

# EXHIBIT E

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 MARK A.  
JANSSON 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, Mark A. Jansson, declare as follows:

2 1. I am a resident, taxpayer, and registered elector of the County of Sacramento, State of  
3 California. I have personal knowledge of the facts stated herein, and if called upon to testify, I  
4 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 qualifying Proposition 8 for the ballot and campaigning for its enactment. For  
18 example, I spent hundreds of hours between January 2008 and November 2008 working in support  
19 of Proposition 8, including obtaining petition signatures, traveling throughout the State to organize  
20 volunteers, speaking to community organizations, meeting with leaders of the various ethnic  
21 communities, and serving on the executive committee of ProtectMarriage.com – Yes on 8, A  
22 Project of California Renewal.

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

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

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

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

12 Executed on May 27<sup>th</sup>, 2009, at Elk Grove, California.

13  
14   
15 Mark A. Jansson  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28