

1 GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
Theodore B. Olson, SBN 38137  
2 *tolson@gibsondunn.com*  
Matthew D. McGill, *pro hac vice*  
3 1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036  
Telephone: (202) 955-8668, Facsimile: (202) 467-0539

4 Theodore J. Boutrous, Jr., SBN 132009  
*tboutrous@gibsondunn.com*  
5 Christopher D. Dusseault, SBN 177557  
Ethan D. Dettmer, SBN 196046  
6 333 S. Grand Avenue, Los Angeles, California 90071  
Telephone: (213) 229-7804, Facsimile: (213) 229-7520

7 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
David Boies, *pro hac vice*  
8 *dboies@bsflp.com*  
333 Main Street, Armonk, New York 10504  
9 Telephone: (914) 749-8200, Facsimile: (914) 749-8300

Jeremy M. Goldman, SBN 218888  
10 *jgoldman@bsflp.com*  
1999 Harrison Street, Suite 900, Oakland, California 94612  
11 Telephone: (510) 874-1000, Facsimile: (510) 874-1460

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

13 Dennis J. Herrera, SBN 139669  
14 Therese M. Stewart, SBN 104930  
Danny Chou, SBN 180240

15 One Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place  
San Francisco, California 94102-4682  
16 Telephone: (415) 554-4708, Facsimile (415) 554-4699

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Intervenor  
17 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

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

20 KRISTIN M. PERRY, *et al.*,  
21 Plaintiffs,  
22 and  
23 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,  
Plaintiff-Intervenor,  
24 v.  
25 ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER, *et al.*,  
Defendants,  
26 and  
27 PROPOSITION 8 OFFICIAL PROPONENTS  
DENNIS HOLLINGSWORTH, *et al.*,  
28 Defendant-Intervenors.

CASE NO. 09-CV-2292 VRW

**PLAINTIFFS' AND PLAINTIFF-  
INTERVENOR'S RESPONSE TO  
COURT'S QUESTIONS FOR  
CLOSING ARGUMENTS**

Trial: January 11-27, 2010  
Closing: June 16, 2010

Judge: Chief Judge Vaughn R. Walker  
Magistrate Judge Joseph C. Spero

Location: Courtroom 6, 17th Floor

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

Page

A. RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS DIRECTED TO PLAINTIFFS..... 1

B. RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS DIRECTED TO PROPONENTS ..... 12

C. RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS DIRECTED TO PLAINTIFFS AND PROPONENTS ..... 22

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page(s)

**CASES**

*Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Pena*,  
515 U.S. 200 (1995)..... 20

*Brown v. Bd. of Educ.*,  
347 U.S. 483 (1954)..... 23, 30

*Carey v. Population Servs. Int’l*,  
431 U.S. 678 (1977)..... 22

*Christian Sci. Reading Room Jointly Maintained v. City & County of San Francisco*,  
784 F.2d 1010 (9th Cir. 1986)..... 33

*City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Ctr.*,  
473 U.S. 432 (1985)..... 24, 34

*Cleveland Bd. of Educ. v. LaFleur*,  
414 U.S. 632 (1974)..... 3

*Craig v. Boren*,  
429 U.S. 190 (1976)..... 33

*Elisa B. v. Superior Court*,  
117 P.3d 660 (Cal. 2005)..... 19

*Ellis v. Arriaga*,  
162 Cal. App. 4th 1000 (2008) ..... 36

*FCC v. Beach Commc’ns, Inc.*,  
508 U.S. 307 (1993)..... 23

*Gratz v. Bollinger*,  
539 U.S. 244 (2003)..... 33

*Heckler v. Mathews*,  
465 U.S. 728 (1984)..... 30

*Hernandez v. Robles*,  
855 N.E.2d 1 (2006)..... 1, 2

*Hernandez-Montiel v. INS*,  
225 F.3d 1084 (9th Cir. 2000)..... 33

*Koebke v Bernardo Heights Country Club*,  
36 Cal. 4th 824 (2005) ..... 29, 36

*Lawrence v. Texas*,  
539 U.S. 558 (2003)..... 2, 3, 4, 10, 12, 20

*Lockyer v. City & County of San Francisco*,  
95 P.3d 459 (Cal. 2004)..... 9

*Loving v. Virginia*,  
388 U.S. 1 (1967)..... 3, 4, 23, 28

*In re Marriage Cases*,  
183 P.3d 384 (Cal. 2008)..... 18

1 *Marriage of Garber*,  
 2008 Cal. App. Unpub. LEXIS 8259 (Oct. 9, 2008)..... 36

2

3 *Mass. Bd. of Ret. v. Murgia*,  
 427 U.S. 307 (1976)..... 34

4 *Maynard v. Hill*,  
 125 U.S. 190 (1888)..... 3, 28

5 *McLaurin v. Okla. State Regents for Higher Educ.*,  
 339 U.S. 637 (1950)..... 30

6 *Michael H. v. Gerald D.*,  
 491 U.S. 110 (1989)..... 19

7

8 *Minnesota v. Clover Leaf Creamery Co.*,  
 449 U.S. 456 (1981)..... 23

9 *P.O.P.S. v. Gardner*,  
 998 F.2d 764 (9th Cir. 1993)..... 22

10 *Palmore v. Sidoti*,  
 466 U.S. 429 (1984)..... 2, 22

11 *Plessy v. Ferguson*,  
 163 U.S. 537 (1896)..... 30

12

13 *Plyler v. Doe*,  
 457 U.S. 202 (1982)..... 8, 9

14 *Reitman v. Mulkey*,  
 387 U.S. 369 (1967)..... 37

15 *Romer v. Evans*,  
 517 U.S. 620 (1996)..... 1, 2, 5, 22, 23, 37

16 *Sharon S. v. Superior Court*,  
 73 P.3d 554 (Cal. 2003)..... 19

17

18 *Sweatt v. Painter*,  
 339 U.S. 629 (1950)..... 30

19 *Turner v. Safley*,  
 482 U.S. 78 (1987)..... 3, 28

20 *United States v. Virginia*,  
 518 U.S. 515 (1996)..... 4, 5, 13, 22, 30

21 *Velez v. Smith*,  
 142 Cal. App. 4th 1154 (2006) ..... 36

22

23 *Washington v. Glucksberg*,  
 521 U.S. 702 (1997)..... 27

24 *Washington v. Seattle Sch. Dist. No.1*,  
 458 U.S. 457 (1982)..... 37

25 *Williams v. Illinois*,  
 399 U.S. 235 (1970)..... 2, 3

26 *Witt v. Dep't of the Air Force*,  
 527 F.3d 806 (9th Cir. 2008)..... 22

27

28 *Zablocki v. Redhail*,  
 434 U.S. 374 (1978)..... 3, 28

1 **CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS**

2 U.S. Const. art. VI..... 37

3 **STATUTES**

4 Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 170.9..... 35

5 Cal. Corp. Code § 21400..... 35

6 Cal. Fam. Code § 297.5..... 19, 29, 35

7 Cal. Fam. Code § 7601..... 19

8 Cal. Fam. Code § 7602..... 19

9 Cal. Fam. Code § 7650..... 19

10 Cal. Fam. Code § 9000..... 19

11 Cal. Health & Safety Code § 102180..... 9

12 Cal. Health & Safety Code § 102295..... 9

13 Cal. Lab. Code § 3503 ..... 35

14 Cal. Prob. Code § 6402 ..... 35

15 Cal. Stats. 2003, ch. 752..... 36

16 Cal. Stats. 2004, ch. 947..... 36

17 Cal. Stats. 2005, ch. 416..... 36

18 Cal. Stats. 2005, ch. 418..... 36

19 Cal. Stats. 2006, ch. 802..... 36

20 Cal. Stats. 2007, ch. 426..... 36

21 Cal. Stats. 2007, ch. 555..... 36

22 Cal. Stats. 2007, ch. 567..... 37

23 Cal. Stats. 2008, ch. 197..... 37

24 Conn. Gen. Stat. § 46b-28a..... 34

25 N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 457:45 ..... 34

26 Wash. Rev. Code Ann. § 26.60.090..... 35

27 **OTHER AUTHORITIES**

28 Nanette Gartrell & Henny Bos, *U.S. National Longitudinal Lesbian Family Study: Psychological Adjustment of 17-Year-Old Adolescents*, 126 J. Pediatrics (forthcoming July 2010, available online)..... 19

Recognition in New Jersey of Same-Sex Marriages, Civil Unions, Domestic Partnerships & Other Government-Sanctioned, Same-Sex Relationships Established Pursuant to the Laws of Other States & Foreign Nations, N.J. Att’y Gen. Formal Op. No. 3-2007..... 34

Survivors’ Home Protection Act, Assemb. 103, 2009-2010 Reg. Sess. (Cal. 2009)..... 37

1 Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenor hereby submit their written responses to the Court’s  
 2 Questions for Closing Arguments, Doc # 677. Plaintiffs and Plaintiff-Intervenor expressly reserve  
 3 the right to supplement their written responses during the closing arguments scheduled for June 16,  
 4 2010. Doc # 678.

5 **A. RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS DIRECTED TO PLAINTIFFS**

- 6 **1. Assume the evidence shows Proposition 8 is not in fact rationally related**  
 7 **to a legitimate state interest. Assume further the evidence shows voters**  
 8 **genuinely but without evidence believed Proposition 8 was rationally**  
 9 **related to a legitimate interest. Do the voters’ honest beliefs in the absence**  
 10 **of supporting evidence have any bearing on the constitutionality of**  
 11 **Proposition 8? See *Hernandez v. Robles*, 855 NE2d 1, 7-8 (2006) (“In the**  
 12 **absence of conclusive scientific evidence, the Legislature could rationally**  
 13 **proceed on the common-sense premise that children will do best with a**  
 14 **mother and a father in the home.”).**

15 To survive rational basis review, a classification must “bear a rational relationship to an  
 16 independent and legitimate legislative end.” *Romer v. Evans*, 517 U.S. 620, 633 (1996). A “law will  
 17 be sustained” under the rational basis standard *only* “if it can be said to *advance* a legitimate  
 18 government interest.” *Id.* at 632 (emphasis added). Accordingly, if this Court finds that “the  
 19 evidence shows Proposition 8 is not in fact rationally related to a legitimate state interest”—as  
 20 Plaintiffs proved at trial—then Prop. 8 could not survive even rational basis review (let alone, the  
 21 more stringent requirements of intermediate and strict scrutiny). The voters’ allegedly  
 22 “genuine[ ]”—but erroneous—views to the contrary would be insufficient to sustain Prop. 8 because  
 23 the genuinely held beliefs of voters who enact an arbitrary, irrational, and discriminatory law cannot  
 24 shield the measure from constitutional scrutiny. *See, e.g., id.* at 635. Voters’ unfounded and  
 25 discriminatory stereotypes are not a substitute for *proof* that a law actually furthers a legitimate state  
 26 interest. Indeed, those who disfavor a particular group often genuinely believe and accept negative  
 27 stereotypes about the disfavored group, even where such stereotypes are wholly unsubstantiated. The  
 28 constitutionally relevant question for rational basis purposes is whether Prop. 8 in fact “*advance[s]* a  
 legitimate government interest” (*id.* at 632 (emphasis added))—not whether the voters *believed* that it  
 did.

The New York Court of Appeals’ decision in *Hernandez v. Robles*, 855 N.E. 2d 1 (N.Y.  
 2006), is not to the contrary. In that case, the court found that there was an “*absence of*” proof that

1 New York’s prohibition on marriage by individuals of the same sex failed to further a legitimate state  
 2 interest. *Id.* at 8 (emphasis added). Here, in contrast, Plaintiffs conclusively proved at trial that  
 3 Prop. 8 does not advance *any* legitimate state interest, and that it is therefore irrational and  
 4 unconstitutional under *any* standard of scrutiny.

5 **2. What evidence supports a finding that maintaining marriage as an**  
 6 **opposite-sex relationship does not afford a rational basis for**  
 7 **Proposition 8?**

8 Merely “maintaining marriage as an opposite-sex relationship” is not by itself a rational basis  
 9 for Prop. 8. As an initial matter, neither tradition nor moral disapproval is a sufficient basis for a  
 10 State to impair a person’s constitutionally protected right to marry. *See Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S.  
 11 558, 577 (2003) (“the fact that the governing majority in a State has traditionally viewed a particular  
 12 practice as immoral is not a sufficient reason for upholding a law prohibiting the practice”) (internal  
 13 quotation marks omitted); *id.* at 579 (“times can blind us to certain truths and later generations can  
 14 see that laws once thought necessary and proper in fact serve only to oppress”); *id.* at 582 (“[m]oral  
 15 disapproval” of gay men and lesbians, “like a bare desire to harm the group, is an interest that is  
 16 insufficient to satisfy” even rational basis review) (O’Connor, J., concurring); *Romer*, 517 U.S. at 634  
 17 (a “bare . . . desire to harm a politically unpopular group cannot constitute a *legitimate* governmental  
 18 interest”) (internal quotation marks omitted; emphasis in original); *id.* at 635 (a state practice of  
 19 restricting citizens’ constitutional rights cannot be perpetuated merely “for its own sake”); *Palmore v.*  
 20 *Sidoti*, 466 U.S. 429, 433 (1984) (while “[p]rivate biases may be outside the reach of the law,” the  
 21 “law cannot, directly or indirectly, give them effect” at the expense of a disfavored group’s  
 22 fundamental constitutional rights); *Williams v. Illinois*, 399 U.S. 235, 239 (1970) (“neither the  
 23 antiquity of a practice nor the fact of steadfast legislative and judicial adherence to it through the  
 24 centuries insulates it from constitutional attack”); *see also* PX2810 at 86:25-87:3 (Court: “Tradition  
 25 alone is not enough because the constitutional imperatives of the Equal Protection clause must have  
 26 priority over the comfortable convenience of the status quo.”).

26 Moreover, the evidence demonstrates that maintaining marriage as an opposite-sex  
 27 relationship to the exclusion of loving and committed gay and lesbian couples does not promote any  
 28 legitimate government interest. *See* Doc # 608-1 at 203-48 (PFFs 238-84). To the contrary, doing so

1 causes irreparable harm to gay men and lesbians and their families, and is fundamentally stigmatizing  
 2 and discriminatory. *See id.* at 64-116 (PFFs 108-47) (evidence demonstrating harm to Plaintiffs and  
 3 other gay and lesbian individuals and their families); *id.* at 248-73 (PFFs 285-97) (evidence  
 4 demonstrating that Prop. 8 was motivated by moral disapproval and animus); *see also* Response to  
 5 Question C.8, *infra*.

6 **3. Until very recently, same-sex relationships did not enjoy legal protection**  
 7 **anywhere in the United States. How does this fact square with plaintiffs’**  
 8 **claim that marriage between persons of the same sex enjoys the status of a**  
 9 **fundamental right entitled to constitutional protection?**

10 The Supreme Court “has long recognized that freedom of personal choice in matters of  
 11 marriage and family life is one of the liberties protected by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth  
 12 Amendment.” *Cleveland Bd. of Educ. v. LaFleur*, 414 U.S. 632, 639-40 (1974); *see also, e.g.,*  
 13 *Maynard v. Hill*, 125 U.S. 190, 205, 211 (1888) (marriage is “the most important relation in life” and  
 14 “the foundation of the family and of society, without which there would be neither civilization nor  
 15 progress”); Doc # 608-1 at 273 (PCL 1). Plaintiffs are seeking invalidation of the discriminatory  
 16 restrictions that Prop. 8 imposes on the *existing* constitutional right to marry—which is  
 17 “fundamental[ly] importan[t] for *all* individuals.” *Zablocki v. Redhail*, 434 U.S. 374, 384 (1978)  
 18 (emphasis added). Those existing “constitutional protection[s]” for “personal decisions relating to  
 19 marriage” extend to individuals in a loving, committed relationship with a person of the opposite sex  
 20 or the same sex (*Lawrence*, 539 U.S. at 574) because, no matter the sex of the individuals involved in  
 21 the relationship, marriage is an “expression[ ] of emotional support and public commitment” essential  
 22 to personal fulfillment. *Turner v. Safley*, 482 U.S. 78, 95 (1987). Thus, just as the plaintiffs in  
 23 *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1 (1967), were not asking the Supreme Court to recognize a new right to  
 24 interracial marriage, Plaintiffs here are not asking this Court to recognize a *new* fundamental right to  
 25 same-sex marriage. They are instead seeking access to an existing constitutional right that has long  
 26 been denied to gay men and lesbians. The mere longevity of those discriminatory and irrational  
 27 restrictions on the right to marry is a constitutionally inadequate ground for continuing to exclude gay  
 28 men and lesbians from this “vital personal right.” *Id.*; *see also Williams*, 399 U.S. at 239; *see also*  
 PX2810 at 86:25-87:3.



1           **4.       What is the import of evidence showing that marriage has historically**  
 2           **been limited to a man and a woman? What evidence shows that that**  
 3           **limitation no longer enjoys constitutional recognition?**

4           Evidence that marriage historically has been limited to a man and a woman does not insulate  
 5           Prop. 8 from constitutional attack. *See* Responses to Questions A.2 & A.3, *supra*. The historical  
 6           exclusion of gay men and lesbians from marriage is consistent with the uncontroverted evidence in  
 7           this case that gay men and lesbians have suffered a history of discrimination and unequal treatment in  
 8           virtually all aspects of their lives. Moreover, although there have historically been discriminatory  
 9           restrictions imposed on marriage, eliminating those restrictions has not deprived marriage of its  
 10          vitality and importance, but has, in fact, strengthened marriage as a social institution. *See* Doc # 608-  
 11          1 at 29-45 (PFFs 37-58). For example, slaves historically were not allowed to marry but gained that  
 12          right after emancipation. *See* Cott, Tr. 205:1-12 (Emancipated slaves viewed marriage as a basic  
 13          civil right and assumed “that once they were legally married, that they could make valid claims about  
 14          their family rights.”). Similarly, although bans on interracial marriage had their origins in the  
 15          colonial period, were eventually enacted by 41 States, and remained on the books in more than a  
 16          dozen States as late as 1967, such restrictions are unthinkable—and flatly unconstitutional—today.  
 17          *See Loving*, 388 U.S. 1; *see also Lawrence*, 539 U.S. at 577-78 (“neither history nor tradition could  
 18          save a law prohibiting miscegenation from constitutional attack”). Although longstanding, none of  
 19          these discriminatory restrictions on marriage ever “enjoy[ed] constitutional recognition”—and nor do  
 20          discriminatory measures that restrict marriage to individuals of the opposite sex.

21           **5.       What does the evidence show regarding the intent of the voters? If the**  
 22           **evidence shows that Proposition 8 on its face and through its consequences**  
 23           **distinguishes on the basis of sexual orientation and sex, of what import is**  
 24           **voter intent?**

25          Whether or not Prop. 8 was motivated by discriminatory animus, it is unconstitutional because  
 26          it facially discriminates on the basis of sexual orientation and sex. The extensive evidence that  
 27          Prop. 8 was in fact motivated by moral disapproval of gay men and lesbians underscores its  
 28          unconstitutionality. Indeed, where, as here, a law is subject to heightened judicial scrutiny, the  
 “justification[s] must be genuine, not hypothesized or invented *post hoc* in response to litigation.”  
*United States v. Virginia*, 518 U.S. 515, 533 (1996). Accordingly, the messages presented to voters

1 during the Prop. 8 campaign and the voters' motivations for supporting Prop. 8 are relevant to  
2 whether Prop. 8 was enacted to further a sufficiently important interest to survive constitutional  
3 scrutiny. Proponents' laundry list of purported state interests, invented after Prop. 8 was enacted and  
4 for the purposes of this litigation, cannot be considered under heightened scrutiny if Prop. 8 was not  
5 in fact enacted to further those interests. *See id.*; Doc # 605 at 12-15. And, if Prop. 8 was motivated  
6 simply by moral disapproval of gay men and lesbians, then it cannot survive any standard of  
7 constitutional scrutiny. *See Romer*, 517 U.S. at 634.

8 The evidence presented at trial establishes that the passage of Prop. 8 was motivated by  
9 animus toward, and moral disapproval of, gay and lesbian individuals. Doc # 608-1 at 248-73 (PFFs  
10 285-97). The explicit purpose of Prop. 8 was to strip gay and lesbian individuals of the constitutional  
11 right to marry afforded them by the California Constitution and to impose a special disability on gay  
12 and lesbian individuals alone by denying them the state constitutional protections available to all  
13 other citizens. *See* PX0001 at 9 (California Voter Information Guide: "Changes California  
14 Constitution to eliminate the right of same-sex couples to marry."). Campaign messages in support  
15 of Prop. 8 stated and implied that same-sex relationships are immoral, and portrayed same-sex  
16 relationships and families as inferior. *See, e.g.*, Chauncey, Tr. 427:16-428:22 (The official Yes on 8  
17 voter arguments are premised on the purported inferiority of gay people and their relationships. To  
18 argue that the best situation for a child is to be with a married mother and father is to argue that the  
19 married heterosexual couple is superior.). The Yes on 8 campaign messages played on the public's  
20 fear that children would be taught in school that gay and lesbian individuals and their relationships  
21 are equal to heterosexual individuals and their relationships. Doc # 608-1 at 254-57 (PFF 289). The  
22 campaign employed some of the most enduring anti-gay stereotypes—many of which reflect  
23 messages from prior anti-gay campaigns—to heighten public apprehension, including messages that  
24 gay men and lesbians recruit and molest children, that gay and lesbian relationships are immoral or  
25 bad and should be kept "private," and that there is a powerful gay "lobby" or "agenda" intent on  
26 destroying heterosexual families and denying religious freedom. *Id.* at 254-69 (PFFs 289-94).

1           **6.       What empirical data, if any, supports a finding that legal recognition of**  
 2           **same-sex marriage reduces discrimination against gays and lesbians?**

3           Uncontroverted evidence demonstrates that invalidating Prop. 8 would immediately and  
 4 significantly reduce discrimination against gay men and lesbians by removing discriminatory  
 5 restrictions that prohibit individuals of the same sex from marrying in California. *See* Herek, Tr.  
 6 2054:7-11 (Prop. 8 is an instance of structural stigma by definition. It is part of the legal system, and  
 7 it differentiates people in same-sex relationships from people in heterosexual relationships.); Meyer,  
 8 Tr. 825:25-826:20, 846:22-847:12 (When gay men and lesbians have to explain why they are not  
 9 married, they “have to explain, I’m really not seen as equal. I’m—my status is—is not respected by  
 10 my state or by my country, by my fellow citizens.”); PX0752 at 2 (“[S]ame-sex couples and their  
 11 children are adversely affected by [existing] discriminatory marriage laws.”); PX0760 at 1, 4  
 12 (Discriminatory marriage laws adversely affect the children of same-sex couples by stigmatizing  
 13 those children and making them less financially secure); Blankenhorn, Tr. 2849:8-11 (“Gay marriage  
 14 would extend a wide range of the natural and practical benefits of marriage to many lesbian and gay  
 15 couples and their children.”); *id.* at 2850:4-9 (“Same-sex marriage would signify greater social  
 16 acceptance of homosexual love and the worth and validity of same-sex intimate relationships.”);  
 17 DIX0956 at 6 (Blankenhorn, *The Future of Marriage*: “Marriage matters. It significantly influences  
 18 individual and societal well-being.”).

19           Affording gay men and lesbians the right to marry would also reduce discrimination by  
 20 providing them with access to certain tangible benefits, such as health insurance, that flow directly  
 21 from marriage. *See* Badgett, Tr. 1350:6-9 (The American Medical Association concluded that  
 22 denying same-sex couples the right to marry reduces access to health insurance and creates health-  
 23 care disparities among children.); PX1261 at 7 (a California Employer Health Benefits Survey found  
 24 that only 56% of California firms offered health insurance to unmarried same-sex couples in 2008.).

25           Moreover, empirical studies from jurisdictions where marriage between individuals of the  
 26 same sex is permitted demonstrate the salutary benefits that flow from permitting gay men and  
 27 lesbians to marry. *See* Badgett, Tr. 1344:3-1348:13; *see also* PX1267 (A study of same-sex couples  
 28 who married in Massachusetts indicated that almost 70% of respondents felt more accepted by their

1 communities and 93% of respondents with children thought that their children were happier and  
 2 better off as a result of their marriage.). Empirical evidence also demonstrates that marriage  
 3 correlates with a variety of measurable health benefits that extend to the married individuals and their  
 4 children. *See* Doc # 608-1 at 84-87 (PFF 119); *see also* Meyer, Tr. 879:18-880:18 (If Prop. 8 was no  
 5 longer the law of California, the mental health outcomes of gay men and lesbians would improve.);  
 6 Peplau, Tr. 577:25-579:9 (noting “very consistent” research findings that married individuals fare  
 7 better, are physically healthier, live longer, engage in fewer risky behaviors, and do better on  
 8 measures of psychological well-being). Indeed, empirical studies have established that gay men and  
 9 lesbians living in States that do not provide them with antidiscrimination protections are at a  
 10 significantly higher risk of suffering from psychiatric disorders. PX0974 at 2277.

11 Finally, substantial evidence demonstrates that gay and lesbian couples are stigmatized  
 12 because they cannot marry. *See* Doc # 608-1 at 88-126 (PFFs 121-58). Prop. 8 necessarily relegates  
 13 the relationships of gay and lesbian individuals to second-class status by communicating the official  
 14 view that their committed relationships are less worthy of recognition than comparable heterosexual  
 15 relationships. *See id.* at 88-92 (PFF 121); *see also* Sanders, Tr. 1277:5-1279:10; Peplau, Tr. 611: 13-  
 16 19. The resulting harm from that stigmatization is profound and far-reaching. *See* Doc # 608-1 at  
 17 88-126 (PFFs 121-58).

18 **7. What evidence supports a finding that recognition of same-sex marriage**  
 19 **would afford a permanent—as opposed to a transitory—benefit to the**  
 20 **City and County of San Francisco? To California cities and counties**  
 21 **generally?**

22 The evidence at trial established that long-term benefits flow to cities and counties from  
 23 reducing discrimination and increasing the number of people who benefit from the health and wealth  
 24 advantages of marriage. Discrimination and stigma have serious adverse health effects for lesbians  
 25 and gay men—including increased incidence of anxiety disorders, mood disorders, and substance  
 26 abuse disorders, and higher rates of attempted suicide by teens—and expose lesbians and gay men  
 27 and those perceived to be gay to harassment and violence. *See* Doc # 608-1 at 151-55 (PFF 187-89)  
 28 (hate crimes and physical violence); *id.* at 167-68 (PFF 199) (school bullying); Meyer, Tr. 870:13-  
 872:10 (stigma and minority stress); *id.* at 898:11-899:8 (negative health outcomes); Chauncey, Tr.

1 361:11-22 (the “continuing legacies and effects” of discrimination); Zia, Tr. 1218:9-1219:6 (“I feel  
 2 constantly aware that my sexual orientation could, for whatever reason, provoke violence toward me  
 3 or toward my loved ones.”); Kendall, Tr. 1514:6-16; PX 672-76 (Hate Crime Reports); PX0710 at  
 4 RFA No. 14-15; PX 810; PX1003. Eliminating the discrimination and stigma that is created and  
 5 perpetuated by Prop. 8 will result in better mental health outcomes for gay men and lesbians, less  
 6 school bullying, and less harassment and violence against those who are or are perceived to be gay,  
 7 and, in turn, reduce the costs that government incurs to investigate and prosecute acts of  
 8 discrimination. *See* Doc # 608-1 at 96 (PFF 130); *id.* at 115-17 (PFF 154). The health benefits from  
 9 the elimination of this discrimination—as well as the health benefits and higher wealth accumulation  
 10 associated with marriage itself—will likely result in greater productivity by gay and lesbian workers,  
 11 larger payroll and business tax revenues for local governments and the State, and a reduction in  
 12 government-funded health-care costs and other social safety net services. *See* Doc # 608-1 at 117  
 13 (PFF 155); Peplau, Tr. 579:23-582:2 (health benefits of marriage); Egan, Tr. 687:23-689:10 (the  
 14 relationship between the health benefits of marriage and San Francisco’s revenue); *id.* at 685-86;  
 15 Badgett, Tr. 1331:12-1332:9 (marriage can improve economic well-being by, among other things,  
 16 promoting more efficient division of labor). Moreover, census data show that structural  
 17 discrimination by a State against lesbians and gay men can result in loss of workers from that State.  
 18 *See* Badgett, Tr. 1368:2-1369:4; PX1262. Finally, if Prop. 8 were struck down there would be a  
 19 temporary spike in marriages of same-sex couples, and a long term more modest increase in the  
 20 number of marriages that would take place in San Francisco and in other jurisdictions in California,  
 21 which would produce hotel tax revenues for local government and sales tax revenues for local and  
 22 state government. *See* Doc # 608-1 at 113 (PFF 152); Egan, Tr. 711:13-22.

23 **8. What is the relevance, if any, of data showing that state and local**  
 24 **governments would benefit economically if same-sex couples were**  
 25 **permitted to marry? Does that relevance depend on the magnitude of the**  
 26 **economic benefit?**

26 “In determining the rationality of [Prop. 8],” this Court “may appropriately take into account  
 27 its costs to the Nation and to the innocent [persons] who are its victims.” *Plyler v. Doe*, 457 U.S.  
 28 202, 223-24 (1982). The fact that marriage discrimination is costly to government, particularly in the

1 absence of credible evidence showing any benefit to society from such discrimination, underscores  
2 the irrationality and lack of justification (compelling or otherwise) for such discrimination.

3 The economic costs to government—whether they are precisely quantified or not—are also a  
4 proxy for the broader harms and burdens such discrimination imposes on society (for example, more  
5 hate crimes and violence, more school bullying, higher numbers of attempted suicides by teenagers,  
6 more health problems, lower productivity, loss of talent from the State, more persons dependent on a  
7 social safety net). The magnitude of the economic cost does not determine the relevancy of the  
8 evidence (but, at most, goes to its weight). Legislation that imposes such harms and burdens on  
9 society, without any countervailing benefit, is irrational and unjustifiable under any standard of  
10 scrutiny. *See Plyler*, 457 U.S. at 230.

11 **9. What are the consequences of a permanent injunction against**  
12 **enforcement of Proposition 8? What remedies do plaintiffs propose?**

13 Plaintiffs seek (1) a declaratory judgment that Prop. 8 violates the U.S. Constitution, and  
14 (2) a permanent injunction that prohibits Defendants from enforcing or applying Prop. 8. Plaintiffs  
15 envision that such an injunction would include an order requiring Defendants to direct all persons  
16 under their supervision not to enforce or apply Prop. 8. Such an injunction would terminate  
17 enforcement of Prop. 8 not just in Alameda and Los Angeles Counties, but throughout the entire State  
18 of California. That is because under the California Health & Safety Code, the local officials who  
19 typically issue marriage licenses, perform civil marriages, and maintain marriage records do so only  
20 “under the supervision and direction of the State Registrar.” § 102295. Indeed, the State Registrar is  
21 charged with ensuring that there shall be “uniform compliance” with the State’s prescriptions  
22 concerning marriage. *Id.* § 102180. The California Supreme Court confirmed that the functions of  
23 county officials with respect to marriage are only ministerial in nature, and that such local officials  
24 have no discretion to disregard the mandate of the state authorities. *See Lockyer v. City & County of*  
25 *San Francisco*, 95 P.3d 459, 472 (Cal. 2004). Thus, once Defendant Mark Horton, State Registrar of  
26 Vital Statistics, complies with an order to direct all local registrars not to enforce or apply Prop. 8, no  
27 local official within the State lawfully could continue doing so.

1           **10. Even if enforcement of Proposition 8 were enjoined, plaintiffs’ marriages**  
 2           **would not be recognized under federal law. Can the court find**  
 3           **Proposition 8 to be unconstitutional without also considering the**  
 4           **constitutionality of the federal Defense of Marriage Act?**

5           Yes. Plaintiffs have challenged only Prop. 8 in this litigation. The Court need not—and in  
 6           the absence of a federal defendant, should not—address the federal Defense of Marriage Act in this  
 7           litigation. It may be that the Court’s ruling will have implications for the Defense of Marriage Act  
 8           and other similar laws that discriminate against gay men and lesbians. But such implications, if any,  
 9           will depend on the parameters of this Court’s decision.

10           **11. What evidence supports a finding that the choice of a person of the same**  
 11           **sex as a marriage partner partakes of traditionally revered liberties of**  
 12           **intimate association and individual autonomy?**

13           Plaintiffs put forth substantial and uncontested evidence at trial that the choice of a person of  
 14           the same sex as a marriage partner invokes the liberties of intimate association and individual  
 15           autonomy. As the Supreme Court has explained, “[w]hen sexuality finds overt expression in intimate  
 16           conduct with another person, the conduct can be but one element in a personal bond that is more  
 17           enduring. The liberty protected by the Constitution allows homosexual persons the right to make this  
 18           choice.” *Lawrence*, 539 U.S. at 567. And the choice of a marriage partner invokes one of the most—  
 19           if not *the* most—“intimate and personal choices a person may make in a lifetime, [a] choice[ ] central  
 20           to personal dignity and autonomy,” which is “central to the liberty protected by the Fourteenth  
 21           Amendment.” *Id.* at 574.

22           Testimony of multiple experts and of Plaintiffs themselves confirms that these liberties are  
 23           precisely what is at stake in the choice of a same-sex marriage partner. Indeed, Proponents’ own  
 24           purported expert on marriage, David Blankenhorn, evoked these same principles, explaining that  
 25           marriage—whether between heterosexual or gay or lesbian couples—is a “personal bond.”  
 26           Blankenhorn, Tr. 2913:8-2916:10. He went on to explain that “I believe that today the principle of  
 27           equal human dignity must apply to gay and lesbian persons. In that sense, insofar as we are a nation  
 28           founded on this principle, we would be *more* American on the day we permitted same-sex marriage  
 than we were the day before.” DIX0956 at 2 (Blankenhorn, *The Future of Marriage*); *see also*  
 Blankenhorn, Tr. 2805:8-20. Put another way, as Professor Cott explained, “a marriage once formed

1 is a zone of liberty for the partners within it.” Cott, Tr. 228:5-6. Professor Cott similarly described  
 2 the “zone of privacy and intimacy and familial harmony that marriage ideally should create.” *Id.* at  
 3 247:19-20.

4 The testimony of Plaintiffs demonstrates these concepts in personal terms. For example,  
 5 Plaintiff Kristin Perry explained that the ability to choose her spouse is a fundamental aspect of her  
 6 personal autonomy—it “symbolizes maybe the most important decision you make as an adult, who  
 7 you choose. No one does it for you.” Perry, Tr. 155:4-6. Her inability to marry Sandy Stier denies  
 8 her this autonomy. *Id.* at 159:2-11.

9 Describing why she is a plaintiff in this case, Sandy Stier explained that “I would like to get  
 10 married, and I would like to marry the person that I choose and that is Kris Perry.” Stier, Tr. 167:11-  
 11 13. Ms. Stier went on to explain that she feels it is important for the next generation “to at least feel  
 12 like the option to be true to yourself is an option that they can have, too.” *Id.* at 180:15-16.

13 Similarly, an American Psychoanalytic Association Position Statement on marriage by same-sex  
 14 couples has explained that “the milestone of marriage moves a couple and its children into full  
 15 citizenship in American society.” PX0752 at 1.

16 Of course, the importance that attaches to the “choice” of a person of the same sex as a  
 17 marriage partner does not mean that gay men and lesbians choose their sexual orientation or could  
 18 choose to marry a person of the opposite sex. Gay men and lesbians, like all other citizens, have the  
 19 right to choose the individual with whom they wish to spend their life in marriage. The evidence in  
 20 this case clearly demonstrates, however, that the vast majority of individuals experience little or no  
 21 choice in their sexual orientation, and that marrying someone of the opposite sex is not a realistic,  
 22 viable option for gay men and lesbians. *See* Response to Question C.5, *infra*.

23 **12. If the evidence of the involvement of the LDS and Roman Catholic**  
 24 **churches and evangelical ministers supports a finding that Proposition 8**  
 25 **was an attempt to enforce private morality, what is the import of that**  
 26 **finding?**

27 The evidence at trial established that the LDS and Roman Catholic churches played an  
 28 instrumental role in the passage of Prop. 8. *See, e.g.*, Segura, Tr. 1609:12-1610:6 (The coalition  
 between the Catholic Church and the LDS Church against a minority group was “unprecedented.”);



1 Doc # 608-1 at 18-23 (PFFs 26-28). They produced and funded campaign messages in support of  
 2 Prop. 8, which stated and implied that same-sex relationships are immoral. *See* Doc # 608-1 at 250-  
 3 68 (PFFs 287-93). Moral disapproval of gay and lesbian individuals, however, is not a legitimate  
 4 government interest. *See Lawrence*, 539 U.S. at 577 (“the fact that the governing majority in a State  
 5 has traditionally viewed a particular practice as immoral is not a sufficient reason for upholding a law  
 6 prohibiting the practice”); *see also* Response to Question A.2, *supra*. Indeed, the Supreme Court  
 7 “acknowledged” in *Lawrence* that, “for centuries[,] there have been powerful voices to condemn  
 8 homosexual conduct as immoral. The condemnation has been shaped by religious beliefs,  
 9 conceptions of right and acceptable behavior, and respect for the traditional family. For many  
 10 persons these are not trivial concerns but profound and deep convictions accepted as ethical and  
 11 moral principles to which they aspire and which thus determine the course of their lives.” 539 U.S. at  
 12 571. “These considerations,” however, did “not answer the question before” the Court in *Lawrence*.  
 13 *Id.* “Our obligation,” the Court explained, “is to define the liberty of all, not to mandate our own  
 14 moral code.” *Id.* (internal quotation marks omitted). Because Prop. 8 was an attempt to enforce  
 15 private moral beliefs about a disfavored minority—and does not further any legitimate state  
 16 interest—it is unconstitutional.

## 17 **B. RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS DIRECTED TO PROPONENTS**

### 18 **1. Assuming a higher level of scrutiny applies to either plaintiffs’ due process** 19 **or equal protection claim, what evidence in the record shows that** 20 **Proposition 8 is substantially related to an important government** **interest? Narrowly tailored to a compelling government interest?**

21 There is no evidence in the record to suggest that Prop. 8 is even rationally related to a  
 22 legitimate government interest—let alone, substantially related to an important government interest  
 23 or narrowly tailored to further a compelling government interest. *See* Doc # 608-1 at 203-48 (PFFs  
 24 238-84). To the contrary, Prop. 8 causes irreparable harm to gay men and lesbians and their families,  
 25 and is fundamentally discriminatory. *See id.* at 64-116 (PFFs 108-47) (evidence demonstrating harm  
 26 to Plaintiffs and other gay and lesbian individuals and their families); *id.* at 248-73 (PFFs 285-97)  
 27 (evidence demonstrating moral disapproval and animus). Indeed, Proponents cannot conceivably  
 28 satisfy the requirements of either intermediate or strict scrutiny because they rely exclusively on *post*

1 *hoc* rationalizations and do not defend any of the arguments advanced in support of Prop. 8 during  
 2 the campaign itself—such as the purported risk that, in the absence of Prop. 8, children would be  
 3 taught in school about marriage between individuals of the same sex. The Supreme Court has made  
 4 clear, however, that, to survive heightened scrutiny, the “justification[s]” offered to defend a  
 5 discriminatory measure “must be genuine, not hypothesized or invented *post hoc* in response to  
 6 litigation.” *Virginia*, 518 U.S. at 533.

7 **2. Aside from the testimony of Mr. Blankenhorn, what evidence in the**  
 8 **record supports a finding that same-sex marriage has or could have**  
 9 **negative social consequences? What does the evidence show the**  
 10 **magnitude of these consequences to be?**

11 Mr. Blankenhorn’s unsubstantiated opinion testimony is insufficient to support a finding that  
 12 affording gay men and lesbians the right to marry has or could have negative social consequences. In  
 13 fact, Mr. Blankenhorn testified at length on cross-examination as to the *positive* social consequences  
 14 that would result from eliminating discriminatory restrictions on the right of gay men and lesbians to  
 15 marry. *See, e.g.*, Blankenhorn, Tr. 2850:21 (permitting gay men and lesbians to marry would be “a  
 16 victory for . . . the American idea”); *see also id.* at 2846:17-2853:12. Nor is there any other evidence  
 17 in the record that could support a finding that marriage by individuals of the same sex would in fact  
 18 have negative implications. Proponents’ only other witness, Kenneth Miller, did not opine on this  
 19 subject. While Proponents subjected each of the credible and well-qualified experts called by  
 20 Plaintiffs to lengthy cross-examination, none offered any testimony that would lend support to the  
 21 premise that allowing gay men and lesbians to marry has or could have negative consequences.  
 22 Indeed, they testified to precisely the opposite. Dr. Nancy Cott, an expert on the history of marriage  
 23 and the ways that marriage has changed over time, testified that she is unaware of any empirical basis  
 24 on which to conclude that allowing individuals of the same sex to marry would increase the divorce  
 25 rate. Cott, Tr. 249:9-13. She further testified that allowing gay men and lesbians to marry would  
 26 fulfill the key defining characteristics of the institution of marriage, and that, “by excluding same-sex  
 27 couples from the ability to marry and engage in this highly-valued institution, . . . society is actually  
 28 denying itself another . . . resource for stability and social order.” Cott, Tr. 251:12-252:23. Dr. Anne  
 Peplau, an expert on couple relationships, testified that allowing same-sex couples to marry would

1 benefit gay men and lesbians, and would not cause fewer heterosexuals to marry or more  
 2 heterosexuals to divorce. Peplau, Tr. 594:11-606:12. Dr. Lee Badgett, an economist, testified that  
 3 Prop. 8 inflicts substantial economic harm on same-sex couples and their children living in  
 4 California. Badgett, Tr. 1330:14-16. Accordingly, the evidence before the Court cannot support a  
 5 conclusion that allowing gay men and lesbians to marry would harm society.

6 **3. The court has reserved ruling on plaintiffs' motion to exclude**  
 7 **Mr. Blankenhorn's testimony. If the motion is granted, is there any other**  
 8 **evidence to support a finding that Proposition 8 advances a legitimate**  
 9 **governmental interest?**

10 If the testimony of Mr. Blankenhorn is excluded (and indeed even if it is not), there is no  
 11 evidence in the record to support a finding that Prop. 8 advances legitimate government interests. As  
 12 Plaintiffs have explained in detail, and with evidentiary citations, in PFFs 229-97, the record in this  
 13 case clearly demonstrates that Prop. 8 in fact serves no legitimate government interest.

14 **4. Why should the court assume that the deinstitutionalization of marriage is**  
 15 **a negative consequence?**

16 For the concept of what it means to "deinstitutionalize" marriage, Proponents rely entirely on  
 17 Mr. Blankenhorn. Mr. Blankenhorn, of course, lacks training and expertise in any of the fields on  
 18 which one would draw to consider and evaluate this issue, including anthropology, history, and  
 19 sociology. Perhaps for that reason, Mr. Blankenhorn was quite vague as to what would and would  
 20 not amount to the "deinstitutionalization" of marriage. To the extent that "deinstitutionalization"  
 21 includes the removal of unfounded and discriminatory restrictions on one or both of the participants  
 22 in a marriage, this Court should not assume that outcome to be a negative one, and the evidence  
 23 proves otherwise. For example, as explained by Dr. Nancy Cott, the removal of historically accepted  
 24 restrictions on the freedom and individuality of women in a marriage, and the lifting of restrictions  
 25 that have existed over time concerning marriage across different races, are positive developments that  
 26 have fulfilled the meaning of marriage and helped it to remain a vibrant and important social  
 27 institution. Even Proponents seem to acknowledge that eliminating from the meaning of marriage  
 28 restrictions that are discriminatory and harmful does not weaken the institution, and Proponents do

1 not and cannot argue that those changes have harmed either the institution of marriage or society at  
2 large.

3 But even to the extent one assumes that the “deinstitutionalization” of marriage is a harmful  
4 or negative thing, the record is devoid of credible, reliable evidence sufficient to show that affording  
5 gay men and lesbians the right to marry would lead to such deinstitutionalization. To the contrary,  
6 the evidence shows that removing a remaining, unfounded and discriminatory restriction from the  
7 meaning of marriage would strengthen, rather than weaken, the institution. Cott, Tr. 251:12-252:23.  
8 Dr. Badgett evaluated data from jurisdictions where individuals of the same sex are permitted to  
9 marry, such as Massachusetts, the Netherlands, and Belgium, and concluded that there is no evidence  
10 of the “deinstitutionalization” described by Mr. Blankenhorn, and no reason to believe that any  
11 “deinstitutionalization” would occur in California. *See, e.g.*, Doc # 608-1 at 209-14 (PFF 247).  
12 Further, as Dr. Cott explained in her testimony, Mr. Blankenhorn’s concern over  
13 deinstitutionalization has “more to do with changes that have occurred in heterosexual mores about  
14 love and sex outside of marriage than it does to do with the question of same-sex couples wanting to  
15 enter the marriage institution and gain its stability and its formal imprimatur.” Cott, Tr. 337:7-11; *see*  
16 *also id.* at 336:3-8 (“Between 1965 and 1980, not only in the United States, but in all the  
17 industrialized world, from Europe to Japan, these indicators, the rate at which people married, the rate  
18 at which people divorced, one sank . . . one rose, and the rate of out-of-wedlock pregnancies, these  
19 underwent very, very sharp shifts”). Indeed, Mr. Blankenhorn himself conceded on cross-  
20 examination that allowing gay men and lesbians to marry would “be a victory for the worthy ideas of  
21 tolerance and inclusion” and “a victory for, and another key expansion of, the American idea.”  
22 Blankenhorn, Tr. 2850:10-21. Mr. Blankenhorn conceded that allowing gay men and lesbians to  
23 marry “would probably reduce the proportion of homosexuals who marry persons of the opposite sex  
24 and, thus, would likely reduce instances of marital unhappiness and divorce” (*id.* at 2851:25-2852:7),  
25 and also “would likely be accompanied by a wide-ranging and potentially valuable national  
26 discussion of marriage’s benefits, status and future.” *Id.* at 2852:18-24.

1           **5.       What evidence in the record shows that same-sex marriage is a drastic or**  
2           **far-reaching change to the institution of marriage?**

3           Simply put, there is no evidence that permitting same-sex couples to marry would effect a  
4           drastic or far-reaching change to the institution of marriage. First, as Professor Cott testified, civil  
5           marriage has never been a static institution. Historically, it has changed, sometimes dramatically, to  
6           reflect the evolving needs, values, and understanding of society. Doc # 608-1 at 29-30 (PFF 37); *see*  
7           *also id.* at 30-37 (PFFs 38-48). Indeed, the institution of marriage has changed repeatedly over its  
8           history, from the elimination of the doctrine of coverture, to permitting interracial couples to marry,  
9           to permitting “no fault” divorces. *See id.* at 29-37 (PFFs 37-48). And Proponents’ witnesses, Mr.  
10          Blankenhorn and Dr. Young, agreed that “the institution of marriage is constantly evolving” and  
11          “always changing.” *Id.* at 30 (PFF 38). The institution has easily weathered those changes, and is  
12          still seen as a significant institution resonating with social meaning. *Id.* at 64-66 (PFF 108). Indeed,  
13          even today—after all these changes—“Marriage matters. It significantly influences individual and  
14          societal well-being.” DIX0956 at 6 (Blankenhorn, *Future of Marriage*). And allowing same-sex  
15          couples to marry is no more drastic than any of those changes.

16          While Proponents speculate that permitting same-sex couples to marry could result in a  
17          parade of horrors, when asked point blank, their lead counsel admitted that Proponents “don’t  
18          know” whether allowing same-sex couples to marry would harm heterosexual relationships. He  
19          further admitted that whether any harm exists “can’t possibly be known now . . . . It may well be that  
20          there are no harms.” PX2810 at 23:10-16, 24:5-8, 29:14-18. And Proponents have not introduced  
21          *any* evidence that permitting same-sex couples to marry would transform marriage as an institution.  
22          Doc # 608-1 at 215-16 (PFF 248). Proponents’ purported expert, Mr. Blankenhorn, even conceded  
23          that he could not prove that permitting same-sex couples to marry would have any actual impact on  
24          the institution of marriage. *Id.* And Mr. Blankenhorn’s *opinion* that permitting same-sex couples to  
25          marry would further deinstitutionalize marriage is not credible, reliable, supported by the evidence, or  
26          entitled to substantial weight. *Id.* at 222-26 (PFFs 253-58). Indeed, he even acknowledged that “The  
27          Marriage Movement: A Statement of Principles,” which was published in part by his organization,  
28          The Institute for American Values, did *not* include homosexuality or marriage by individuals of the

1 same sex as one of the reasons the institution of marriage was allegedly “weakening.” Blankenhorn,  
2 Tr. 2911:9-2913:5.

3 More specifically, even though marriage by individuals of the same sex has been permitted in  
4 the Netherlands since 2001, and in Massachusetts since 2004, Proponents have not identified any  
5 harm caused by the removal of discriminatory marriage restrictions in those jurisdictions. *See* Doc  
6 # 608-1 at 217-21 (PFF 250). Indeed, the evidence actually demonstrates the opposite. For example,  
7 evidence from the Netherlands suggests that the marriage rate, divorce rate, and nonmarital birth rate  
8 *were not affected* by permitting individuals of the same sex to marry. *Id.* Similarly, since marriage  
9 has been made available to individuals of the same sex in Massachusetts, the divorce rate has not  
10 increased; in fact, the Massachusetts divorce rate is the lowest in the Nation. *Id.* at 221-22 (PFF 251).

11 **6. What evidence in the record shows that same-sex couples are differently**  
12 **situated from opposite-sex couples where at least one partner is infertile?**

13 No evidence in the record shows that same-sex couples are differently situated from opposite-  
14 sex couples where at least one partner is infertile. In fact, Plaintiffs presented testimony from Dr.  
15 Anne Peplau establishing, based on years of research, that same-sex couples and opposite-sex couples  
16 are fundamentally the *same* in terms of their relationships, what they are looking for in a relationship,  
17 and what makes the relationship successful or unsuccessful. Peplau, Tr. 583:12-594:10; *see also*  
18 Badgett, Tr. 1331:3-5 (“my opinion is that same-sex couples are very similar to different-sex couples  
19 in most economic and demographic characteristics”). These similarities do not depend on whether  
20 the couple has the ability to procreate together.

21 On cross-examination, Proponents’ counsel asked whether Dr. Peplau would agree “that gay  
22 and lesbian couples do not accidentally have children,” and Dr. Peplau responded “can two lesbians  
23 spontaneously accidentally impregnate each other, not to my knowledge.” Peplau, Tr. 640:13-22.  
24 Of course, in this respect gay men and lesbians are similarly situated to an opposite-sex couple where  
25 at least one partner is infertile.

1           **7. Assume the evidence shows that children do best when raised by their**  
 2           **married, biological mother and father. Assume further the court**  
 3           **concludes it is in the state’s interest to encourage children to be raised by**  
 4           **their married biological mother and father where possible. What**  
 5           **evidence if any shows that Proposition 8 furthers this state interest?**

6           There is no evidence that Prop. 8 furthers any state interest that may exist in encouraging  
 7 children to be raised by their married, biological mother and father. Prop. 8 does not change  
 8 California’s laws and policies that permit gay and lesbian individuals to have, adopt, or raise  
 9 children. *See* Doc # 608-1 at 244-45 (PFF 279). Nor does prohibiting marriage by individuals of the  
 10 same sex have any effect on whether biological parents will choose to raise their biological children  
 11 or whether biological parents will choose to marry or remain married to raise those children. To the  
 12 contrary, to the extent the State has an interest in what is “best” for children, the evidence shows that  
 13 Prop. 8 affirmatively harms the interests of children and does not promote the achievement of good  
 14 child-adjustment outcomes. *See, e.g., id.* at 227-41 (PFFs 260-80). By denying same-sex couples  
 15 with children the right to marry, Prop. 8 deprives the children of those couples the legitimacy that  
 16 marriage confers on children and the sense of security, stability, and increased well-being that  
 17 accompany that legitimacy. *See, e.g., id.* at 111-12, 115 (PFFs 142, 145). Indeed, the evidence  
 18 shows that Prop. 8 stigmatizes the children of same-sex couples by relegating their parents to the  
 19 separate and unequal institution of domestic partnership. *See, e.g., id.* at 116 (PFF 146). Moreover,  
 20 because certain tangible and intangible benefits flow to a married couple’s children by virtue of the  
 21 State’s (and society’s) recognition of that bond, Prop. 8 denies children of same-sex couples access to  
 22 those benefits. *See, e.g., id.* at 112-15, 116 (PFFs 143-44, 147).

21           **8. Do California’s laws permitting same-sex couples to raise and adopt**  
 22           **children undermine any conclusion that encouraging children to be raised**  
 23           **by a married mother and father is a legitimate state interest?**

24           California’s laws permitting same-sex couples to raise and adopt children undermine  
 25 Proponents’ contention that Prop. 8 furthers the State’s purported interest in encouraging children to  
 26 be raised by a married mother and father. Doc # 605 at 13-14. Prop. 8 did not change the provisions  
 27 of California law that expressly authorize adoption by unmarried same-sex couples and did not  
 28 otherwise restrict the ability of same-sex couples to raise children. *See In re Marriage Cases*, 183  
 P.3d 384, 452 n.72 (Cal. 2008) (“the governing California statutes permit same-sex couples to adopt

1 and raise children and additionally draw no distinction between married couples and domestic  
 2 partners with regard to the legal rights and responsibilities relating to children raised within each of  
 3 these family relationships”); Cal. Fam. Code §§ 297.5(d), 7601, 7602, 7650, 9000(b); *Elisa B. v.*  
 4 *Superior Court*, 117 P.3d 660, 670 (Cal. 2005); *Sharon S. v. Superior Court*, 73 P.3d 554, 569 (Cal.  
 5 2003). Indeed, research shows that any such distinction between same-sex parents and opposite-sex  
 6 parents would be contrary to the needs and interests of children. *See, e.g.*, Nanette Gartrell & Henny  
 7 Bos, *U.S. National Longitudinal Lesbian Family Study: Psychological Adjustment of 17-Year-Old*  
 8 *Adolescents*, 126 J. Pediatrics (forthcoming July 2010, available online) (concluding that adolescents  
 9 who have been raised in lesbian-mother families since birth demonstrate healthy psychological  
 10 adjustment). Prop. 8 therefore does nothing to further the State’s purported interest in encouraging  
 11 children to be raised by a married mother and father.

12 **9. How does the Supreme Court’s holding in *Michael H. v. Gerald D.*,  
 13 **491 U.S. 110 (1989)** square with an emphasis on the importance of a  
 biological connection between parents and their children?**

14 In *Michael H. v. Gerald D.*, 491 U.S. 110 (1989), the Supreme Court rejected a constitutional  
 15 challenge to a California statute that declared it “irrelevant for paternity purposes whether a child  
 16 conceived during, and born into, an existing marriage was begotten by someone other than the  
 17 husband.” *Id.* at 119. The Court held that a biological father had neither a procedural due process  
 18 right nor a liberty interest in a relationship with his daughter where the child’s mother was married to  
 19 another man at the time of birth. It emphasized that, in California, the “marital family,” not the  
 20 biological family, “has been treated as a protected family unit under . . . historic practices.” *Id.* at  
 21 124. *Michael H.*—and California’s tradition of protecting the “marital family”—therefore undermine  
 22 Proponents’ reliance on the purported importance of ensuring a biological connection between  
 23 parents and their children.

24 **10. Assume the evidence shows that sexual orientation is socially constructed.  
 25 Assume further the evidence shows Proposition 8 assumes the existence of  
 26 sexual orientation as a stable category. What bearing if any do these facts  
 have on the constitutionality of Proposition 8?**

27 Plaintiffs agree that Prop. 8 assumes the existence of sexual orientation as a stable and  
 28 readily-identifiable category. Doc # 608-1 at 135-37 (PFFs 168-69). Indeed, even supporters of



1 Prop. 8 were able to identify gay and lesbian individuals or couples. PX0480; *see also* PX1867 at 42,  
 2 63-64, 81; PX1868 at 21, 33, 48, 61, 72, 94, 98; PX2153; PX2156; PX2597. Further, the evidence  
 3 demonstrated that sexual orientation is essential to one’s identity. *See* Response to Question A.11,  
 4 *supra*. Fundamentally, then, Prop. 8 discriminates on the basis of a readily-definable category.

5 Moreover, whether sexual orientation is socially constructed is entirely irrelevant to the  
 6 question whether people should be afforded constitutional protection on the basis of sexual  
 7 orientation. For example, classifications based on race, a readily-identifiable category, are subject to  
 8 strict scrutiny. *Adarand Constructors, Inc. v. Peña*, 515 U.S. 200, 223 (1995). But the evidence at  
 9 trial demonstrated that race is socially constructed. *See* Herek, Tr. 2178:2-16 (“[T]he definition of  
 10 which races are which, which ones are separate from each other, what type of skin coloring or what  
 11 type of ancestry involves a person being of a particular race, all of those things are socially  
 12 constructed.”); *see also* Meyer, Tr. 954:3-24 (“identities change and they are responsive to the social  
 13 context in many different ways, but—obviously, the population itself doesn’t change, but how people  
 14 refer to themselves might change”); Doc # 608-1 at 138-39 (PFF 172).

15 **11. Why is legislating based on moral disapproval of homosexuality not**  
 16 **tantamount to discrimination? *See* Doc #605 at 11 (“But sincerely held**  
 17 **moral or religious views that require acceptance and love of gay people,**  
 18 **while disapproving certain aspects of their conduct, are not tantamount to**  
 19 **discrimination.”). What evidence in the record shows that a belief based**  
 20 **in morality cannot also be discriminatory? If that moral point of view is**  
 21 **not held and is disputed by a small but significant minority of the**  
 22 **community, should not an effort to enact that moral point of view into a**  
 23 **state constitution be deemed a violation of equal protection?**

24 Legislative action based on moral disapproval of gay men and lesbians as a group *is*  
 25 discrimination, and mere moral disapproval is not a legitimate government interest. *See Lawrence*,  
 26 539 U.S. at 579 (“the fact that the governing majority in a State has traditionally viewed a particular  
 27 practice as immoral is not a sufficient reason for upholding a law prohibiting the practice”); *see also*  
 28 Response to Question A.2, *supra*. Accordingly, whether that “moral point of view” is held  
 unanimously—or whether it is disputed by a significant minority of the population—it is not a  
 sufficient basis for sustaining legislation.

1           **12.    What harm do proponents face if an injunction against the enforcement of**  
2           **Proposition 8 is issued?**

3           Excluding individuals of the same sex from the institution of marriage harms Plaintiffs, their  
4 children, and hundreds of thousands of other gay men and lesbians (and their families) throughout  
5 California. Allowing gay men and lesbians to marry harms no one. Doc # 608-1 at 205-26 (PFFs  
6 243-58). Indeed, Proponents' counsel admitted that Proponents "don't know" what effect, if any,  
7 marriage by individuals of the same sex would have on opposite-sex marriage. PX2810 at 23:10-16;  
8 24:5-8; *see also id.* at 29:14-18 (further admitting that "[i]t may well be that there are no harms").  
9 And Proponents' own purported expert, Mr. Blankenhorn, admitted that "[i]t's impossible to be  
10 completely sure" whether allowing gay men and lesbians to marry would further the  
11 deinstitutionalization of marriage. *See* Blankenhorn, Tr. 2780:13-17. Tellingly, Proponents  
12 presented no evidence whatsoever that the 18,000 same-sex marriages that took place between the  
13 California Supreme Court's decision in the *Marriage Cases* and the passage of Prop. 8 have harmed  
14 Proponents or anyone else. Thus, if an injunction against the enforcement of Prop. 8 is issued and  
15 more gay and lesbian couples are allowed to marry in California, Proponents would not be harmed in  
16 any way.

17           Additionally, no amount of supposed uncertainty about the legal status of marriages  
18 performed while Prop. 8 is enjoined and this case is on appeal can outweigh the compelling need for  
19 immediate injunctive relief to alleviate the irreparable harm that Plaintiffs are suffering each day that  
20 Prop. 8 remains on the books. After all, the burden of any such legal uncertainty would be borne  
21 principally by Plaintiffs and those gay men and lesbians who decide to get married while this case is  
22 on appeal. Gay and lesbian individuals who wish to wait until all appeals in this matter have run their  
23 course before marrying would be free to do so, while those who cannot or do not wish to wait longer  
24 than they already have would enjoy the same freedom to marry as all other citizens.

1 **C. RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS DIRECTED TO PLAINTIFFS AND**  
2 **PROponents**

3 **1. What party bears the burden of proof on plaintiffs' claims? Under what**  
4 **standard of review is the evidence considered?**

5 Prop. 8 infringes on Plaintiffs' fundamental right to marry (as well as their fundamental right  
6 to privacy and personal autonomy) and discriminates on the basis of sexual orientation and sex.  
7 Because Prop. 8 impairs fundamental rights and discriminates on the basis of suspect classifications,  
8 Proponents bear the burden of proving that Prop. 8 is narrowly tailored to further a compelling state  
9 interest. *See P.O.P.S. v. Gardner*, 998 F.2d 764, 767-68 (9th Cir. 1993) ("Statutes that directly and  
10 substantially impair [the right to marry] require strict scrutiny."); *see also Carey v. Population Servs.*  
11 *Int'l*, 431 U.S. 678, 686 (1977); *Palmore*, 466 U.S. at 432-33. In the alternative, if the Court  
12 concludes that strict scrutiny is not appropriate, then Proponents would bear the burden of proving  
13 that Prop. 8 is substantially related to an important state interest because Prop. 8 infringes on  
14 Plaintiffs' right to marry and their right to privacy and personal autonomy—which are significant  
15 liberty interests—and discriminates on the basis of sexual orientation and sex, which are both (at a  
16 minimum) quasi-suspect classifications. *See Virginia*, 518 U.S. at 533 ("The burden of justification  
17 is demanding and it rests entirely on the State. The State must show at least that the challenged  
18 classification serves important governmental objectives and that the discriminatory means employed  
19 are substantially related to the achievement of those objectives.") (internal quotation marks,  
20 alterations, and citation omitted); *Witt v. Dep't of the Air Force*, 527 F.3d 806, 819 (9th Cir. 2008). If  
21 the Court concludes that rational basis review applies, then it should examine the interests that  
22 Proponents offer for Prop. 8 to determine whether they are legitimate state interests. *See Romer*, 517  
23 U.S. at 635 (examining the "rationale *the State offers* for Amendment 2") (emphasis added). If the  
24 interests are legitimate, then Plaintiffs would be required to prove that Prop. 8 does not in fact  
25 "advance" those interests. *Id.* at 632.  
26  
27  
28

1           **2. Does the existence of a debate inform whether the existence of a rational**  
 2           **basis supporting Proposition 8 is “debatable” or “arguable” under the**  
 3           **Equal Protection Clause? See *Minnesota v. Clover Leaf Creamery Co.*, 449**  
 4           **U.S. 456, 469 (1981); *FCC v. Beach Communications, Inc.*, 508 U.S. 307,**  
 5           **320 (1993).**

6           The public debate about authorizing marriage between individuals of the same sex has no  
 7 bearing on the legal issue before the Court on Plaintiffs’ equal protection claim: Whether Prop. 8  
 8 unconstitutionally discriminates against gay men and lesbians in violation of the Fourteenth  
 9 Amendment. The fact that some segment of the population may strongly support a discriminatory  
 10 measure—and may be engaged in a public debate on the issue—cannot conceivably shield the law  
 11 from the requirements of equal protection. The issues that the Supreme Court confronted in a number  
 12 of its most significant equal protection cases were the subject of widespread public debate at the time  
 13 of the Court’s decision (*see, e.g., Brown v. Bd. of Educ.*, 347 U.S. 483, 494 (1954); *Loving*, 388  
 14 U.S. 1)—but such debate did not cause the Court to hesitate when invalidating discriminatory  
 15 legislation. This holds true whether the Court applies strict scrutiny, intermediate scrutiny, or rational  
 16 basis review. Indeed, there can be no question that the issue before the Court in *Romer*—the  
 17 availability of antidiscrimination protections for gay men and lesbians—was the subject of extensive  
 18 public debate—but the Court did not take that debate into account when invalidating the Colorado  
 19 constitutional amendment stripping gay men and lesbians of their antidiscrimination protections. 517  
 20 U.S. at 635.

21           *Minnesota v. Clover Leaf Creamery Co.*, 449 U.S. 456 (1981), and *FCC v. Beach*  
 22 *Communications, Inc.*, 508 U.S. 307 (1993), simply state that, where there are “plausible rationales”  
 23 underlying a statute, a court should not substitute its assessment of those rationales for those of the  
 24 legislature (or voters). *Beach Commc’ns*, 508 U.S. at 320. Here, there is not even a “plausible,”  
 25 “debatable,” or “arguable” rationale underlying Prop. 8 because the evidence demonstrated that Prop.  
 26 8 does not in fact “advance a legitimate government interest.” *Romer*, 517 U.S. at 632. It instead  
 27 singles out gay men and lesbians for disfavored treatment under the law by stripping them of their  
 28 fundamental right to marry. While some people might strongly support branding gay men and  
 lesbians with a mark of second-class citizenship, such naked discrimination is not “plausibl[y],”  
 “debatabl[y],” or “arguabl[y]” a legitimate government interest.

1           **3.       What does the evidence show the difference to be between gays and**  
2           **lesbians, on the one hand, and heterosexuals on the other? Is that**  
3           **difference one which the government “may legitimately take into account”**  
4           **when making legislative classifications? See *City of Cleburne v. Cleburne***  
5           ***Living Center*, 473 U.S. 432, 446 (1985).**

6           The evidence demonstrates that gay and lesbian individuals and heterosexuals are similarly  
7           situated with respect to marriage. See Doc # 608-1 at 126-34 (PFFs 159-66). The only difference is  
8           that gay and lesbian individuals desire to marry a person of the same sex and heterosexual individuals  
9           desire to marry a person of the opposite sex. But this difference is not one that the government “may  
10          legitimately take into account” when making legislative classifications (*Cleburne*, 473 U.S. at 446),  
11          because it “bears no relation to ability to perform or contribute to society.” *Id.* at 441 (internal  
12          quotation marks omitted); Doc # 608-1 at 131-34 (PFFs 164-66).

13          Moreover, any difference with respect to procreation is not a basis for barring gay men and  
14          lesbians from marrying because marriage has never been limited to procreative unions. Doc # 608-1  
15          at 45-46, 203-05 (PFFs 59-61, 238-42). And, to the extent that Proponents claim that gay and lesbian  
16          couples are less stable and monogamous in their relationships than heterosexual couples, there is no  
17          empirical support for this negative stereotype. Peplau, Tr. 585:22-586:8. In any event, even if such a  
18          difference did exist, the State of California does not condition marriage on monogamy; indeed, even  
19          philanderers and serial divorcees are permitted to marry in California. See Doc # 608-1 at 46 (PFF  
20          62). Finally, any difference that did exist in this regard would no doubt be the direct result of  
21          precisely the discrimination being challenged in this case: exclusion from the institution of marriage.  
22          The public recognition that attends marriage, the legal obligations created by marriage, and the  
23          emotional and tangible investments that spouses make in their joint relationship serve as deterrents to  
24          relationship dissolution. *Id.* at 64-87 (PFFs 108-19); Peplau, Tr. 613:9-614:12 (Marriage is an  
25          important barrier to the dissolution of a relationship.); PX1245 at 413 (review by Anne Peplau and  
26          Adam Fingerhut: “Marriage would help couples feel closer and strengthen their relationships, in part  
27          by creating structural barriers to relationship dissolution.”); Peplau, Tr. 612:6-612:18 (“[P]eople  
28          associate with marriage a degree of seriousness and sort of gravitas that leads them to take those  
                obligations seriously.”). Plaintiffs’ testimony confirmed that marriage would solidify their

1 relationships. *See, e.g.,* Katami, Tr. 89:17-90:3 (“[H]aving a marriage would grow our relationship.  
2 It represents us to our community and to society.”).

3 **4. What does the evidence show the definition (or definitions) of marriage to**  
4 **be? How does Professor Cott’s proposed definition of marriage fit within**  
5 **Mr. Blankenhorn’s testimony that competing definitions of marriage are**  
6 **either focused on children or focused on spousal affection? *See* Cott,**  
7 **Tr. 201:9-14 and 222:13-17; Blankenhorn, Tr. 2742:9-18 and 2755:25-**  
8 **2756:1.**

9 Professor Cott testified that civil marriage is a capacious, complex institution that has never  
10 been static, but instead has changed, sometimes dramatically, to reflect the changing needs, values,  
11 and understanding of our evolving society. Doc # 608-1 at 29-30 (PFFs 37-38). Still, marriage has  
12 several key defining characteristics: A “mutual consent between partners who freely choose each  
13 other, and their commitment to establish a continuing stable relationship as the foundation for a  
14 household in which they will economically support one another and their dependents, and enable  
15 themselves to compose a family.” Cott, Tr. 251:13-252:3. In short, the emphasis in modern marriage  
16 is the creation of a private arena—a zone of liberty, privacy, and intimacy for those within it. Doc  
17 # 608-1 at 31-32 (PFF 40).

18 In contrast, Mr. Blankenhorn testified that there are two competing, irreconcilable definitions  
19 of marriage—one of which is focused on a sexual relationship and the other on a private commitment  
20 made by two adults to love each other and receive support and recognition from others.  
21 Blankenhorn, Tr. 2742:9-19; 2755:24-2756:1. Of these two possible competing definitions,  
22 Mr. Blankenhorn maintains that the proper definition of marriage is a “socially-approved sexual  
23 relationship between a man and a woman” entered into for the purpose of procreation. *See id.* at  
24 2742:9-10. Mr. Blankenhorn’s competing definitions of marriage, however, are unsupported by  
25 scholarship, are artificially narrow, and fail to accurately define the institution.

26 Professor Cott’s definition of marriage does not “fit” into either of Mr. Blankenhorn’s  
27 definitions. Rather, the definition Professor Cott advances captures elements of both of  
28 Mr. Blankenhorn’s definitions. Marriage is fundamentally an intimate commitment between two  
people who choose to build a life and home together—with or without children. This definition of  
marriage recognizes that, for many, marriage may include childrearing or the legitimization of

1 children, but at its core, procreation is not required for a relationship to constitute a “marriage” as  
2 understood through the history of our Nation.

3 Lastly, it should be noted that, in contrast to Professor Cott’s extensive independent scholarly  
4 work on the subject of marriage, there is no evidence that Mr. Blankenhorn’s views are based on  
5 anything more than his limited review of what others have written. *See* Blankenhorn, Tr. 2742:8-24  
6 (Blankenhorn’s views are “drawn from scholarly investigations”); *id.* at 2897:15-2899:13 (“I’m  
7 simply repeating things that they say. . . . I’m a transmitter here of findings of these eminent  
8 scholars.”). Mr. Blankenhorn also admitted that he had never even read a Supreme Court decision  
9 discussing marriage, which is of course central to this litigation. *See id.* at 2909:7-12.

10 **5. What does it mean to have a “choice” in one’s sexual orientation? *See***  
11 ***e.g.*, Tr. 2032:17-22; PX0928 at 37.**

12 Having a “choice” necessarily entails being able to voluntarily decide between two (or more)  
13 viable options. Because “[s]exual orientation is a term that we use to describe an enduring sexual,  
14 romantic, or intensely affectional attraction to men, to women, or to both men and women” (Herek,  
15 Tr. 2025:3-7), having “choice” in one’s sexual orientation would amount to choosing the sex of the  
16 person to whom one is attracted. Not surprisingly, no party argued or put on any evidence that  
17 heterosexuals feel as though they have a “choice” regarding the sex to which they are attracted. And  
18 the overwhelming evidence demonstrates that the same is true for gay men and lesbians. Doc # 608-  
19 1 at 142 (PFF 175); *see also* Herek, Tr. 2054:12-2057:16, 2252:1-10; PX0928; PX0930. One cannot  
20 choose the sex to which one is attracted, and it therefore follows logically that a man who is attracted  
21 only to men would not choose to marry a woman. Doc # 608-1 at 60, 141 (PFFs 96, 174); *see also*  
22 Herek, Tr. 2324:6-10 (If two women want to marry, it is a safe assumption that they are lesbians.).

23 Notably, despite Proponents’ repeated attempts to conflate the two concepts, “choice” is not  
24 the same thing as “change.” Some percentage of individuals may experience a change in their sexual  
25 orientation at some point during their lifetime, but that does not mean that the individual could at any  
26 point *voluntarily choose* to change his or her sexual orientation. There are many reasons why a  
27 change may occur—for example, a man may be married to a woman before he realizes that he is gay.  
28 *See* Herek, Tr. 2042:13-2043:19, 2202:7-22. But, by definition, “choice” requires a voluntary

1 decision, and there is no testimony or evidence to support the notion that one consciously decides on  
 2 his or her sexual orientation. *See* PX0912 at 1-2 (“We recommend the term *sexual orientation*  
 3 because most research findings indicate that homosexual feelings are a basic part of an individual’s  
 4 psyche and are established much earlier than conscious choice would indicate.”); *see also* Herek, Tr.  
 5 2319:23-2320:10.

6 Even Proponents’ own (withdrawn) expert on immutability, Professor Robinson, conceded  
 7 that sexual orientation is not readily subject to change. *See* Herek, Tr. 2315:20-15 (reading  
 8 deposition testimony of Prof. Robinson). And the testimony of multiple other witnesses repeatedly  
 9 confirmed this. *See* Perry, Tr. 141:14-19 (Kris Perry feels that she was born with her sexual  
 10 orientation and that it will not change); Stier, Tr. 166:24-167:9 (Sandy Stier is 47 years old and has  
 11 fallen in love one time in her life—with Perry); Zarrillo, Tr. 77:4-5 (Jeffrey Zarrillo has been gay “as  
 12 long as [he] can remember”); Katami, Tr. 91:15-17 (Paul Katami has been a “natural-born gay” “as  
 13 long as he can remember”); Zia, Tr. 1210:22-25 (Helen Zia is a lesbian and thinks she has been a  
 14 lesbian all her life); Kendall, Tr. 1509:24-1510:1 (Ryan Kendall reported that neither reversal therapy  
 15 he tried was successful in changing him from gay to heterosexual).

16 Moreover, there was uncontroverted empirical evidence that *attempting* to change one’s  
 17 sexual orientation will almost invariably be unsuccessful and, in fact, harmful (if not life-  
 18 threatening). As the “Report of the American Psychological Association Task Force on Appropriate  
 19 Therapeutic Responses to Sexual Orientation” explained:

20 [E]nduring change to an individual’s sexual orientation is uncommon. . . .  
 21 [T]he results of scientifically valid research indicate that it is unlikely that  
 22 individuals will be able to reduce same-sex attractions or increase other-sex  
 sexual attractions through SOCE [sexual orientation change efforts].

23 PX0888 at 2-3; *see also* Herek, Tr. 2033:6-2034:9; PX0888 at 3.

24 **6. In order to be rooted in “our Nation’s history, legal traditions, and**  
 25 **practices,” *see Washington v. Glucksberg*, 521 U.S. 702, 710 (1997), is it**  
 26 **sufficient that a practice has existed historically, or need there be an**  
**articulable purpose underlying the practice?**

27 There is no question that marriage is deeply rooted in our Nation’s history, traditions, and  
 28 practices. Indeed, the “freedom to marry has long been recognized as one of the vital personal rights



1 essential to the orderly pursuit of happiness by free men.” *Loving*, 388 U.S. at 12; *see also Maynard*,  
 2 125 U.S. at 211 (marriage is “the foundation of the family and of society”). Moreover, marriage  
 3 promotes numerous “articulable”—and extraordinarily important—purposes that extend well beyond  
 4 simple procreation. Marriage “is of fundamental importance for all individuals” (*Zablocki*, 434 U.S.  
 5 at 384)—including those who cannot, or choose not to, procreate. The love, “emotional support,”  
 6 friendship, comfort, and encouragement that spouses provide each other enable personal self-  
 7 fulfillment, and are essential parts of what it means to be married. *Turner*, 482 U.S. at 95. Thus,  
 8 whether or not an “articulable purpose” is required for a practice to be rooted in our Nation’s history,  
 9 traditions, and practices, marriage is inextricably and unquestionably linked to “articulable purposes”  
 10 that are promoted whether a marriage involves individuals of the same sex or individuals of the  
 11 opposite sex.

12 **7. If spouses are obligated to one another for mutual support and support of**  
 13 **dependents, and if legal spousal obligations have no basis in the gender of**  
 14 **the spouse, what purpose does a law requiring that a marital partnership**  
 15 **consist of one man and one woman serve?**

16 Plaintiffs agree that spouses are obligated to one another for mutual support and the support of  
 17 dependants. *See Cott*, Tr. 201:3-18 (A core feature of marriage in the United States is that it is based  
 18 on “a couple’s choice to live with each other, to remain committed to one another, and to form a  
 19 household based on their own feelings about one another, and their agreement to join in an economic  
 20 partnership and support one another.”); *see also id.* at 209:4-210:9, 251:13-252:3. Plaintiffs further  
 21 agree that the sex of the spouse is irrelevant to legal spousal obligations. *See id.* at Tr. 243:5-244:10,  
 22 244:21-25. Indeed, changes in society have led spousal roles to become more gender-neutral over  
 23 time, and changes in the law have ended gender-determined roles for spouses—“to no apparent  
 24 damage to the institution.” *Id.* at 245:9-247:3. Accordingly, there is no purpose in limiting marriage  
 25 to opposite-sex couples. Individuals in marriages of two men or two women are equally capable—  
 26 and equally obligated—to provide mutual support and support for their dependents as individuals in  
 27 opposite-sex marriages.  
 28

1           **8. The California Family Code requires that registered domestic partners be**  
 2           **treated as spouses. Cal. Fam. Code § 297.5. Businesses that extend**  
 3           **benefits to married spouses in California must extend equal benefits to**  
 4           **registered domestic partners. See *Koebke v Bernardo Heights Country***  
 5           ***Club*, 36 Cal. 4th 824, 846 (2005) (“We interpret [Cal. Fam. Code**  
 6           **§ 297.5(f)] to mean that there shall be no discrimination in the treatment**  
 7           **of registered domestic partners and spouses.”). If, under California law,**  
 8           **registered domestic partners are to be treated just like married spouses,**  
 9           **what purpose is served by differentiating—in name only—between same-**  
 10           **sex and opposite-sex unions?**

7           The fact that California grants gay and lesbian individuals virtually all the tangible rights  
 8 associated with marriage but denies them the label of “marriage” serves no purpose but to stigmatize  
 9 and discriminate against gay and lesbian individuals. *See* Doc # 608-1 at 64-106 (PFFs 108-32).

10           The word “marriage” has a unique meaning, and there is a significant symbolic disparity  
 11 between domestic partnership and marriage. Doc # 608-1 at 69-72 (PFF 110). As Proponents’  
 12 purported expert, Mr. Blankenhorn, admitted, “the word ‘marriage’” is “much bigger, much more  
 13 powerful and potent as a role in society than merely or only the enumeration of its legal incidents.”  
 14 Blankenhorn, Tr. 2790:5-9. The unique cultural value and social meaning of “marriage” cannot  
 15 compare to the legal benefits of domestic partnerships. *See* Cott, Tr. 208:9-17 (“I appreciate the fact  
 16 that several states have extended . . . most of the material rights and benefits of marriage to people  
 17 who have civil unions or domestic partnerships. But there really is no comparison, in my historical  
 18 view, because there is nothing that is like marriage except marriage.”); Peplau, Tr. 611:1-7 (“I have  
 19 great confidence that some of the things that come from marriage, believing that you are part of the  
 20 first class kind of relationship in this country, that you are . . . in the status of relationships that this  
 21 society most values, most esteems, considers the most legitimate and the most appropriate,  
 22 undoubtedly has benefits that are not part of domestic partnerships.”); *see also* Stier, Tr. 179:5-18  
 23 (explaining that being able to marry Perry would “change my life dramatically. . . . I would feel more  
 24 secure. I would feel more accepted. I would feel more pride.”). Proponent Tam’s testimony also  
 25 confirmed that the label “marriage” matters. *See* Tam, Tr. 1962:17-24 (“Because the name of  
 26 ‘marriage’ is so important, especially for us parents to teach our . . . kids, all right? . . . Everyone  
 27 fantasize whom they will marry when they grow up.”).

1 Domestic partnerships—even if they confer virtually all the material benefits of marriage—  
2 stigmatize gay and lesbian individuals and relegate them to the status of second-class citizens. *See*,  
3 *e.g.*, Meyer, Tr. 966:6-8 (Domestic partnerships stigmatize gay and lesbian individuals.); Badgett,  
4 Tr. 1342:14-1343:12 (Some same-sex couples who might marry would not register as domestic  
5 partners because they see domestic partnership as second-class status, value marriage because it is  
6 socially validated by the community, and dislike domestic partnership because it sounds too  
7 clinical.); *id.* at 1471:1-1472:8 (Same-sex couples value the social recognition of marriage, and  
8 believe that the alternative status conveys a message of inferiority.); Katami, Tr. 115:3-116:1  
9 (Domestic partnerships “make[] you into a second, third, and . . . fourth class citizen now that we  
10 actually recognize marriages from other states. . . . None of our friends have ever said, ‘Hey, this is  
11 my domestic partner.’”); Herek, Tr. 2044:20-2045:22 (But the difference between domestic  
12 partnerships and marriage is more than simply a word. “[J]ust the fact that we’re here today suggests  
13 that this is more than a word . . . clearly, [there is] a great deal of strong feeling and emotion about  
14 the difference between marriage and domestic partnerships.”); Blankenhorn, Tr. 2850:4-21 (agreeing  
15 that “Same-sex marriage would signify greater social acceptance of homosexual love and the worth  
16 and validity of same-sex intimate relationships”); Doc # 608-1 at 72-75 (PFFs 112-13).

17 Prop. 8 reflects and propagates the stigma that gay and lesbian individuals do not have  
18 intimate relations similar to those of heterosexual couples and conveys the State’s judgment that  
19 same-sex couples are inherently less deserving of society’s full recognition through the status of civil  
20 marriage than heterosexual couples. This distinction is stigmatizing—and thus unconstitutional. *See*  
21 *Virginia*, 518 U.S. at 554; *Brown*, 347 U.S. at 494; *McLaurin v. Okla. State Regents for Higher*  
22 *Educ.*, 339 U.S. 637, 641 (1950); *Sweatt v. Painter*, 339 U.S. 629, 634-35 (1950); *see also Heckler v.*  
23 *Mathews*, 465 U.S. 728, 739-40 (1984) (“discrimination itself, by perpetuating ‘archaic and  
24 stereotypic notions’ or by stigmatizing members of the disfavored group as ‘innately inferior’ and  
25 therefore as less worthy participants in the political community, can cause serious noneconomic  
26 injuries to those persons who are personally denied equal treatment”); *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U.S.  
27 537, 562 (1896) (Harlan, J., dissenting) (laws creating “separate but equal” accommodations “put[ ]  
28 the brand of . . . degradation upon a large class of our fellow-citizens”).

1           **9.       What evidence, if any, shows whether infertility has ever been a legal basis**  
 2           **for annulment or divorce?**

3           The ability or willingness of married couples to produce children has never been a  
 4 prerequisite to the validity of a marriage under American law. *See* PX0709 at RFA No. 52  
 5 (Administration admits “that California law does not restrict heterosexual individuals with no  
 6 children and/or no intent to have children from marrying on the basis of their status as a heterosexual  
 7 individual with no children and/or no intent to have children.”); Doc # 608-1 at 45 (PFF 59). Nor has  
 8 infertility ever been a legal basis for divorce. *See* Cott, Tr. 222:22-223:22 (“There has never been a  
 9 requirement that a couple produce children in order to have a valid marriage. . . . Nor has [the  
 10 inability to have children] been a ground . . . for divorce.”). There is no evidence in the record that an  
 11 opposite-sex couple not capable of procreating together has *ever* been barred from marrying simply  
 12 because their union would not be naturally procreative. Accordingly, Proponents’ assertion that “the  
 13 institution of marriage is, and always has been, uniquely concerned with promoting and regulating  
 14 naturally procreative relationships between men and women” is factually incorrect and has no support  
 15 in the trial record. Doc # 605 at 6.

16           **10.       How should the failure of the Briggs Initiative (Proposition 6 in 1978) or**  
 17           **the LaRouche Initiative (Proposition 64 in 1986) be viewed in determining**  
 18           **whether gays and lesbians are politically powerless?**

19           Because the Briggs Initiative and the LaRouche Initiative would have affected the rights of a  
 20 far broader segment of the population than merely gay and lesbian individuals, the coalitions that  
 21 formed and ultimately defeated those initiatives were not concerned exclusively with gay and lesbian  
 22 rights. Thus, the defeat of these initiatives does not demonstrate that gay men and lesbians are  
 23 politically powerful. To the contrary, the evidence clearly shows that gay and lesbian individuals  
 24 lack political power to defend their basic rights. *See* Doc # 608-1 at 176-95 (PFFs 202-28).

25           The Briggs Initiative involved issues of free speech and free expression as well as the rights  
 26 of public school teachers. Proponents’ political power expert Kenneth Miller testified that the Briggs  
 27 Initiative, “by its terms, would have allowed public schools to fire teachers, teachers aides, school  
 28 administrators, or counselors found to be advocating, imposing, encouraging or promoting  
 homosexual activity or—publicly or indiscreetly engaging in said acts.” Miller, Tr. 2476:3-8. As

1 Professor George Chauncey testified, that far-reaching initiative generated opposition from not only  
2 gay rights groups but also from “many teachers groups” and “noted politicians” concerned about the  
3 “ominous censorship of teachers.” Chauncey, Tr. 505:5-12.

4 The LaRouche Initiative also involved more than gay and lesbian rights. Professor Miller  
5 testified that the LaRouche Initiative “sought to make persons with HIV subject to quarantine and  
6 isolation.” Miller, Tr. 2476:22-23. When asked if the initiative directly affected the rights of gay  
7 men and lesbians, Professor Miller replied that the initiative “directly affected people . . . infected by  
8 [the] HIV virus.” *Id.* at 2476:14-18. Because HIV afflicts both heterosexuals and gay men and  
9 lesbians, the LaRouche Initiative cannot be characterized as simply an anti-gay measure.

10 In contrast to the Briggs and LaRouche initiatives, initiatives that specifically target the rights  
11 of gay men and lesbians have been overwhelmingly successful. *See* Segura, Tr. 1554:14-19 (33 of 34  
12 ballot initiatives banning marriage equality have been passed in the last decade; in Arizona the  
13 initiative failed the first time but was passed the second time); *id.* at 1552:9-12 (“Gays and lesbians  
14 lose 70 percent of the contests over other matters. They have essentially lost a hundred percent of the  
15 contests over same-sex marriage and now on adoption.”); *see also* PX1869 at \*1056-57.

16 Moreover, to the extent that the Briggs and LaRouche Initiatives were anti-gay measures, the  
17 most remarkable thing is not that they failed, but that they reached the ballot at all—and captured the  
18 votes of millions of Californians. As Dr. Segura testified, the evaluation of the political power of a  
19 minority group must consider not only outcomes, but also the kinds of political battles the minority  
20 group is required to fight. Segura, Tr. 1539:10-25; 1663:2-3. Minority groups with meaningful  
21 political power do not have to endure public debate over whether it would be in children’s best  
22 interests to bar members of the group from the profession of teaching. The fact that such a debate  
23 took place at all illustrates the lack of political power of gay men and lesbians.

24 **11. What are the constitutional consequences if the evidence shows that sexual**  
25 **orientation is immutable for men but not for women? Must gay men and**  
26 **lesbians be treated identically under the Equal Protection Clause?**

27 As a threshold matter, the evidence conclusively demonstrates that sexual orientation is not a  
28 choice—it is not consciously changeable for the vast majority of men or women, whether they are  
heterosexual, gay, or lesbian. *See* Response to Question C.5, *supra*. While the empirical evidence

1 demonstrated a slight variation in response patterns for gay men and lesbians to the question “How  
2 much choice do you feel that you had about being [lesbian/gay]/bisexual?” (see PX0928 at 37;  
3 PX0930 at 7), the *vast majority* of lesbians (84% in one study, 70% in another) said that they  
4 perceived having “no” or “very little” choice. PX0928 at 39; PX0930 at 27; see also Herek, Tr.  
5 2054:15-2056:25.

6 Moreover, even if sexual orientation were changeable, gay men, lesbians, and heterosexuals  
7 should all be treated equally under the Equal Protection Clause. Once heightened scrutiny is applied  
8 in the equal protection context, it applies to *any* law premised on a suspect classification. For  
9 example, it is impermissible to discriminate against blacks or whites, even though whites have not  
10 suffered a history of discrimination and are not politically powerless. See, e.g., *Gratz v. Bollinger*,  
11 539 U.S. 244, 270 (2003). Similarly, it is impermissible to discriminate against women or men. See,  
12 e.g., *Craig v. Boren*, 429 U.S. 190, 204 (1976). Because sexual orientation is properly considered a  
13 suspect or quasi-suspect classification, discrimination based on sexual orientation is inherently  
14 suspect whether it targets a gay man, a lesbian, or a heterosexual.

15 Furthermore, even if some laws based on a suspect classification could receive a lower level  
16 of scrutiny, that still does not mean that gay men and lesbians could be treated differently for equal  
17 protection purposes. The legal term “immutable” is not synonymous with the word “changeable.”  
18 Instead, the equal protection test set forth by the Ninth Circuit is whether sexual orientation is a trait  
19 so fundamental to one’s identity that the State should not ask people to change it to enjoy a right  
20 enjoyed by all others. The Ninth Circuit has already answered that question in the affirmative for  
21 both gay men and lesbians, holding that “[s]exual orientation and sexual identity are immutable” and  
22 that “[h]omosexuality is as deeply ingrained as heterosexuality.” *Hernandez-Montiel v. INS*, 225  
23 F.3d 1084, 1093 (9th Cir. 2000) (internal quotation marks omitted). Accordingly, even if change  
24 were possible, heightened scrutiny would still be appropriate because it is not constitutionally  
25 acceptable for the State to demand either men or women to change their sexual orientation.

26 Finally, though relevant to the suspect classification inquiry, “immutability” has never been  
27 recognized as necessary to or dispositive of that inquiry. See *Christian Sci. Reading Room Jointly*  
28 *Maintained v. City & County of San Francisco*, 784 F.2d 1010, 1012 (9th Cir. 1986) (holding that “an

1 individual religion meets the requirements for treatment as a suspect class,” even though religion is  
 2 not immutable). Indeed, the Supreme Court has concluded that where a group has experienced “a  
 3 history of purposeful unequal treatment” and “been subjected to unique disabilities on the basis of  
 4 stereotyped characteristics not truly indicative of their abilities” (*Mass Bd. of Ret. v. Murgia*, 427  
 5 U.S. 307, 313 (1976) (internal quotation marks omitted)), there is an overwhelming probability that  
 6 laws singling out such a group for adverse treatment are grounded on irrational and illegitimate  
 7 considerations. Because there can be no reasonable dispute that gay men and lesbians have suffered a  
 8 history of discrimination and are defined by a “characteristic” that “frequently bears no relation to  
 9 ability to perform or contribute to society,” heightened scrutiny is appropriate without regard to  
 10 whether sexual orientation is immutable. *Cleburne*, 473 U.S. at 440-41.

11 **12. How many opposite-sex couples have registered as domestic partners**  
 12 **under California law? Are domestic partnerships between opposite-sex**  
 13 **partners or same-sex partners recognized in other jurisdictions? If**  
 14 **appropriate, the parties may rely on documents subject to judicial notice**  
 15 **to answer this question.**

16 The evidence suggests that approximately 3,000 opposite-sex couples are registered as  
 17 domestic partners under California law. The record shows that, according to the California Secretary  
 18 of State’s Office, a total of 55,684 couples registered as domestic partners in California between 2000  
 19 and 2009. *See* DIX2647. The Secretary of State does not track whether these couples are same-sex  
 20 or opposite-sex, but Plaintiffs presented evidence that approximately 5% to 6% of California’s  
 21 registered domestic partnerships are opposite-sex couples. *See* PX1263 at 14; PX1280. Applying  
 22 those percentages to the total number of registered domestic partnerships reported by the Secretary of  
 23 State yields an estimated range of between 2,784 and 3,341 opposite-sex couples registered as  
 24 domestic partners under California law.

25 The following jurisdictions, besides California, have statutes that explicitly recognize civil  
 26 unions and domestic partnerships from other States: Connecticut, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and  
 27 Washington. PX1263, App. 3; *see also* Conn. Gen. Stat. § 46b-28a; N.H. Rev. Stat. Ann. § 457:45;  
 28 Recognition in New Jersey of Same-Sex Marriages, Civil Unions, Domestic Partnerships and Other  
 Government-Sanctioned, Same-Sex Relationships Established Pursuant to the Laws of Other States

1 and Foreign Nations, N.J. Att’y Gen. Formal Opinion No. 3-2007, at 1; Wash. Rev. Code Ann.  
2 § 26.60.090.

3 **13. Do domestic partnerships create legal extended family relationships**  
4 **or in-laws?**

5 Family Code § 297.5 provides that domestic partners will receive all the rights and  
6 responsibilities of spouses under California law. That provision does not specifically reference the  
7 rights of domestic partners with respect to the relatives of a partner, and it does not include language  
8 defining terms such as “mother in law” to include relatives of a domestic partner. There are a number  
9 of California statutes that specifically grant rights to the relatives of a spouse, using terms like “parent  
10 of a spouse.” *See, e.g.*, Cal. Prob. Code § 6402 (providing for intestate succession to “parents of a  
11 predeceased spouse or the issue of those parents”). Numerous other California statutes use terms like  
12 “mother-in-law,” “father-in-law,” “brother-in-law,” and “sister-in-law.” *See, e.g.*, Cal. Corp. Code  
13 § 21400 (limiting benefits paid by fraternal societies and lodges to persons other than specified  
14 family members, including certain in-laws, of deceased members); Cal. Lab. Code § 3503 (limiting  
15 dependents for workers’ compensation purposes to include certain relatives including in-laws); Cal.  
16 Code Civ. Proc. Code § 170.9 (exception from restrictions on gifts to judges for gifts from certain  
17 family members, including certain in-laws).

18 Whether statutes using such terminology apply to relatives of a domestic partner, by operation  
19 of Family Code § 297.5, has not been addressed by any judicial or administrative decision of which  
20 we are aware. Further, as the testimony of Ms. Helen Zia compellingly demonstrated, the in-law and  
21 extended family relationships created by marriage have a strong social meaning that is uniquely  
22 associated with marriage. *See Zia, Tr. 1232:11-1237:22.*

23 **14. What does the evidence show regarding the difficulty or ease with which**  
24 **the State of California regulates the current system of opposite-sex and**  
25 **same-sex marriage and opposite-sex and same-sex domestic partnerships?**

26 The passage of Prop. 8 has resulted in a crazy quilt of marriage regulations that involves five  
27 categories of citizens: (1) opposite-sex couples, who are permitted to marry, and to remarry upon  
28 divorce; (2) the 18,000 same-sex couples who married after the California Supreme Court’s decision  
in the *Marriage Cases* but before the enactment of Prop. 8, whose marriages remain valid but who



1 are not permitted to remarry if divorced or widowed; (3) unmarried same-sex couples, who are  
2 prohibited by Prop. 8 from marrying and restricted to the status of domestic partnership; (4) same-sex  
3 couples who entered into a valid marriage outside California before November 5, 2008, who are  
4 treated as married under California law, but not permitted to remarry if divorced or widowed; and  
5 (5) same-sex couples who entered into a valid marriage outside California on or after November 5,  
6 2008, who are granted the rights and responsibilities of marriage, but not the designation of  
7 “marriage” itself.

8 Prop. 8 has unquestionably increased the challenges and costs of administering California’s  
9 already complex marriage and domestic partnership laws, which had spawned a significant amount of  
10 costly and inefficient litigation even before Prop. 8 was enacted. *See, e.g., Koebke*, 36 Cal. 4th 824  
11 (whether businesses that offer benefits to married couples are required to offer them to couples who  
12 are registered domestic partners); *Velez v. Smith*, 142 Cal. App. 4th 1154 (2006) (whether the putative  
13 spouse doctrine applied based on a couple’s local domestic partnership registration); *Ellis v. Arriaga*,  
14 162 Cal. App. 4th 1000 (2008) (whether the putative spouse doctrine applied based on a party’s  
15 mistaken belief that his former partner had submitted the couple’s domestic partnership registration  
16 form to the Secretary of State); *Marriage of Garber*, 2008 Cal. App. Unpub. LEXIS 8259 (Oct. 9,  
17 2008) (whether duty to pay spousal support was terminated by supported former spouse’s entry into a  
18 registered domestic partnership).

19 Moreover, the California Legislature has found it necessary to amend the domestic  
20 partnership statute and related statutes every year since adoption of comprehensive domestic  
21 partnership legislation in 2003 to address ambiguities and disparities in treatment of married couples  
22 and domestic partners. *See, e.g., Stats. 2003, ch. 752 (AB 17); Stats. 2004, ch. 947 (AB 2580)*  
23 (amending domestic partner statute to clarify that reference to date of marriage should be deemed to  
24 refer to the date of a domestic partnership registration, and addressing enforceability of  
25 premarital/pre-registration agreements of domestic partners); *Stats. 2005, ch. 416 (SB 565)*  
26 (amending Revenue & Taxation Code to protect domestic partners from reassessment of real property  
27 upon transfers between partners to the same extent spouses are protected); *Stats. 2005, ch. 418 (SB*  
28 *973); Stats. 2006, ch. 802 (SB 1827); Stats. 2007, ch. 426 (SB 105); Stats. 2007, ch. 555 (SB 559);*

1 Stats. 2007, ch. 567 (AB 102); Stats. 2008, ch. 197 (AB 2673); *see also* Survivors’ Home Protection  
2 Act (AB 103) (pending legislation that would protect domestic partners from property taxes and  
3 potential loss of their homes following the death of their partner and allow same-sex couples to enter  
4 into confidential domestic partnership agreement so their personal information is not publicly  
5 available). Finally, when significant changes to the rights and obligations of domestic partners have  
6 been made, the Legislature has required the Secretary of State to send multiple notices to all  
7 registered domestic partners regarding the changes. *See* [http://www.sos.ca.gov/dpregistry/faqs.](http://www.sos.ca.gov/dpregistry/faqs.htm#question4)  
8 [htm#question4](http://www.sos.ca.gov/dpregistry/faqs.htm#question4).

9 **15. If the court finds Proposition 8 to be unconstitutional, what remedy would**  
10 **“yield to the constitutional expression of the people of California’s will”?**  
11 ***See Doc #605 at 18.***

12 No remedy short of an order permanently enjoining Prop. 8’s enforcement in its entirety  
13 would be sufficient. If a state constitutional provision is inconsistent with the Fourteenth  
14 Amendment of the U.S. Constitution, it can no longer be given effect—regardless of its level of  
15 public support. U.S. Const. art. VI; *see also, e.g., Romer*, 517 U.S. at 635; *Reitman v. Mulkey*, 387  
16 U.S. 369, 381 (1967); *cf. Washington v. Seattle Sch. Dist. No.1*, 458 U.S. 457, 487 (1982).

16 DATED: June 15, 2010

GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP  
Theodore B. Olson  
Theodore J. Boutrous, Jr.  
Christopher D. Dusseault  
Ethan D. Dettmer  
Matthew D. McGill  
Amir C. Tayrani  
Sarah E. Piepmeier  
Theane Evangelis Kapur  
Enrique A. Monagas

23 By: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/  
24 Theodore B. Olson

25 and

26 ///  
27 ///  
28 ///

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP  
David Boies  
Steven C. Holtzman  
Jeremy M. Goldman  
Rosanne C. Baxter  
Richard J. Bettan  
Beko O. Richardson  
Theodore H. Uno  
Joshua Irwin Schiller

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

DENNIS J. HERRERA  
City Attorney  
THERESE M. STEWART  
Chief Deputy City Attorney  
DANNY CHOU  
Chief of Complex and Special Litigation  
RONALD P. FLYNN  
VINCE CHHABRIA  
ERIN BERNSTEIN  
CHRISTINE VAN AKEN  
MOLLIE M. LEE  
Deputy City Attorneys

By: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/  
Therese M. Stewart

Attorneys for Plaintiff-Intervenor  
CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

**ATTESTATION PURSUANT TO GENERAL ORDER NO. 45**

Pursuant to General Order No. 45 of the Northern District of California, I attest that concurrence in the filing of the document has been obtained from each of the other signatories to this document.

By: \_\_\_\_\_ /s/  
Theodore B. Olson

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28