UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

.

Plaintiffs,

Case No. 03-2006 (EGS/JMF)

RINGLING BROS. AND BARNUM &

BAILEY CIRCUS, et al.,

v.

:

Defendants.

Delendants.

DEFENDANT'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION UNDER RULE 11

EXHIBIT 92

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