA Bar No. 234325)
2 *tchandler@telladf.org*
101 Parkshore Drive, Suite 100, Folsom, California 95630
3 Telephone: (916) 932-2850, Facsimile: (916) 932-2851

4 Benjamin W. Bull, (AZ Bar No. 009940)
bbull@telladf.org
5 Brian W. Raum (NY Bar No. 2856102)*
braum@telladf.org
6 James A. Campbell (OH Bar No. 0081501)*
jcampbell@telladf.org
7 15100 North 90th Street, Scottsdale, Arizona 85260
Telephone: (480) 444-0020, Facsimile: (480) 444-0028
8

9 LAW OFFICES OF ANDREW P. PUGNO
Andrew P. Pugno (CA Bar No. 206587)+
andrew@pugnolaw.com
10 101 Parkshore Drive, Suite 100, Folsom, California 95630
Telephone: (916) 608-3065, Facsimile: (916) 608-3066
11

12 ATTORNEYS FOR PROPOSED INTERVENORS DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH,
GAIL J. KNIGHT, MARTIN F. GUTIERREZ, HAK-SHING WILLIAM TAM,
13 and MARK A. JANSSON; and PROTECTMARRIAGE.COM – YES ON 8, A
PROJECT OF CALIFORNIA RENEWAL

14 * *Pro hac vice* application forthcoming
+ Application for admission forthcoming
15

16 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

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

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21 ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, in his official
capacity as Governor of California; EDMUND G.
22 BROWN, JR., in his official capacity as Attorney
General of California; MARK B. HORTON, in his
23 official capacity as Director of the California
Department of Public Health and State Registrar of
24 Vital Statistics; LINETTE SCOTT, in her official
capacity as Deputy Director of Health Information
25 & Strategic Planning for the California Department
of Public Health; PATRICK O'CONNELL, in his
26 official capacity as Clerk-Recorder for the County
of Alameda; and DEAN C. LOGAN, in his official
27 capacity as Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk for
28

CASE NO. 09-CV-2292 VRW

**DECLARATION OF HAK-SHING
WILLIAM TAM IN SUPPORT OF
PROPOSED INTERVENORS'
MOTION TO INTERVENE**

1 the County of Los Angeles,

2 Defendants,

3 and

4 PROPOSITION 8 OFFICIAL PROPONENTS
5 DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH, GAIL J.
6 KNIGHT, MARTIN F. GUTIERREZ, HAK-
7 SHING WILLIAM TAM, and MARK A.
8 JANSSON; and PROTECTMARRIAGE.COM –
9 YES ON 8, A PROJECT OF CALIFORNIA
10 RENEWAL,

11 Proposed Intervenors.

1 I, Hak-Shing William Tam, declare as follows:

2 1. I am a resident, taxpayer, and registered elector of the City and County of San Francisco,
3 State of California. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein, and if called upon to
4 testify, I could, and would, competently testify to those facts.

5 2. Under Article II, Section 8 of the California Constitution, I have a personal right as an
6 elector “to propose statutes and amendments to the Constitution” through the initiative process.

7 3. As one of the five Official Proponents of Proposition 8, I have exercised my
8 constitutional right to propose Proposition 8 as an initiative amendment to the California
9 Constitution.

10 4. My state constitutional and statutory rights as an Official Proponent of Proposition 8
11 could be adversely affected by the ruling in this case.

12 5. As an Official Proponent of Proposition 8, I assert an individualized and personal
13 interest that is *distinguishable* from the generalized public-policy interest in defining marriage as
14 the union of a man and a woman, shared by the majority of California voters who voted in favor of
15 Proposition 8.

16 6. In October 2008, I supervised the preparation of the appropriate language for
17 Proposition 8. At that time, I also executed the forms and documents prescribed by the California
18 Elections Code, and presented them to the California Attorney General so that he would prepare a
19 Title and Summary of the chief purpose and points of Proposition 8.

20 7. Under California Elections Code Section 342, I hold the status of an “Official
21 Proponent” of Proposition 8 because I submitted a draft of the petition proposing Proposition 8 by
22 initiative to the California Attorney General with a request that he prepare a Title and Summary of
23 the chief purpose and points of the proposed measure.

24 8. To become an Official Proponent, I was also required by California Elections Code
25 Section 9608 to execute and submit to the Attorney General a certification (1) acknowledging that it
26 is a misdemeanor under state law to allow signatures on an initiative petition to be used for any
27 purpose other than qualifying the proposed measure for the ballot and (2) certifying that I will not
28 allow the signatures for Proposition 8 to be used for any purpose other than qualifying the measure

1 for the ballot.

2 9. Under California Elections Code Section 9004, as an Official Proponent, I was
3 responsible for paying the filing fee to begin the initiative process; I was entitled to compel the
4 Attorney General to draft a Title and Summary for Proposition 8; and I was authorized to submit
5 amendments to Proposition 8.

6 10. On November 29, 2007, the Attorney General issued a Title and Summary for the
7 signature petitions. This Title and Summary appeared on the petitions that were circulated for the
8 purpose of obtaining signatures to qualify Proposition 8 for the ballot.

9 11. As an Official Proponent, I had unique legal duties to perform and rights to exercise
10 prescribed by the California Constitution and the California Elections Code.

11 12. As an Official Proponent, I was legally responsible for preparing a Proposition 8 petition
12 form that complied with the requirements of California Elections Code Sections 9001, 9008, 9012,
13 and 9014.

14 13. As an Official Proponent, I endorsed ProtectMarriage.com – Yes on 8, A Project of
15 California Renewal (a “primarily formed ballot measure committee” under California law registered
16 with the California Secretary of State) to conduct a petition-gathering campaign for the purpose of
17 qualifying Proposition 8 for the ballot.

18 14. Before allowing signatures to be collected for Proposition 8, as an Official Proponent, I
19 was required by California Elections Code Section 9609 to obtain and keep on file an executed
20 certification by each person, company official, or other organizational officer in charge of signature
21 gathering, certifying that he or she will not allow the signatures for Proposition 8 to be used for any
22 purpose other than qualifying that measure for the ballot.

23 15. As an Official Proponent, I was responsible under California Elections Code Section
24 9607 for ensuring that all volunteers and paid signature-gatherers received instruction on the state-
25 law requirements and prohibitions concerning petition circulation and signature gathering. As part
26 of this legal requirement, I was responsible for making sure that all volunteers and paid signature-
27 collectors were instructed about the state-law prohibition against the use of signatures for a purpose
28 other than qualifying the proposed initiative for the ballot.

1 16. As an Official Proponent, I was responsible for obtaining at least 694,354 valid petition
2 signatures within a maximum of 150 days between November 29, 2007, and April 28, 2008.

3 17. As an Official Proponent, I was responsible for ensuring that each petition circulator
4 who obtained signatures executed the “Declaration of Circulator” on each petition sheet. I was also
5 responsible for including each circulator’s signature, date, and place of signing as required under
6 Section 2015.5 of the California Code of Civil Procedure.

7 18. As an Official Proponent, I had the exclusive statutory right under California Elections
8 Code Section 9032 to file the signature petitions with county-elections officials for signature
9 verification. No one (other than the other four Official Proponents) could submit petitions for
10 signature verification.

11 19. On April 24, 2008, in my capacity as an Official Proponent, I authorized that the
12 petitions, bearing the signatures of over 1.2 million Californians, be submitted to county-elections
13 officials for signature verification.

14 20. As an Official Proponent, I was entitled, under California Elections Code Sections 9030,
15 9031, and 9033, to receive special notices and updates during the signature-verification process.

16 21. On June 2, 2008, because of my capacity as an Official Proponent, the Secretary of State
17 notified me that the county-elections officials had verified the requisite number of voter signatures
18 and that Proposition 8 qualified for inclusion on the November 2008 ballot.

19 22. As an Official Proponent, I had the statutory authority under California Elections Code
20 Section 9067 to designate the arguments and rebuttal arguments in favor of Proposition 8 appearing
21 in the statewide voter pamphlet.

22 23. After Proposition 8 qualified for the ballot, I was sued, in my capacity as an Official
23 Proponent, in a pre-election legal challenge before the California Supreme Court seeking to remove
24 Proposition 8 from the ballot because it was alleged to be an improperly presented constitutional
25 “revision” (rather than an amendment). The name of that case is *Bennett v. Bowen*, No. S164520.
26 As an Official Proponent, I through counsel defended my right to propose Proposition 8 as an
27 initiative amendment to the California Constitution. The California Supreme Court dismissed that
28 suit in July 2008.

1 24. In the same pre-election lawsuit, I was also sued, in my capacity as an Official
2 Proponent, on grounds that the Title and Summary prepared by the Attorney General for the
3 circulating petitions had been false and misleading. As an Official Proponent, I through counsel
4 defended the propriety of the Title and Summary appearing on Proposition 8's official petitions.
5 The California Supreme Court dismissed that suit in July 2008.

6 25. On November 4, 2008, a majority of voting Californians approved Proposition 8, and it
7 immediately became Article I, Section 7.5 of the California Constitution, which states: "Only
8 marriage between a man and a woman is valid or recognized in California."

9 26. As an Official Proponent, I successfully intervened in three post-election legal
10 challenges to Proposition 8 filed with the California Supreme Court. The petitioners in those cases
11 challenge the legality of Proposition 8 under the California Constitution. On November 19, 2008,
12 the Court permitted my intervention in those consolidated cases. The name of that consolidated
13 action is *Strauss v. Horton*, No. S168047. In my capacity as an Official Proponent, I through
14 counsel defended Proposition 8 against those legal challenges. On March 26, 2009, the California
15 Supreme Court denied those challenges and upheld Proposition 8.

16 27. As an Official Proponent, I invested substantial time, effort, reputation, and personal
17 resources in campaigning for Proposition 8. For example, I dedicated the majority of my working
18 hours between January 2008 and November 2008 toward qualifying Proposition 8 for the ballot and
19 campaigning for its enactment. I organized several rallies in support of Proposition 8 (which were
20 attended by thousands of voters), coordinated volunteers from the Asian-American community, and
21 raised thousands of dollars for the Proposition 8 campaign.

22 28. My state constitutional and statutory rights as an Official Proponent of Proposition 8 are
23 jeopardized by the legal claims raised by the plaintiffs in this case. These rights are personal
24 interests of such a direct, immediate, and individualized nature that I will suffer a personal loss if
25 the Court grants the judgment sought by the plaintiffs in that case.

26 29. I do not think that any other party in this case will adequately represent my interests as
27 an Official Proponent of Proposition 8.

28 30. As an Official Proponent of Proposition 8, I have intervened in a case currently pending

1 before the United States District Court for the Central District of California, *Smelt v. United States*,
2 Case No. SACV-09-286 DOC (MLGx). I intervened in that case with the four other Official
3 Proponents of Proposition 8—Dennis Hollingsworth, Gail J. Knight, Martin F. Gutierrez, and Mark
4 A. Jansson—as well as ProtectMarriage.com – Yes on 8, A Project of California Renewal. That
5 court granted our request for intervention on May 6, 2009. That case, like this one, asserts federal
6 constitutional challenges against Proposition 8. The plaintiffs in that case, like the plaintiffs in this
7 case, request declaratory and injunctive relief invalidating Proposition 8. Through my counsel, I
8 am currently defending against that legal challenge to Proposition 8.

9 I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the
10 foregoing is true and correct.

11 Executed on May 27, 2009, at San Francisco, California.

12
13
14 
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
Hak-Shing William Tam