## PAUL WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP Windsor v. The United States Of America

1285 AVENUE OF THE AMERICAS NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10019-6064

TELEPHONE (212) 378-3000

LLOYD K, GARRIGON (1946-1981) RANDOLPH E, PAUL (1946-1936) SIMON H, RIFKIND (1930-1993) LOUIS S, WEISS (1027-1970) JOHN E WHARTON (1987-1877)

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NUMBER

(212) 373-3086 WRITER'S DIRECT FACSIMILE

(212) 373-2818
WRITER'S DIRECT E-MAIL ADDRESS

rkaplan@paulweiss.com

UNIT 3601, FORTUNE PLAZA OFFICE TOWER A
NO. 7 DONG SANMUAN THONGLU
CHAO YANG DISTRICT
REJUNG 100000
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA
TELEPHONE (106-10) 3828-8300

12TH FLOOR, HONG KONG CI,UR RUILDING 9A CHATER ROAD, CENTRAL HONG KONG TELEPHONE (132) 2046-0300

> ALDRR CASTLE 10 NOBLE STREET LONDON EG2V 7JU, U.K. TELEPHONE (44 20) 7367 1500

FUKOKU SEIMEI BUILDING 2-2 UGHIBAIWAICHO 2-CHOME CHIYODA-KU, YOKYO 100-0011, JAPAN TELEPHONE (81-3) 3597-8101

TORONTO-DOMINION CENTRE 77 KING STREET WEST, SUITE 3100 RO. 100X 226 TORONTO, ONTARIO MISK 1JJ TELEPHONE (418) 504-0320

> 2001 K STREET, NW WABHINGTON, DG 20005-1047 TRUKPHONE (202) 223-7300

500 DELAWARE AVENUE, 6UITE 200 POST OFFICE NOX 32 WILMINGTON, DE 19899-0032 TELEPMONE (3021 655-4410

August 12, 2011



DANIEL J. KRAMER

DAVID K. LAKHDHIR

DAVID K. LAKHDHIR

DEFFREN F. LAMB

DIALOTU GREE LLL

JACOTU GREE LLU

JEFFREN D. MARELL

MARCO V. MANDARD

DAVID K. MANDARD

JEFFREN D. MARELL

MARCO V. MANDARD

DAVID M. MANDARD

JOHN E. M. MEROLE

DAVID M. MANDARD

JOHN E. MANDARD

MARCO V. MANDARD

JOHN E. MANDARD

MARCO V. MANDARD

MARCO V. MANDARD

JOHN E. MANDARD

JOHN E. MANDARD

MARCO V. MANDARD

MARCO V. MANDARD

JOHN E. MANDARD

MARCO V. MANDARD

JOHN E. MAND

'NOT ADMITTED TO THE NEW YORK DAR

## BY FACSIMILE

Judge Barbara S. Jones United States District Court Southern District of New York 500 Pearl Street New York, NY 10007

Magistrate Judge James C. Francis United States District Court Southern District of New York 500 Pearl Street New York, NY 10007 USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: 9 9 12

Windsor v. United States, 10 Civ. 8435 (BSJ) (JCF)

Dear Judge Jones and Judge Francis:

While we, too, regret having to burden the Court with further correspondence, defendant-intervenor raises for the first time in his letter in sur-reply the issue of constitutional facts. The finding of constitutional facts is not so simple an issue that it can be summed up in a brief letter, but suffice it to say that BLAG's attempt to do so is inaccurate. As the Second Circuit has explained, in response to a dissenter making much the same argument BLAG makes here.

The dissent's extensive discussion of the significance of the distinction between adjudicative and legislative facts seems to us tangential and unhelpful. The fact that this Court may ultimately undertake *de novo* 

PAUL, WEISS, RIFKIND, WHARTON & GARRISON LLP Judge Barbara S. Jones Magistrate Judge James C. Francis

2

review of any legislative facts found by the District Court on remand or that appellate courts take judicial notice of legislative facts under appropriate circumstances... does not mean that we must resolve disputed legislative facts-particularly facts that are dispositive of the case before us-on an insufficiently developed record. Nor should we... the types of "legislative facts" that have been addressed most recently in our caselaw deal with much more straightforward questions, e.g., geography and jurisdiction or the fact that cocaine is derived from coca leaves.

Landell v. Sorrell, 382 F.3d 91, n.24 (2d Cir. 2004), overruled on other grounds by Randall v. Sorrell, 548 U.S. 230 (2006) (holding statute unconstitutional without need for remand); accord Ashcroft v. ACLU, 542 U.S. 656 (2004) (remanding to trial court for fact finding on constitutional fact of whether law was least restrictive alternative under the First Amendment, noting "[b]y remanding for trial, we require the Government to shoulder its full constitutional burden of proof respecting the less restrictive alternative argument, rather than excuse it from doing so"); see also Perry v. Schwarzenegger, Transcript of Oral Argument at 81, 704 F. Supp. 2d 921 (No. 09-Civ-2292) (Oct. 14, 2009) ("embedded within such a legislative fact are certain assumptions about human behavior and relationships [... a]nd the presentation of evidence, I believe, is essential to the resolution of the issues insofar as they bear on that legal question.").

Moreover, not one of the cases cited by BLAG stands for the radical proposition, apparently advanced by BLAG, that a trial court, when finding any type of fact (whether "adjudicative," "legislative," or "constitutional"), is supposed to engage in a veritable "free for all" -- with hearsay admitted for the truth of the matters asserted, with lay witnesses testifying as to matters that are clearly only within the realm of expert testimony, and with declarants "testifying" without there being any opportunity to test their credibility, bias, or competency. We respectfully submit that trial and summary adjudications in our system do not get conducted in this manner and for good reason -- because doing so would render fundamental principles of fairness and due process that are inherent in our court system a farce.

As noted in my prior letter, should the Court believe it advisable, we are available for a conference with the Court at the Court's convenience. Our goal is to resolve these procedural issues raised by plaintiff's motion to strike in a way that is fair and efficient for the parties and the Court.

Respectfully submitted,

Roberta a. Kaplan / the Roberta A. Kaplan

cc: James D. Esseks, Esq.

H. Christopher Bartolomucci, Esq.

Jean Lin, Esq.