

1 COOPER AND KIRK, PLLC
 Charles J. Cooper (DC Bar No. 248070)*
 2 *ccooper@cooperkirk.com*
 David H. Thompson (DC Bar No. 450503)*
 3 *dthompson@cooperkirk.com*
 Howard C. Nielson, Jr. (DC Bar No. 473018)*
 4 *hnielson@cooperkirk.com*
 Nicole J. Moss
 5 *nmoss@cooperkirk.com* (DC Bar No. 472424)
 Jesse Panuccio
 6 *jpanuccio@cooperkirk.com* (DC Bar No. 981634)
 Peter A. Patterson (Ohio Bar No. 0080840)*
 7 *ppatterson@cooperkirk.com*
 1523 New Hampshire Ave. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036
 8 Telephone: (202) 220-9600, Facsimile: (202) 220-9601

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

12 ALLIANCE DEFENSE FUND
 Brian W. Raum (NY Bar No. 2856102)*
 13 *braum@telladf.org*
 James A. Campbell (OH Bar No. 0081501)*
 14 *jcampbell@telladf.org*
 15100 North 90th Street, Scottsdale, Arizona 85260
 15 Telephone: (480) 444-0020, Facsimile: (480) 444-0028

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

18 * Admitted *pro hac vice*

19
 20 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

21 KRISTIN M. PERRY, SANDRA B. STIER,
 22 PAUL T. KATAMI, and JEFFREY J.
 ZARRILLO,

23 Plaintiffs,

24 v.

25 ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, in his official
 26 capacity as Governor of California; EDMUND
 27 G. BROWN, JR., in his official capacity as
 Attorney General of California; MARK B.
 28 HORTON, in his official capacity as Director of

CASE NO. 09-CV-2292 VRW

**DEFENDANT-INTERVENORS'
 MOTION FOR ADMINISTRATIVE
 LEAVE TO EXCEED PAGE
 LIMITATIONS**

Date: October 14, 2009

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Judge: Chief Judge Vaughn R. Walker

Location: Courtroom 6, 17th Floor

1 the California Department of Public Health and
2 State Registrar of Vital Statistics; LINETTE
3 SCOTT, in her official capacity as Deputy
4 Director of Health Information & Strategic
5 Planning for the California Department of Public
6 Health; PATRICK O'CONNELL, in his official
7 capacity as Clerk-Recorder for the County of
8 Alameda; and DEAN C. LOGAN, in his official
9 capacity as Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk for
10 the County of Los Angeles,

11
12 Defendants,

13 and

14 PROPOSITION 8 OFFICIAL PROPONENTS
15 DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH, GAIL J.
16 KNIGHT, MARTIN F. GUTIERREZ, HAK-
17 SHING WILLIAM TAM, and MARK A.
18 JANSSON; and PROTECTMARRIAGE.COM –
19 YES ON 8, A PROJECT OF CALIFORNIA
20 RENEWAL,

21 Defendant-Intervenors.

22
23 Additional Counsel for Defendant-Intervenors

24 ALLIANCE DEFENSE FUND
25 Timothy Chandler (CA Bar No. 234325)
26 *tchandler@telladf.org*
27 101 Parkshore Drive, Suite 100, Folsom, California 95630
28 Telephone: (916) 932-2850, Facsimile: (916) 932-2851

Jordan W. Lorence (DC Bar No. 385022)*
jlorence@telladf.org
Austin R. Nimocks (TX Bar No. 24002695)*
animocks@telladf.org
801 G Street NW, Suite 509, Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 393-8690, Facsimile: (202) 347-3622

* Admitted *pro hac vice*

1 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 7-11, Defendant-Intervenors (“Proponents”) respectfully seek
2 the Court’s leave to file a reply in support of their motion for summary judgment motion that is
3 longer than the fifteen pages normally allotted by local rule. *See* Civ. L.R. 7-2(b). Specifically,
4 Proponents respectfully submit that an expanded page limit of twenty-five pages is warranted by
5 the nature of the issues presented in this case, and request the Court’s leave to file a motion of that
6 length. While Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenor have declined to stipulate to this proposed page
7 limit, they have indicated that they do not intend to make a submission opposing it. The other
8 parties to this case, with the exception of the County of Los Angeles who has not yet responded,
9 have either indicated that they take no position on this motion or have no objection.
10

11 As Proponents have previously noted, this case is of momentous importance: at stake is
12 the future of the venerable and vitally important social institution of marriage. Indeed, although
13 Plaintiffs directly challenge only Proposition 8, the joint response brief filed by Plaintiffs and
14 Plaintiff-Intervenor acknowledges that under the theories they advance, the laws of every other
15 State defining marriage as the union of a man and a woman, and likely the federal definition of
16 marriage, are likewise unconstitutional. *See* Doc # 202 at 27, 28. In keeping with the importance
17 of this case, the issues raised in Proponents’ summary judgment motion and addressed in
18 Plaintiffs’ and Plaintiff-Intervenor’s response in opposition are multitude and complex. In
19 recognition of these facts, the Court has previously granted leave to file briefs in excess of the
20 normal page limitations. Further, Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenor have addressed not only the
21 issues raised by Proponents, but have also raised additional questions regarding the weight to be
22 given to the views and admissions of the State Attorney General (which admissions Proponents
23 first received as an attachment in support of Plaintiffs’ and Plaintiff-Intervenor’s response),¹
24
25
26

27 ¹ In an email serving the State Attorney General’s responses to Plaintiffs’ requests for
28 admissions today, counsel for the Attorney General indicated that her attempt to serve
these responses on the afternoon of September 23 was unsuccessful due to a glitch in her
(Continued)

1 whether certain statements of legislative fact by the California Supreme Court in the Marriage
2 Cases are binding in this litigation, the meaning and adequacy of Proponents' responses to
3 Plaintiffs' requests for admissions and other discovery requests, and the application of Fed. R.
4 Civ. P. 56(f) to a case such as this one that turns on issues of legislative fact.

5
6 For these reasons, Proponents respectfully request that this motion be granted.

7 Dated: September 25, 2009

8 COOPER AND KIRK, PLLC
9 ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS-INTERVENORS
10 DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH, GAIL J. KNIGHT,
11 MARTIN F. GUTIERREZ, HAK-SHING WILLIAM
12 TAM, MARK A. JANSSON, AND
13 PROTECTMARRIAGE.COM – YES ON 8, A PROJECT
14 OF CALIFORNIA RENEWAL

15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 By: /s/ Charles J. Cooper
28 Charles J. Cooper

(Cont'd)
email address book.