



DENNIS J. HERRERA  
City Attorney

THERESE M. STEWART  
CHIEF DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY  
Direct Dial: (415) 554-4708  
Email: therese.stewart@stg.gov.org

January 24, 2011

**VIA HAND DELIVERY**

The Honorable Tani Cantil-Sakauye,  
Chief Justice of California,  
and Associate Justices  
The Supreme Court of California  
350 McAllister Street  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Re: *Perry v. Schwarzenegger (Hollingsworth)*, California Supreme Court No. S189476  
Certification request pending from the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth  
Circuit, Case No. 10-16696

Dear Chief Justice Cantil-Sakauye and Associate Justices:

The City and County of San Francisco ("City") is plaintiff-intervenor in this case. Pursuant to California Rule of Court 8.548(e)(3), the City respectfully submits that, should this Court accept the questions certified to it by the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, it should reformulate those questions as follows:

1. Whether under Article II, Section 8 of the California Constitution, or otherwise under California law, the official proponents of an initiative measure possess a particularized interest in the initiative's validity after the measure has been adopted by the voters? If so, what is the nature of their interest under California law and how is it harmed by a decision that the initiative is unconstitutional?
2. Whether under Article II, Section 8 of the California Constitution, or otherwise under California law, the official proponents of an initiative measure possess the authority to assert the State's interest in the initiative's validity when public officials decline to appeal an adverse judgment concerning the initiative's validity?

We suggest the revision to the first question in order to ensure that, if this Court accepts review, whatever answer it provides to the Ninth Circuit provides that court with sufficient information to decide the question of federal law that will remain: whether any injury to official proponents' state-created right is sufficient to establish Article III standing in the federal courts. We suggest the revision to the second question in order to describe more accurately the circumstances of this case. Further justification for our proposed reformulation is provided below.

Letter to The Honorable Tani Cantil-Sakauye, Chief Justice,  
and Associate Justices

Page 2

January 24, 2011

**A. If This Court Accepts Certification Of The First Question, It Should Describe The Nature Of Any State-Created Interest Possessed By Official Proponents.**

To invoke the jurisdiction of the federal appellate courts pursuant to Article III of the United States Constitution, a putative appellant must assert an injury related to the judgment appealed from. (*Western Watersheds Project v. Kraayenbrink* (9th Cir. 2010) 620 F.3d 1187.) Generally the injury must be concrete, particularized, and actual or imminent. (*Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife* (1992) 504 U.S. 555, 560.) In some cases, an injury to a right created by state law may satisfy Article III's requirement of concrete, particularized, and actual injury. (*Diamond v. Charles* (1986) 476 U.S. 54, 66 n.17.) But not every invasion of a right created by statute will satisfy the requirement of injury. (*Sierra Club v. Morton* (1972) 405 U.S. 72, 735.) Indeed, even the express creation of a private right of action may not suffice to create a sufficiently concrete, particularized and imminent injury to satisfy the requirements of Article III. (See *id.*; see also *Raines v. Byrd* (1997) 521 U.S. 811, 820 n.3.) In *Arizonans for Official English v. Arizona* (1997) 520 U.S. 43, for example, the United States Supreme Court noted that a state law allowing citizen suits in state court to enforce an English-only initiative amendment did not give rise to a right in federal court to defend the initiative amendment. (*Id.* at 66.) It bears noting that the California Constitution is explicit in giving intervenors a private right of action in state court in specified circumstances, such as to enforce Article III, section 6 of the California Constitution (making English the official language of California). Here, where the official proponents did not include a private right of action in the text of Proposition 8, the question is what rights these proponents may possess in the continuing enforcement or validity of the measure when the Constitution is silent.

Moreover, the nature of the alleged injury to any right created by state law may make a difference in whether the federal courts recognize it as sufficient to confer Article III standing. For example, the invasion of purely procedural rights may be insufficient to confer standing. (*Summers v. Earth Island Institute* (2009) -- U.S. --, 129 S. Ct. 1142, 1151.) The invasion of rights that accrue by virtue of an official position, rather than individually held rights, may be insufficient as well. In *Raines v. Byrd*, *supra*, the Supreme Court found that members of Congress who alleged that they lost political power when the line-item veto was enacted did not have standing to challenge its enactment. (521 U.S. 811.) This was in part because their claimed loss of political power was not the loss of something to which they were personally entitled but instead was something they possessed by virtue of their official positions as members of Congress, making their loss less concrete and their stake in the controversy less personal. (*Id.* at 821.)

Thus, if this Court accepts a certified question from the Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit concerning any harm initiative proponents may suffer when a court enjoins the enforcement of a law that proponents drafted, the answer to the certified question should provide sufficient information about the nature of the harm so that the Ninth Circuit may determine whether that harm satisfies Article III. We respectfully submit that this Court should therefore reformulate the question to ask what is the nature of initiative proponents' interest under California law and how that interest is injured, if at all, by a decision enjoining enforcement of the measure. In answering this question, the Court may wish to consider and address whether the rights possessed by initiative proponents are legislative (and thus similar to those of the members of Congress whose claims were considered in *Raines v. Byrd*); whether initiative proponents are conferred some measure of executive or enforcement power by virtue of the adoption of the initiative; whether initiative proponents have a private right of action concerning enforcement of

Letter to The Honorable Tani Cantil-Sakauye, Chief Justice,  
and Associate Justices

Page 3

January 24, 2011

laws they drafted when the text of the law does not create a right of action or a right to defend; whether any rights possessed by initiative proponents survive after adoption of the measure by the voters, and if so, what is the period of time during which initiative proponents possess these rights; whether the rights possessed by initiative proponents are held collectively or individually (since, in this case, there are five separate official proponents); and whether any injury to initiative proponents is a personal injury or merely accrues to them by virtue of their official role as initiative proponents.

**B. If This Court Accepts Certification Of The Second Question, It Should Reformulate The Question To More Accurately Describe The Circumstances Of This Case.**

We have also proposed, above, a revision to the separate question posed by the Court of Appeals to this Court: whether official proponents of an initiative may assert the interest of the State of California in the validity of an enacted initiative. We respectfully submit that the Court of Appeals' formulation of this question does not accurately describe the circumstances of *Perry v. Schwarzenegger* or the duty of executive officials.

As presently formulated, the Court of Appeals' question asks whether initiative proponents may defend an initiative when public officials "refuse to do so." Here, the State officials did not refuse to defend the initiative. They enforced Proposition 8 (and continue to enforce Proposition 8), and they put plaintiffs in this case to their proof by answering their federal lawsuit. They also acceded to intervention by the official proponents of Proposition 8, and they did not in any way interfere with proponents' presentation of evidence and argument in the District Court. Rather than "refus[ing] to defend" Proposition 8, the State officials merely exercised their discretion, after a full and fair trial of the issues and a well-reasoned decision that thoroughly addressed the evidence and the law, not to appeal from the District Court's judgment.

Moreover, the Ninth Circuit's question asks whether initiative proponents may defend an initiative where public officials "charged with that duty" do not do so. We respectfully submit that there is no duty of the Governor or Attorney General to file a notice of appeal from an adverse decision of a trial court. Indeed, in *Connerly v. State Personnel Board* (2006) 37 Cal.4th 1169, this Court recently explained that state officials' refusal "to defend the challenged statutes does not imply that these agencies committed misconduct," and that "whether [officials] have an obligation to defend such statutes in court is a complex issue, which [the Court] need not decide here." (*Id.* at 1183.) In this case, the Court of Appeal for the Third Appellate District denied a petition for writ of mandamus concerning any mandatory duty by the Governor and Attorney General to file a notice of appeal of the federal district court's decision (*Beckley v. Schwarzenegger*, Case No. C065920), and this Court denied a petition for review of that decision. (Case No. S186072.)

Deciding whether or not to assert the State's interest in appealing adverse lower court decisions is routinely entrusted to the discretion of the State's law enforcement officers. The issue posed by this case is not whether the State's executive branch officials have failed to carry out a duty but rather whether the official proponents of an initiative that has been enacted into law have been delegated the power to assert the State's interest on appeal in a manner contrary to the decision of the elected officials in whom the State Constitution vests that power. (*Cf. Arizonans for Official English, supra*, 520 U.S. at 64 [issue in appeal of constitutional initiative prosecuted by initiative proponents was whether there was a state law "appointing initiative sponsors as agents of the people . . . to defend, in lieu of public officials, the constitutionality of

Letter to The Honorable Tani Cantil-Sakauye, Chief Justice,  
and Associate Justices

Page 4

January 24, 2011

initiatives"].) Reformulating the certified question as we have proposed above focuses the question on this issue and more accurately describes the procedural history of this case.

For these reasons, we respectfully submit that, should it accept certification of the questions posed by the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, this Court should reformulate the questions as we have proposed in this letter.

Very truly yours,

DENNIS J. HERRERA  
City Attorney



THERESE M. STEWART  
Chief Deputy City Attorney

## PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Catheryn M. Daly, declare as follows:

I am a citizen of the United States, over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the above-entitled action. I am employed at the City Attorney's Office of San Francisco, Fox Plaza Building, 1390 Market Street, Seventh Floor, San Francisco, CA 94102. The electronic notification address from which I served the documents is: *catheryn.daly@sfgov.org*.

On January 24, 2011, I served the following document(s):

### **Letter to Supreme Court re Certification request pending from the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit, Case No. 10-16696**

on the following persons at the locations specified:

Jesse Panuccio  
David Thompson  
Charles J. Cooper  
Nichole Jo Moss  
Peter A. Patterson  
COOPER & KIRK, PLLC  
1523 New Hampshire Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20036

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

David Boies  
Rosanne C. Baxter  
BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER  
333 Main Street  
Armonk, NY 10504

Theodore J. Boutrous, Jr.  
Christopher D. Dusseault  
Theane Evangelis Kapur  
GIBSON DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP  
333 South Grand Avenue, Suite 5350  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197

Jeremy Michael Goldman  
BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER, LLP  
1999 Harrison Street  
Oakland, CA 94612

Joshua Irwin Schiller  
Richard Jason Bettan  
BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER, LLP  
575 Lexington Avenue, 7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, NY 10022

Brian William Raum, Senior Counsel  
James Andrew Campbell  
Litigation Staff Counsel  
ALLIANCE DEFENSE FUN  
15100 N 90<sup>th</sup> Street  
Scottsdale, AZ 85260

Terry L. Thompson  
Law Office of Terry L. Thompson  
P.O. Box 1346  
Alamo, CA 94507

Theodore Olson  
Matthew McGill  
Amir C. Tayrani  
GIBSON DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP  
1050 Connecticut Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20036-5306

Ethan Douglas Dettmer  
Enrique Antonio Monagas  
Sarah E. Piepmeier  
GIBSON DUNN & CRUTCHER, LLP  
555 Mission Street, Suite 3000  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2933

Theodore H. Uno  
BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER, LLP  
2435 Hollywood Blvd.  
Hollywood, FL 33020

Tamar Pachter, Deputy Attorney General  
Daniel Powell, Deputy Attorney General  
CALIFORNIA DEPT. OF JUSTICE  
455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000  
San Francisco, CA 94102

Kenneth C. Mennemeier, Jr.  
Andrew W. Stroud  
MENNEMEIER, GLASSMAN & STROUD  
LLP  
980 9<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 1700  
Sacramento, CA 95814

Judy W. Whitehurst  
Principal Deputy County Counsel  
LOS ANGELES COUNTY COUNSEL  
6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
648 Kenneth Hahn Hall of Administration  
500 West Temple Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90012-2713

Diana E. Richmond  
SIDEMAN & BANCROFT LLP  
One Embarcadero Center, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Thomas Brejcha  
Thomas More Society  
29 S. La Salle Street, Suite 440  
Chicago, IL 60603

Elizabeth J. Cabraser  
LIEFF CABRASER HEIMANN &  
BERNSTEIN, LLP  
Embarcadero Center West  
275 Battery Street, 29<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111-3339

Darin L. Wessel  
MANNING & MARDER KASS ELLROD  
RAMIREZ LLP  
801 S. Figueroa Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Stephen Kent Ehat  
California Legal Research, Inc.  
167 North 1150 East  
Lindon, UT 84042-2527

Lynn Dennis Wardle  
3359 Cherokee Ln.  
Provo, UT 84604

Claude Franklin Kolm  
OFFICE OF COUNTY COUNSEL  
1221 Oak Street, Suite 450  
Oakland, CA 94612-4296

James Joseph Lynch, Jr.  
4144 Winding Way, Suite 115  
Sacramento, CA 95841-4413

Paul Benjamin Linton  
921 Keystone Avenue  
Northbrook, IL 60062

Kelly J. Shackelford, Chief Counsel  
Jeffrey Mateer  
Hiram S. Sasser  
Liberty Institute  
2001 W Plano Parkway, Suite 1600  
Plano, TX 75075

Scott Wm. Davenport  
MANNING & MARDER  
19800 MacArthur, Suite 600  
Irvine, CA 94612

Peter Obstler  
BINGHAM McCUTCHEN LLP  
Three Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111-4067

Lincoln C. Oliphant  
Columbus School of Law  
The Catholic University of America  
Washington, DC 20064

Dean Robert Broyles  
James Matthew Griffiths  
Western Center for Law & Policy  
539 West Grand Avenue  
Escondido, CA 92025

M. Edward Whelan, III  
Ethics and Public Policy Center  
1730 M Street N.W., Suite 910  
Washington, DC 20036

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

Walter Martin Weber  
Stuart J. Roth  
Jay Sekulow  
AMERICAN CENTER FOR LAW AND  
JUSTICE  
201 Maryland Avenue, N.E.  
Washington, DC 20002

Alexander Dushku  
Von G. Keetch  
KIRTON & McCONKIE, PC  
Eagle Gate Tower, Suite 1800  
60 E. South Temple  
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

James Francis Sweeney  
SWEENEY & GREENE LLP  
Liberty Center II  
9381 E. Stockton Blvd., Ste. 218  
Elk Grove, CA 95624

Gary G. Kreep  
UNITED STATES JUSTICE FOUNDATION  
932 "D" Street, Suite 2  
Ramona, CA 92065

Abram John Pafford  
PAFFORD, LAWRENCE & ROSS, PLLC  
1100 Commerce Street  
Lynchburg, VA 24504

Kevin J. Hasson  
The Becket Fund for Religious Liberty  
Suite 220  
3000 K. St, NW  
Washington, DC 20007

Rena Lindevaldsen  
Stephen M. Crampton  
Mary Elizabeth McAlister  
LIBERTY COUNSEL  
P.O. Box 11108  
Lynchburg, VA 24502-2272

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

Donald MacPherson  
The MacPherson Group  
3039 West Peoria Avenue, #102-620  
Phoenix, AZ 85029

Jeffrey Hunter Moon  
Michael F. Moses  
Anthony R. Picarello, Jr.  
United States Catholic Conference  
3211 Fourth Street, N.E.  
Washington, DC 20017

Steven Thomas O'Ban  
Kristen K. Waggoner  
ELLIS, LI & McKINSTRY, PLLC  
Suite 4900  
Market Place Tower  
2025 First Avenue, Penthouse A  
Seattle, WA 98121-3125

Thomas Molnar Fisher  
Iago – Indiana Attorney Generals Office  
Indiana Government Center South  
IGCS – 5th Floor  
302 W. Washington Street  
Indianapolis, IN 46204-2770

John C. Eastman  
The Claremont Institute Center for  
Constitutional Prudence  
c/o Chapman Univ. School of Law  
One University Drive  
Orange, CA 92866

Steven W. Fitschen  
The National Legal Foundation  
Suite 204  
2224 Virginia Beach Blvd.  
Virginia Beach, VA 23454

Lawrence John Joseph  
Law Office of Lawrence J. Joseph  
Suite 200  
1250 Connecticut Avenue  
Washington, DC 20036

Joshua K. Baker  
National Organization for Marriage  
Suite 300  
2029 K Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20006

Eugene Dong  
786 Holly Oak Drive  
Palo Alto, CA 94303

Kevin Trent Snider, Chief Counsel  
Pacific Justice Institute  
9851 Horn Road, Suite 115  
Sacramento, CA 95827

Tammy Cravit  
Paralegal for the Children  
P.O. Box 2445  
Lompoc, CA 93438-2445

Richard B. Rosenthal  
The Law Offices of Richard B. Rosenthal, P.A.  
1010 B Street, Suite 300  
San Rafael, CA 94901

Elizabeth B. Wydra, Chief Counsel  
Constitutional Accountability Center  
1200 18<sup>th</sup> Street NW  
Washington, DC 20036

Paul March Smith  
JENNER & BLOCK LLP  
Suite 900  
1099 New York Avenue, NW  
Washington, DC 20001

Michael S. Wald  
Stanford Law School  
Crown Quadrangle  
559 Nathan Abbott Way  
Stanford, CA 94305

Holly Carmichael  
5096 Selinda Way  
Los Gatos, CA 95032

Herbert George Grey  
Attorney at Law  
Suite 320  
4800 S.W. Griffith Drive  
Beaverton, OR 97005-8716

Kenneth Alan Klukowski  
12915 Wood Crescent Circle  
Herndon, VA 20171

Richard Gonzalo Katerndahl  
Law Office of Richard Gonzalo Katerndahl  
171 Dominican Drive  
San Rafael, CA 94901

Louis P. Feuchtbaum  
SIDEMAN & BANCROFT LLP  
One Embarcadero Center, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Jerome Cary Roth  
MUNGER TOLLES & OLSON, LLP  
560 Mission Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105

Alan E. Schoenfeld  
WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE and  
DORR LLP  
399 Park Avenue  
New York, NY 10022

Laura W. Brill  
KENDALL BRILL & KLIEGER LLP  
10100 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 1725  
Los Angeles, CA 90067

Benjamin G. Shatz  
MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS, LLP  
11355 West Olympic Boulevard  
Los Angeles, CA 90064

Walter Dellinger  
O'Melveny & Myers LLP  
1625 Eye Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006

Maura T. Healey, Assistant Attorney General  
Attorney General of Massachusetts  
One Ashburton Place  
Boston, MA 02108

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

Victoria Fishman Maroulis  
QUINN EMANUEL URQUHART &  
SULLIVAN, LLP  
555 Twin Dolphin Drive, 5<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Redwood Shores, CA 94065

Dale Ho, Assistant Counsel  
NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund,  
Inc.  
99 Hudson Street, #1600  
New York, NY 10013

Kathleen M. O'Sullivan  
PERKINS COIE LLP  
Suite 4800 Room 43-4  
1201 Third Avenue  
Seattle, WA 98101-3099

John D. Freed  
COVINGTON & BURLING LLP  
One Front Street, Suite 3500  
San Francisco, CA 94111

Jennifer Pizer  
LAMBDA LEGAL DEFENSE AND  
EDUCATION FUND, INC.  
3325 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 1300  
Los Angeles, CA 90010-1729

Eric Alan Isaacson  
ROBBINS GELLER RUDMAN & DOWD  
LLP  
655 West Broadway, Suite 1900  
San Diego, CA 92101-8498

David C. Codell  
Caldwell Leslie & Proctor PC  
1000 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 600  
Los Angeles, CA 90017

Suzanne Goldberg  
Columbia University Law School  
Sexuality and Gender Law Clinic  
435 West 116<sup>th</sup> Street  
New York, NY 10027

in the manner indicated below:

**BY UNITED STATES MAIL:** Following ordinary business practices, I sealed true and correct copies of the above documents in addressed envelope(s) and placed them at my workplace for collection and mailing with the United States Postal Service. I am readily familiar with the practices of the San Francisco City Attorney's Office for collecting and processing mail. In the ordinary course of business, the sealed envelope(s) that I placed for collection would be deposited, postage prepaid, with the United States Postal Service that same day.

**BY ELECTRONIC SERVICE:** Based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission, I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the electronic notification addresses listed: *jpanuccio@cooperkirk.com, dthompson@cooperkirk.com, jcampbell@telladf.org, ccooper@cooperkirk.com, nmoos@cooperkirk.com, ppatterson@cooperkirk.com, andrew@pugnotlaw.com, braum@telladf.org, tl\_thompson@earthlink.net, dboies@bsflp.com, tolgson@gibsondunn.com, rbaxter@bsflp.com, tboutrous@gibsondunn.com, EDettmer@gibsondunn.com, cdusseault@gibsondunn.com, jgoldman@bsflp.com, tkapur@gibsondunn.com, MMcGill@gibsondunn.com, emonagas@gibsondunn.com,*

*spiepmeier@gibsondunn.com, atayrani@gibsondunn.com, tuno@bsflp.com,  
jischiller@bsflp.com, rbettan@bsflp.com, Tamar.Pachter@doj.ca.gov, stroud@mgsllaw.com,  
daniel.powell@doj.ca.gov, kcm@mgsllaw.com, claude.kolm@acgov.org,  
jwhitehurst@counsel.lacounty.gov.*

I declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed January 24, 2011, at San Francisco, California.

  
Catheryn M. Daly