## **PLAINTIFFS' EXHIBIT 30**

To Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendant Feld Entertainment, Inc.'s Motion for Leave to Amend Answers to Assert Additional Defense and Rico Counterclaim Civ. No. 03-2006 (EGS/JMF)

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS, et al.,

Docket No. CA-03-2006

Plaintiffs,

VS.

RINGLING BROTHERS AND BARNUM BAILEY CIRCUS, et al.,

. Washington, D.C.

Defendants.

. Friday, September 16, 2005

2:35 p.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF A MOTION BEFORE THE HONORABLE EMMET G. SULLIVAN UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

## APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs:

KATHERINE A. MEYER, Esquire

KIMBERLY DENISE OCKENE, Esquire MEYER GLITZENSTEIN & CRYSTAL 1601 Connecticut Avenue, NW

Suite 700

Washington, DC 20009

For the Defendants:

EUGENE D. GULLAND, Esquire JOSHUA D. WOLSON, Esquire

COVINGTON & BURLING

1201 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20004-2401

Court Reporter:

Elaine A. Merchant, RPR, CRR

Official Court Reporter 333 Constitution Avenue, NW

Room 6822

Washington, DC 20001

(202) 289–1571

Proceedings recorded by machine shorthand, transcript produced by computer-aided transcription.

they want to, they do. That's what happens.

I don't see anything nefarious or wrong about that. They're free to respond to it. Right now they are out there on a daily basis making all kinds of statements about the wonderful care that they give their elephants, that they're conserving them for the future and that our clients are lying, Mr. Rider is lying about what he is saying about these elephants being beaten all the time, chained all the time, that we're lying about the babies being forcibly removed from their mothers, that we are whacky animal rights activists, we cannot be trusted. None of that is true. And they're controlling the entire debate.

Now, if they're going to get to control the entire debate, then perhaps we should get a gag order against them for making those kind of statements and then we'll be on equal footing. But I don't think that they should be able to use that fact that one of these documents might make its way into the public somewhere along the line and somebody might draw an inference from it as a basis for getting a protective order.

THE COURT: I agree with you. There's no reason why your organization ought be maligned. Especially if they control the media, they can get on the Katie Couric show and bad mouth your organization and call you whatever they're calling you, I agree with you.

MS. MEYER: That's right. And what we have on the

other side, Your Honor, we have Tom Rider, a plaintiff in this case, he's going around the country in his own van, he gets grant money from some of the clients and some other organizations to speak out and say what really happened when he worked there. That's what we have on their side.

And they want to make sure that none of the information that might actually shed some light on what's going on, I'm not saying it necessarily does, but it might, I don't know, not be ever disclosed to the public. We have to litigate this case in secret so that they can control the debate.

And, again, Your Honor, the presumption is open proceedings. They have to come forward with good cause to get a protective order. They simply haven't met their showing.

The number one argument is that we're going to, they say, misuse the information in the public. No showing on that score.

Number two, they say the information relate, all of the medical records, all of the detailed medical records, relate to scientific research papers that they're working on right now. We say, well, we doubt that all of the medical records do, if you could show us particular records of particular studies we might be able to willing to agree to a protective order.

And their third argument that they came up with most belatedly, I think it was in their reply brief on the motion

also to show cause why they shouldn't be held in contempt of court, and I mean it. And if I find they're in contempt of court, I'm going to impose sanctions. I'm going to give the word monetary recovery a new definition, because they're playing games with the Court and I don't appreciate that.

MR. GULLAND: Your Honor, with all due respect, I don't think that there's an adequate basis here to reach that conclusion.

THE COURT: Fine. Then they can respond to my order to show cause, but someone is going to respond and tell me why they could not respond to a clear English request for a production of all medical and veterinarian records. They're going to do that. And if they don't, if they can't do it, I'm going to hold them in contempt and impose significant — and do you know what, I'm not going to rule out incarceration either. Because I'm sick and tired of all these efforts by litigants to hide the ball. I've seen it time and time again and I'm tired of it.

So an order to show cause will be separate and apart from my ruling to produce all of the medical records and veterinarian records. And when I say all, I mean all, every last record.

Now, if there's some research going on that is going on in an effort to prepare some documentary, that's something different. If it can be justified. If it can be justified.

protective order, and then puts the burden on my clients to come forward and ask you with respect to particular information, please let that be lifted from the protective order.

That's not the way it's supposed to work, Your Honor, under the rules. The burden is on them, the burden is on them to show that something, that there's good cause to have something subject to a protective order. Otherwise, the presumption is that these proceedings should be open to the public.

Now, I've got to address what Mr. Gulland had to say about the Channel 2 report in San Francisco. It's true, that was a videotape that they released to us, never claimed it was confidential, never claimed it was privileged, our clients have it. And Mr. Rider, as I explained, he goes around the country, he tries to talk to reporters, tell them what's really going on behind the scenes, because it is an issue of great public debate. The only reason they're allowed to have these animals that's an endangered species, Your Honor, is because our federal government allows them to have them because they claim they're conserving them.

And one of the reporters say, well, do you have anything? You say they chain their elephants all the time, Ringling Brothers say they don't chain their elephants all the time. Do you have any anything that would show they chain

their elephants? Yeah, we have this videotape that shows a nine year old elephant chained on three legs giving birth to a baby. Here it is. They gave it to us in discovery, just as you suggested.

The correspondence that Mr. Gulland referred to, they even gave the reporter the correspondence from Mr. Wolson. Do you know why we gave him that correspondence? Because the editor called us up on the phone and said where did you get this, how did you get this? We said they gave it to us in discovery, here's the letter, here's the letter from their lawyer. That's why we gave it to them.

So we just said we got it in discovery, they gave it to us, it's their videotape. That's exactly what we did. That's all we did. There's nothing nefarious about that. And they don't want that kind of information to be made public, Your Honor.

I've got to say one other thing, Your Honor, again, about them controlling the debate. They go around the country, they issue, here's an example, colored brochures handed out. This one we got in April of this year, babies, babies and more on the way. All about their wonderful conservation program. They're breeding more elephants for use in the circus and they say they're conserving them.

This is what they're handing out to the public, Your Honor. Now, they didn't bother to tell the public that three

1 of these baby elephants who are depicted here, Kenny, Benjamin 2 and Ricardo, are dead, they're dead. We think the public is 3 entitled to know that. These baby elephants all died when they 4 were under the age of four in the care of Ringling Brothers. 5 They don't tell the public that. They say, babies, babies, 6 babies. 7 THE COURT: Is this a recent publication? 8 MS. MEYER: Yes, Your Honor. 9 THE COURT: And it's published post-death of those 10 baby elephants? 11 MS. MEYER: Yes, Your Honor. We got it just in 12 April, April of 2005. It was picked up at the circus. The 13 three babies that are dead are at the bottom of the page. The 14 two in the corner, Kenny and Benjamin, it tells you when 15 they're born, it tells the public when they're born. It 16 doesn't mention that they're dead. The other elephant is 17 Ricardo. Here he is on the left-hand page. He's at the 18 bottom. Ricardo, born 12-05-03. Well, Ricardo died last 19 August. They don't mention that. This was handed out at the 20 circus in April of this year in Washington, D.C. 21 THE COURT: I didn't go this year. 22 MS. MEYER: So they're allowed to do that. 23 THE COURT: Not because I didn't want to go. My 24 grandkids didn't want to go.

MS. MEYER: The point is, Your Honor, I don't

25

begrudge them their right to issue things like this. I have no problem with that at all.

I do object strenuously, however, when they come to this Court and say the actual records about these animals, records that might show that Ricardo is dead, that Kenny is dead, that Benjamin is dead, oh, the public can't see those because those are confidential. They get to control the debate. That's not fair.

And that's my position. Your Honor.

Again, we are willing to entertain the notion that there may be some particular medical record that relates to some scientific study that they're working on.

Mr. Gulland kept talking about how they're so cryptic, they're cryptic, they're cryptic. I mean, I know in the Exemption 4 context under FOIA. If the information is so cryptic, there is case law that says, well, then how could it be of any commercial value to any competitor if it's so cryptic you can't understand it without additional information. It seems to be what he's taking. It's your cryptic.

But there's simply no basis for basically giving them what they want and again rewarding them for the practice that they engaged in here by a year and a half later giving them the protective order and making us have to come in document by document and explain to you why this should be made public.

We don't want to advocate that a particular document

should be made public. We may not rely on any of this information in the public domain, I don't know. The point is it shouldn't be held in secret, unless there's a good reason to hold it in secret.

I mean, I got to tell you, Your Honor, one of the other reasons that we want this information to be available to us is, frankly, the only way we've been able to figure out that there are documents that we asked for that we didn't get, because, again, they didn't tell us, they didn't list them on a privilege log, was, frankly, talking to other groups and talking to reporters. The way we found out about this baby Ricardo, we had no medical records on him at all, the baby who is dead, the way we found out about it is a Washington Post reporter wrote an article about a lion, a Ringling Brothers lion, a young lion that had died last summer. And in the course of writing that story he found out that Ricardo, a baby elephant —

THE COURT: You're saying three of these elephants are dead?

MS. MEYER: Correct.

THE COURT: When did this appear? When did this publication appear?

MS. MEYER: This was a souvenir program that was handed out by Ringling Brothers in April of 2005 at either the MCI Center or the Armory.

THE COURT: It ends, and when Asian elephants are content, they naturally make little Asian elephants creating a wondrous living legacy for many generations to come.

Endangered species? Not if we can help it. And three of these elephants are dead?

MS. MEYER: Correct, Your Honor. And they don't want the public to know that. And that's why they don't want us to have any of these records in public.

Again, Your Honor, the burden is on them, the burden is on them. They claim they're not privileged, they have some other basis for saying this information should be withheld from the public. Let them make a document by document demonstration. But don't put the burden on my plaintiffs to come forward and show that a particular document should be disclosed. That's just not the way the rules are supposed to work.

And I really think it really gives these defendants what they wanted and what their whole strategy was designed to get. And I really just don't, in the interest of fairness, in addition to the fact that that's not the way the rules work, I don't think that should be the outcome here.

I'm a little concerned that we haven't really addressed the motion to compel, because there are large categories of other records that we've never seen. There's videotapes. We asked for all the videotapes that depict their