

GIBSON DUNN

Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP
555 Mission Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-2933
Tel 415.393.8200
www.gibsondunn.com

Enrique A. Monagas
Direct: 415.393.8353
Fax: 415.374.8403
EMonagas@gibsondunn.com

Client: T 36330-00001

May 9, 2011

Ms. Molly C. Dwyer
Clerk of the Court
United States Court of Appeals
for the Ninth Circuit
James R. Browning U.S. Courthouse
San Francisco, CA 94119-3939

Re: *Perry v. Brown*, No. 10-16696

Dear Ms. Dwyer:

Enclosed please find a courtesy copy of Plaintiffs-Respondents' Reply to *Amicus Curiae* Briefs, filed today in the Supreme Court of California, Case No. S189476.

Very truly yours,

/s/ *Enrique A. Monagas*
Enrique A. Monagas

Enclosure

cc: All counsel via ECF

No. S189476

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

KRISTIN M. PERRY et al., Plaintiffs and Respondents,

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, Plaintiff, Intervenor and Respondent,

v.

EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., as Governor, etc. et al., Defendants,

DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH et al., Defendants, Intervenors and Appellants.

Question Certified from the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit
The Honorable Stephen R. Reinhardt, Michael Daly Hawkins,
and N. Randy Smith, Circuit Judges, Presiding
Ninth Circuit Case No. 10-16696

**PLAINTIFFS-RESPONDENTS' REPLY TO
AMICUS CURIAE BRIEFS**

DAVID BOIES*
BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
333 Main Street
Armonk, NY 10504
(914) 749-8200

JEREMY M. GOLDMAN, SBN 218888
THEODORE H. UNO, SBN 248603
BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP
1999 Harrison Street, Suite 900
Oakland, CA 94612
(510) 874-1000

* *Pro hac vice*

THEODORE B. OLSON, SBN 38137
Counsel of Record
MATTHEW D. MCGILL*
AMIR C. TAYRANI, SBN 229609
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 955-8500

THEODORE J. BOUTROUS, JR., SBN 132099
CHRISTOPHER D. DUSSEAULT, SBN 177557
ENRIQUE A. MONAGAS, SBN 239087
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
333 South Grand Avenue
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 229-7000

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Respondents
Kristin M. Perry, Sandra B. Stier, Paul T. Katami, and Jeffrey J. Zarrillo

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES.....	ii
REPLY TO <i>AMICUS CURIAE</i> BRIEFS.....	1
CONCLUSION	6

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

CASES

<i>Citizens for Jobs & the Economy v. County of Orange</i> (2002) 94 Cal.App.4th 1311	4
<i>Reycraft v. Lee</i> (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 1211	5
<i>W. Watersheds Project v. Kraayenbrink</i> (9th Cir. 2011) 632 F.3d 472	4

STATUTES

Code Civ. Proc., § 902.1	5
--------------------------------	---

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS

Cal. Const. art. V, § 13	3
U.S. Const. art. III	3, 4, 5

REPLY TO *AMICUS CURIAE* BRIEFS

Nothing in the *amicus curiae* briefs filed in support of proponents alleviates the fundamental flaw in proponents' effort to defend Proposition 8 on appeal: The California Constitution grants the Attorney General the *exclusive* authority to ascertain and articulate the position of the State of California in the Judiciary and to represent the State's interest in judicial proceedings. From a jurisprudential standpoint, the interest of initiative proponents in the constitutionality of an already-enacted ballot initiative is indistinguishable from that of any other Californian who supported, and voted in favor of, the measure. Indeed, the *amicus curiae* briefs supporting proponents are most remarkable for what they do *not* say. None of them identifies a case in which initiative proponents have been permitted to represent the interest of *the State*—as opposed to their own interest—in the constitutionality of an initiative. Similarly, none of the briefs identifies any provision of California law that affords initiative proponents a particularized interest in the constitutionality of a ballot initiative that distinguishes the proponents from the millions of other Californians who supported the measure.

Proponents' *amici* instead fall back on the same undisguised and unpersuasive policy arguments—and the same inapposite case citations—as proponents themselves. They argue, for example, that failing to grant proponents the right to represent the interest of the State in the

constitutionality of Proposition 8 “would undermine the initiative process” and grant elected officials an “effective veto over initiatives.” Judicial Watch Br. at p. 2 (capitalization altered); Center for Constitutional Jurisprudence Br. at p. 12. But, despite the decision of the Attorney General and Governor that it was not in the interest of the State of California to defend Proposition 8, the measure was afforded a full-throated (albeit substantively anemic) defense by proponents themselves during a twelve-day bench trial. The Attorney General and Governor did not—and could not—exercise a unilateral veto over Proposition 8, but they have determined that the interest of California and its citizens is best served by accepting the thorough, well-grounded, and overwhelmingly persuasive decision of the trial court striking down Proposition 8 as an unconstitutional denial to Californians of due process and equal protection. They have nevertheless enforced and continue to enforce Proposition 8 statewide without regard to their own views on its wisdom or constitutionality. When the enforcement of this discriminatory constitutional amendment comes to an end, it will be because the federal courts have deemed it constitutionally infirm after a full and fair trial on the merits, not because the Attorney General or Governor “vetoed” it.

The fact that proponents lack the authority to continue their defense of Proposition 8 on appeal is a direct result of the decision of the People of California to afford the Attorney General the authority to represent the

State's interest in litigation (Cal. Const. art. V, § 13), as well as the decision of the Framers of the United States Constitution to impose certain limitations on the jurisdiction of federal courts. U.S. Const. art. III. While the initiative power is undeniably an important constitutional right, it does not displace the other provisions of the California Constitution—including those that prescribe the procedures for the representation of the State's interest in litigation. *See* Att'y Gen. Br. at p. 10 ("The Constitution, statutes, and decisions of this Court lead to the conclusion that proponents have no right to assert the state's interest in defending the validity of an adopted initiative measure . . ."). The initiative power enables citizens to initiate legislation and to bring such proposals to fruition, but it does not displace the vital fundamental authority of the State's constitutional officials. And, it certainly cannot in any way modify, diminish, or override the jurisdictional requirements of Article III.

Like proponents themselves, proponents' *amici* attempt to manufacture Article III standing by emphasizing decisions in which ballot initiative proponents have been permitted to intervene to defend the constitutionality of already-enacted initiatives (as proponents were permitted to do here). *See, e.g.*, Center for Constitutional Jurisprudence Br. at pp. 15-16. As discussed in plaintiffs' answering brief, however, none of those decisions permitted proponents to represent the interest of the State—as opposed to their *own* interest in the initiative's constitutionality.

Plaintiffs-Respondents' Answering Br. at p. 14; *see also W. Watersheds Project v. Kraayenbrink* (9th Cir. 2011) 632 F.3d 472, 482 (“An interest strong enough to permit intervention is not necessarily a sufficient basis to pursue an appeal abandoned by the other parties.”).

Moreover, none of those decisions affords initiative proponents a privileged status under state law that distinguishes them from other supporters of a ballot initiative in a manner sufficient to create a “particularized” interest for Article III purposes. Like other persons who have an interest in the validity of a ballot initiative, proponents have been permitted to intervene in state court litigation when, in the exercise of its discretion, the court deems intervention appropriate. *See, e.g., Citizens for Jobs & the Economy v. County of Orange* (2002) 94 Cal.App.4th 1311, 1316 & fn.2 (trial court granted intervention by both proponents of a ballot initiative and other groups that supported the measure). Ballot initiative proponents are thus no different from other supporters of a ballot initiative in possessing the ability to intervene in initiative-related litigation where the trial court deems intervention to be appropriate.

Coincidentally, the California Senate recently *rejected* a bill that would have authorized ballot initiative proponents to intervene *as of right* in all *state court litigation* challenging the constitutionality of a ballot initiative. *See* Senate Bill 5 (proposing to add § 387.5 to the Civil Procedure Code, which would have provided that “[t]he proponent of a

state initiative statute or constitutional amendment that has been approved by the voters shall have the right to intervene and participate in any court action challenging the constitutionality of that initiative statute or constitutional amendment”), *available at* http://leginfo.ca.gov/pub/11-12/bill/sen/sb_0001-0050/sb_5_bill_20110412_amended_sen_v98.html. Accordingly, even if a state legislature could modify state law to grant a litigant an interest that is sufficiently “particularized” to create Article III standing—which it plainly cannot (*see* Plaintiffs-Respondents’ Answering Br. at p. 19)—the California Legislature has squarely rejected any effort to afford procedural rights to initiative proponents that are different from those possessed by every other Californian who supported, donated money to, and voted for the measure. In contrast, the California Legislature has granted the Attorney General the “right to intervene and participate in *any* appeal taken” from a decision invalidating a state law. Code Civ. Proc., § 902.1 (emphasis added).*

* The Center for Constitutional Jurisprudence also relies on cases in which initiative proponents appealed decisions regarding the validity of a ballot initiative, and asserts that these cases are instructive because “the relevant California standing rules parallel those applied by the federal courts under Article III.” Center for Constitutional Jurisprudence Br. at p. 17. In fact, California law is clear that, “[i]n assessing standing, California courts are *not* bound by the ‘case or controversy’ requirement of article III of the United States Constitution.” *Reycraft v. Lee* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 1211, 1217 (emphasis added; internal quotation marks omitted). In any event, in none of the cited cases did the court address the initiative

[Footnote continued on next page]

* * *

Proposition 8 was robustly defended in a twelve-day trial. After a full and fair trial on the merits, a federal court concluded that the measure is irrational, discriminatory, and unconstitutional. Under the California Constitution, the Governor and Attorney General—not private individuals—possess the authority to decide whether Californians should continue to suffer irreparable constitutional injury during a prolonged appeal. Proponents lack the authority under state law to displace and override the considered judgment of these elected officials that Proposition 8 does not warrant further defense.

CONCLUSION

The Court should answer the Certified Question in the negative.

DATED: May 9, 2011

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

By: Theodore B. Olson /s/
THEODORE B. OLSON

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Respondents
KRISTIN M. PERRY, SANDRA B.
STIER, PAUL T. KATAMI,
AND JEFFREY J. ZARRILLO

[Footnote continued from previous page]

proponents' standing to appeal. *See* Plaintiffs-Respondents' Answering Br. at p. 19.

CERTIFICATION OF WORD COUNT

Pursuant to Rule 8.204(c)(1), California Rules of Court, the undersigned hereby certifies that Plaintiffs-Respondents' Reply to *Amicus Curiae* Briefs contains 1,340 words, excluding tables and this certificate, according to the word count generated by the computer program to produce this brief.

By: Theodore B. Olson / 
THEODORE B. OLSON

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Respondents
KRISTIN M. PERRY, SANDRA B.
STIER, PAUL T. KATAMI,
AND JEFFREY J. ZARRILLO

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I declare that I am, and was at the time of service hereinafter mentioned, at least 18 years of age and not a party to the above-entitled action. I am employed in the City and County of San Francisco. My business address is 555 Mission Street, Suite 3000, San Francisco, California 94105. On May 9, 2011, I caused to be served the following documents:

PLAINTIFFS-RESPONDENTS' REPLY TO *AMICUS CURIAE* BRIEFS

by placing a true copy thereof in an envelope addressed to each of the persons named below at the address shown, in the following manner:

SEE SERVICE LIST BELOW

- BY MAIL:** I placed a true copy in a sealed envelope for deposit in the U.S. Postal Service through the regular mail collection process at Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP on the date indicated above. I am familiar with the firm's practice for collection and processing of correspondence for mailing with the U.S. Postal Service. It is deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with postage prepaid on that same day in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of a party served, service is presumed invalid if the postal cancellation date or the postage meter date is more than one day after the date of deposit for mailing in the declaration.
- BY EMAIL:** By agreement of the parties, a copy was emailed to the email addresses listed below.

Counsel

Charles J. Cooper
David H. Thompson
Howard C. Nielson, Jr.
Peter A. Patterson
Cooper & Kirk, PLLC
1523 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036
ccooper@cooperkirk.com
dthompson@cooperkirk.com

Andrew P. Pugno
Law Offices of Andrew P. Pugno
101 Parkshore Drive, Suite 100
Folsom, CA 95630
andrew@pugnotlaw.com

Attorneys For

Attorneys for Defendants-
Intervenors-Appellants

Attorneys for Defendants-
Intervenors-Appellants

Brian W. Raum
James A. Campbell
Alliance Defense Fund
15100 North 90th Street
Scottsdale, AZ 85260
braum@telladf.org
jcampbell@telladf.org

Attorneys for Defendants-
Intervenors-Appellants

Terry L. Thompson
Law Office of Terry L. Thompson
P.O. Box 1346
Alamo, CA 94507
tl_thompson@earthlink.net

Attorneys for Defendant-Intervenor
Hak-Shing William Tam

Dennis J. Herrera
Therese Stewart
Christine Van Aken
San Francisco City Attorney's Office
City Hall 234
One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
San Francisco, CA 94102-4682
therese.stewart@sfgov.org
christine.van.aken@sfgov.org

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Intervenor-
Appellee City and County of San
Francisco

Tamar Pachter
Daniel Powell
Deputy Attorney General
California Department of Justice
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102
tamar.pachter@doj.ca.gov

Attorneys for Defendant Edmund G.
Brown, Jr., in his official capacity as
Attorney General of California

Kenneth C. Mennemeier, Jr
Andrew W. Stroud
Mennemeier, Glassman & Stroud LLP
980 9th Street, Suite 1700
Sacramento, CA 95814
kcm@mgsllaw.com
stroud@mgsllaw.com

Attorneys for Defendants Arnold
Schwarzenegger, in his official
capacity as Governor of California;
Mark B. Horton, in his official
capacity as Director of the California
Department of Public Health & State
Registrar of Vital Statistics; and
Linette Scott, in her official capacity
as Deputy Director of Health
Information & Strategic Planning for
the California Department of Public
Health (the "Administration
Defendants")

Claude Franklin Kolm
Office of County Counsel
1221 Oak Street, Suite 450
Oakland, CA 94612-4296
claude.kolm@acgov.org

Attorneys for Defendant Patrick
O'Connell, in his official capacity as
Clerk-Recorder for the County of
Alameda

Judy W. Whitehurst
Principal Deputy County Counsel
Los Angeles County Counsel
648 Kenneth Hahn Hall of
Administration
500 West Temple Street, 6th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2713
jwhitehurst@counsel.lacounty.gov

Attorneys for Defendant Dean C.
Logan, in his official capacity as
Registrar-Recorder/County Clerk for
the County of Los Angeles

Office of the Governor
Attn: Legal Department
State Capitol Building
Sacramento, CA 95814
(VIA U.S. MAIL ONLY)

Attorneys for the Governor
Edmund G. Brown, Jr.

Office of the Attorney General
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102-7004
(VIA U.S. MAIL ONLY)

Attorneys for the Attorney General
Kamala D. Harris

Ms. Molly C. Dwyer
Clerk of the Court
United States Court of Appeals
for the Ninth Circuit
James Browning Courthouse
95 7th Street
San Francisco, CA 94103
(VIA ECF ONLY)

United States Court of Appeals for
the Ninth Circuit

Harold Johnson
Damien M. Schiff
Pacific Legal Foundation
3900 Lennane Drive, Suite 200
Sacramento, CA 95834
(VIA U.S. MAIL ONLY)

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae
Pacific Legal Foundation, et al.

Cynthia Tobisman
Greines Martin Stein & Richland, LLP
5900 Wilshire Boulevard, 12th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90036
(VIA U.S. MAIL ONLY)

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae League
of Women Voters of California

Eric A. Isaacson
Coughlin Stoia et al. LLP
655 W. Broadway, Suite 1900
San Diego, CA 92101
(VIA U.S. MAIL ONLY)

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae
California Faith for Equality, et al.

Miguel A. Marquez
Office of the County Counsel
70 W. Hedding Street
San Jose, CA 95110
(VIA U.S. MAIL ONLY)

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae
County of Santa Clara, et al.

James J. Lynch
Attorney at Law
P.O. Box 4144
Sacramento, CA 95821-8802
(VIA U.S. MAIL ONLY)

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae
Margie Reilly

Laura W. Brill
Kendall Brill & Klieger, LLP
10100 Santa Monica Boulevard, Suite
1725
Los Angeles, CA 90067
(VIA U.S. MAIL ONLY)

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae
Jon Eisenberg and Laurie Levenson

David C. Codell
Caldwell Leslie & Proctor, PC
1000 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90017
(VIA U.S. MAIL ONLY)

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae
Equality California, National Center
for Lesbian Rights and Lambda Legal
Defense and Education Fund, Inc.

Jon W. Davidson
Lambda Legal Defense & Education
Fund, Inc.
3325 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1300
Los Angeles, CA 90010
(VIA U.S. MAIL ONLY)

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae
Equality California, National Center
for Lesbian Rights and Lambda Legal
Defense and Education Fund, Inc.

Shannon P. Minter
National Center for Lesbian Rights
870 Market Street, Suite 370
San Francisco, CA 94102
(VIA U.S. MAIL ONLY)

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae
Equality California, National Center
for Lesbian Rights and Lambda Legal
Defense and Education Fund, Inc.

Julie B. Axelrod
Judicial Watch, Inc.
425 Third Street, SW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20024
(VIA U.S. MAIL ONLY)

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae
Judicial Watch, Inc.


Kevin T. Snider
Pacific Justice Institute
212 Ninth Street, Suite 208
Oakland, CA 94607
(VIA U.S. MAIL ONLY)

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae
Joshua Beckley

John C. Eastman
Center for Constitutional Jurisprudence
c/o Chapman University School of Law
One University Drive
Orange, CA 92866
(VIA U.S. MAIL ONLY)

Attorneys for Amicus Curiae Center
for Constitutional Jurisprudence

I certify under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct,
that the foregoing document(s) were printed on recycled paper, and that this
Certificate of Service was executed by me on May 9, 2011, at San Francisco,
California.



Ling Chiou

9th Circuit Case Number(s) 10-16696

NOTE: To secure your input, you should print the filled-in form to PDF (File > Print > PDF Printer/Creator).

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

When All Case Participants are Registered for the Appellate CM/ECF System

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system on (date) [] .

I certify that all participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the appellate CM/ECF system.

Signature (use "s/" format)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

When Not All Case Participants are Registered for the Appellate CM/ECF System

I hereby certify that I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court for the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit by using the appellate CM/ECF system on (date) [May 9, 2011] .

Participants in the case who are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the appellate CM/ECF system.

I further certify that some of the participants in the case are not registered CM/ECF users. I have mailed the foregoing document by First-Class Mail, postage prepaid, or have dispatched it to a third party commercial carrier for delivery within 3 calendar days to the following non-CM/ECF participants:

Please see attached service list.

Signature (use "s/" format)

/s/ Enrique A. Monagas

SERVICE LIST

Thomas Brejcha
THOMAS MORE SOCIETY
29 S. La Salle Street, Suite 440
Chicago, IL 60603

Anthony R. Picarello, Jr.
Michael F. Moses
UNITED STATES CATHOLIC
CONFERENCE
3211 Fourth Street, N.E.
Washington, DC 20017

Lincoln C. Oliphant
COLUMBUS SCHOOL OF LAW
The Catholic University of America
3600 John McCormack Road, NE
Washington, DC 20064

Arthur Bailey, Jr.
HAUSFELD LLP
44 Montgomery Street
Suite 3400
San Francisco, CA 94104

Anita L. Staver
LIBERTY COUNSEL
P.O. Box 540774
Orlando, FL 32854

Mathew D. Staver
LIBERTY COUNSEL
1055 Maitland Center Commons
2nd Floor
Maitland, FL 32751

Hon. Vaughn Walker
c/o PILLSBURY WINTHROP
SHAW PITTMAN LLP
50 Fremont Street
San Francisco, CA 94105-2228

Hon. Vaughn Walker
c/o BERKELEY LAW
215 Boalt Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720-7200

Thomas R. Burke
Rochelle L. Wilcox
DAVIS WRIGHT TREMAINE LLP
505 Montgomery Street, Suite 800
San Francisco, CA 94111