1		The Honorable Ronald B. Leighton
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
8	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
9		
10	MAJOR MARGARET WITT,	
11	Plaintiff,	NO. C06-5195 RBL
12	VS.	DECLARATION OF JAMES E. LOBSENZ
13	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE, et al.	
14	Defendants.	
15		
16	I, JAMES E. LOBSENZ, do hereby declare under penalty of perjury under the	
17	laws of the United States of America that the following facts are true and correct:	
18	1. I am counsel for the plaintiff. I have personal knowledge of the facts set	
19	forth here.	·
20	2. In the course of my duties as counsel for Major Witt I have contacted	
21	several people who serve, or who previously served, in the 446 th Aeromedical Evacuation	
	DECLADATION OF LAMES F	CARNEY LAW OFFICES A PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CORPORATION
	DECLARATION OF JAMES E. LOBSENZ – 1 NO. C06-5195 RBL	BADLEY SPELLMAN A PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CORPORATION 700 FIFTH AVENUE, #5800 SEATTLE, WA 98104-5017 FAX (206) 467-8215 TEL (206) 622-8020

19

20

21

Squadron, to ask them for information pertinent to the case. The Ninth Circuit's 2008 decision ordered a remand so that the record could be developed on the second and third factors of the heightened scrutiny test which it recognized. The Court said:

The Air Force attempts to justify the policy by relying on congressional findings regarding "unit cohesion" and the like, but that does not go to whether the application of DADT specifically to Major Witt significantly furthers the government's interest and whether less intrusive means would achieve substantially the government's interest. Remand is therefore necessary for the district court to develop the record on Major Witt's substantive due process claim.

Witt v. Department of the Air Force, 527 F.3d 806, 821 (9th Cir. 2008). To prepare for trial in this case, I have contacted witnesses who have personal knowledge about whether Major Witt's presence in the 446th interfered with unit morale or unit cohesion, and how members of her unit reacted to her suspension and discharge.

3. Central to the plaintiff's case is her contention that prior to Major Witt's suspension in 2004, several gay and lesbian persons served in the 446th AES for many years; that their sexual orientation was well known to members of the 446th; and that no one was bothered by this fact; and that the unit morale, discipline and cohesion did not suffer as a result. The Government maintains that there is little probative value to be gained by deposing members of the 446th. But in fact several witnesses have told me that during their years of service in the 446th AES they were aware of the presence in the unit of 6-8 openly gay and lesbian servicemembers, and that their presence did not cause any problems. Further, I anticipate that the scheduled deponents will testify that Major Witt's reinstatement will have no negative effect on unit morale, cohesion or discipline.

DECLARATION OF JAMES E. LOBSENZ – 2 NO. C06-5195 RBL CARNEY BADLEY SPELLMAN

21

- 4. The list of names of unit members in the 446th was read to both Colonel Walker and Colonel Moore-Harbert to determine their suspicion or knowledge of the unit culture and its acceptance of gays and lesbians, and whether they would acknowledge it under oath.
- 5. With respect to sexual orientation, Colonel Walker testified that, in her 28-plus years in the Air Force, she never suspected or wondered whether any service member was gay or lesbian. *See* Colonel Mary E. Walker Dep. (Attached here as App. F) (hereinafter "Walker Dep.") 45:15–46:13, Jan. 8, 2010.
- 6. Colonel Moore-Harbert was asked, in addition to the list of unit members, whether she had ever encountered anyone in the 446th or in any other unit that she had ever suspected was gay or lesbian. After demanding and receiving a definition of the word "suspect" ("did it ever cross your mind"), she asserted that she could not remember ever suspecting anyone in the Air Force of being gay or lesbian. *See* Colonel Janette Moore-Harbert Dep. (Attached here as App. G) (hereinafter "Moore-Harbert Dep.") 79:25–80:7, Feb. 25, 2010. Yet, moments later in her deposition, Colonel Moore-Harbert admitted that she had learned that there was a report of a domestic violence incident (after Major Witt was suspended) which resulted in local police going to the home of a female officer in the 446th and a female enlisted service member who served under that officer's command. Colonel Moore-Harbert admitted that she eventually disciplined these two service members for fraternization. But Moore-Harbert still insisted that she did not know the two service members were lesbian. *See* Moore-Harbert Dep. 92:20-93:6.

DECLARATION OF JAMES E. LOBSENZ – 3 NO. C06-5195 RBL CARNEY BADLEY SPELLMAN

21

- 7. I have counted the number of times Colonel Moore-Harbert responded in her deposition with "I don't remember" or "Not that I can remember" to amount to over 300 instances. She also replied "I don't know" over 65 times. The deposition lasted from 9:00am to 2:00pm with a one hour lunch break and multiple bathroom breaks.
- 8. In their answers to interrogatories, the Government listed Colonel Moore-Harbert as a person who held the opinion that it would have a negative effect on unit morale, cohesion or discipline if Major Witt, now a known lesbian, were to be reinstated and returned to duty in the 446th. Attached here as App. A (Def.'s Resp. to Pl.'s Interrog. No. 9).
- 9. At her deposition, Colonel Moore-Harbert confirmed that this was her personal opinion. She was asked why she held this opinion and Colonel Moore-Harbert speculated that on future deployments Major Witt might come in contact with other service members that would be uncomfortable with Major Witt, now a known lesbian. *See* Moore-Harbert Dep. 184:15-19; 185:7-13.
- 10. She was then asked again what evidence she had to support her opinion that Major Witt's presence would cause such problems, and she finally confessed she had none:
 - Q. Now, I didn't ask you whether it would be a concern. You told me it would be a concern. I asked you: What evidence do you have that Major Witt specifically would cause that reaction?
 - A. I have no evidence.

Moore-Harbert Dep. 186: 9-13.

DECLARATION OF JAMES E. LOBSENZ – 4 NO. C06-5195 RBL CARNEY BADLEY SPELLMAN

21

- that the reinstatement of Witt now a known lesbian -- would harm unit morale, discipline or cohesion, there is in fact a wealth of evidence to suggest the exact opposite. As attested to by SMSgt. James Schaffer, Capt. Edmond Hrivnak, and Major Heather Julian, it is a fact that a number of known gays and lesbians served in the 446th for several years and their presence caused no problems at all. *See* James Schaffer Decl. ¶ 18; Edmond Hrivnak Decl. ¶¶ 3-4; Heather Julian Decl. ¶ 8. And in response to the defendants' requests for production, plaintiff Witt has produced an email from a squadron servicemember [whose name has been redacted] expressing that servicemember's belief that despite efforts to "lay low" in the unit, the servicemember believes that "most people" in the unit know about the servicemember's relationship with a same sex partner. A true and correct copy of this email is attached as Appendix B to my declaration.
- 12. In the past month I have spoken by phone with Captain Jill Robinson about being deposed in this case. She has not indicated any reluctance to be deposed. My notes of our brief conversation show that when asked whether there are gays and lesbians in the 446th AES she will say that "we have a ton of them in the squadron" and that "everyone knows" they are there. She reports that although in theory the command is supposed to turn them in for discharge, there is a culture in the 446th that since their presence causes no problems, no action is taken.
- 13. Captain Robinson's testimony is probative because she has fulfilled many different roles in the unit for more than fifteen years, serving initially as an enlisted service

DECLARATION OF JAMES E. LOBSENZ – 5 NO. C06-5195 RBL CARNEY BADLEY SPELLMAN

member, then a non-commissioned officer, and finally as an officer. She would provide three different perspectives. Captain Robinson is also expected to testify that the lesbian officer involved in the domestic violence dispute was angry with Capt. Robinson because the lesbian officer erroneously believed that Robinson had outed her. I spoke with Capt. Robinson in the past month and she told me that she had gone to Colonel Moore-Harbert and asked Moore-Harbert to explain to the angry officer that Capt. Robinson had not outed the officer, and that Moore-Harbert learned of the officer's sexual orientation from a police report regarding the domestic violence incident.

- 14. The Government implies that Lt. Colonel Hansen and Lt. Colonel Kenneth Winslow would consider it burdensome and invasive to be deposed. Within the past ten days I have spoken to Lt. Colonel Hansen and he never indicated that he felt this way. He did contact me to inform me that he had a family vacation planned for the scheduled deposition and he asked if the date of his deposition could be changed. I said certainly, and I changed the date to one that would not conflict with his vacation. A copy of the email exchange between myself and Lt. Colonel Hansen is attached as Appendix C.
- 15. I have had no contact with Lt. Colonel Winslow. Both Lt. Colonel Hansen and Lt. Colonel Winslow cooperated with the plaintiff in the past, and both gave declarations in support of Major Witt which were filed in the spring of 2006. Both Hansen and Winslow supervised Major Witt and rated her on Officer Evaluation Reports. Plaintiff has reason to believe that both have knowledge of events that have occurred in the four years since they gave their original declarations, and that such information would contradict the Air Force's

DECLARATION OF JAMES E. LOBSENZ – 6 NO. C06-5195 RBL CARNEY BADLEY SPELLMAN

position reinstatement of Major Witt would negatively affect unit morale, discipline or cohesion.

- 16. Attached as Appendix D is a true and correct copy of Major Witt's last Officer Evaluation Report (OER) written by Lt. Colonel Hansen (then Major Hansen) that specifically states Major Witt being "committed to continuing squadron cohesion and morale." This OER was written and signed in May 2006, after the lawsuit had been filed and it was public knowledge that Major Witt is a lesbian.
- as TSgt. Leah Crawford, to be deposed. In the fall of 2006, TSgt. Crawford, without my asking her to do so, voluntarily provided a letter in support of Major Witt. Her letter was intended for use at the administrative discharge board hearing held at AFB Robbins in Georgia, and in fact, it was offered and admitted as an exhibit at that hearing. A copy of her letter is attached as Appendix E. TSgt. Crawford has been on annual tours with Major Witt multiple times and can testify as to her conduct on tour.
- 18. In the past two months, witnesses have informed me that they have been forcefully discouraged from talking to Witt's lawyers. I have attempted to speak with Sgt. Stacey Julian, a 446th AES member who had provided me with a declaration in 2006. I left telephone messages for him in the past month which were not returned. However, when I spoke with Sgt. Julian's wife, who is a retired member of the 446th, she told me that her husband "wants to talk to you, but he can't right now" because he had been ordered not to. *See* Julian Decl. ¶¶ 4-5. *See also* Schaffer Decl. ¶¶ 7-8.

DECLARATION OF JAMES E. LOBSENZ – 7 NO. C06-5195 RBL CARNEY BADLEY SPELLMAN

- 19. Sgt. Stacey Julian is the unit member who deployed with Major Witt more times than any other unit member and can testify as to her conduct on deployment. He has also served in the unit for over 15 years and can testify about the unit culture and the acceptance of gay and lesbian service members within the unit.
- 20. Testimony concerning Major Witt's conduct during deployment is relevant given the testimony by Colonel Moore-Harbert. *See* Moore-Harbert Dep. 184:15-19; 185:7-13. Colonel Walker and Colonel Moore-Harbert cannot provide this evidence because Colonel Walker has not deployed since 1991 (*see* Walker Dep. 152:13-23) and there is no evidence that Colonel Moore-Harbert has been deployed since 1995.
- 21. Attached to this declaration as Appendix A are true and correct copies of the Defendants' Answers to Plaintiff's first Interrogatories numbers 1-4, 7(b) & 9, in which Colonel Mary E. Walker and Colonel Janette Moore-Harbert are identified as opinion witnesses for the defendants.
- 22. Attached to this declaration as Appendix F are true and correct copies of excerpts from the deposition of Colonel Mary E. Walker, who was identified as a Government opinion witness in this case.
- 23. Attached to this declaration as Appendix G are true and correct copies of excerpts from the deposition of Colonel Janette Moore-Harbert.

DECLARATION OF JAMES E. LOBSENZ – 8 NO. C06-5195 RBL CARNEY BADLEY SPELLMAN

DATED this 9th day of March, 2010.

2

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

DECLARATION OF JAMES E. LOBSENZ – 9 NO. C06-5195 RBL CARNEY BADLEY SPELLMAN LAW OFFICES A PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CORPORATION 700 FIFTH AVENUE, #5800 SEATTLE, WA 98104-5017 FAX (206) 467-8215 TEL (206) 622-8020

WIT004 plds lc094204 3/9/10

1 2 CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 3 4 5 I hereby certify that on March 9, 2010, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the 6 following: 7 James E. Lobsenz Lobsenz@carneylaw.com Peter J. Phipps Peter.phipps@usdoj.gov 8 Jamie.mittet@usdoj.gov Marion J. Mittet dunne@aclu-wa.org Sarah A. Dunne 9 Aaron Caplan aaron.caplan@lls.edu 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 **CARNEY**

BADLEY

SPELLMAN

A PROFESSIONAL SERVICE CORPORATION

700 FIFTH AVENUE, #5800

SEATTLE, WA 98104-5017 FAX (206) 467-8215

TEL (206) 622-8020

WIT004 plds lc094204 3/9/10

NO. C06-5195 RBL

LOBSENZ - 10

DECLARATION OF JAMES E.