## 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.

Tuesday, January 11, 2005

10:40 a.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF A HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE EMMET G. SULLIVAN

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiffs:

KATHERINE A. MEYER, Esquire

KIMBERLY OCKENE, Esquire MEYER & GLITZENSTEIN

1601 Connecticut Avenue, NW

Suite 700

Washington, DC 20009

For Defendants:

EUGENE D. GULLAND, Esquire

JOSH WILSON, Esquire CONTINGTON & 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.

## PROCEEDINGS

THE CLERK: Civic Action 03-2005, American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, et al. versus Ringling Brothers and Barnum and Bailey Circus, et al.

would counsel please identify yourselves for the record.

MS. MEYER: Katherine Meyer and Kim Ockene for the plaintiffs.

MR. GULLAND: Good morning, Your Honor. I'm Gene Gulland for the defendant, Ringling Brothers. And my colleague Josh Wolson is with me.

THE COURT: Good morning, counsel.

Let me invite principal counsel to the podium.

This is a status hearing. You've been very quiet, so I assume you've been working in resolving whatever issues you had to resolve, I assume.

You haven't settled the case, though, have you?

MS. MEYER: No, Your Honor.

MR. GULLAND: We've not.

MS. MEYER: At this point, Your Honor, while we continue to engage in some negotiations with respect to plaintiffs' concerns about the defendants' responses to our discovery, it's clear that we've reached an impasse on certain issues. So plaintiffs are prepared to go forward with a motion to compel. And our current plan is to file that within the

next two weeks. We were going to suggest two weeks from today, 1 which would be January 25. 2 THE COURT: All right. That's fine. 3 How much time do you need, counsel, to file a 4 response to a motion that you haven't seen? 5 MR. GULLAND: I think if we had two weeks, that would 6 7 be adequate. THE COURT: That's fine. 8 And maybe another week for a reply? 9 MS. MEYER: That would be fine, Your Honor. 10 THE COURT: All right. Two weeks from the 25th of 11 January. That will take us to February 8. Why don't I give 12 you until the 18th. 13 will two weeks be enough time? 14 MR. GULLAND: Now that you mention it, if we could 15 have three. The reason for that is the last two weeks of 16 17 January --THE COURT: I don't have any problems with that. 18 The 25th for the filing of the motion. Three weeks 19 thereafter would be the 15th of February. Why don't I give you 20 until the 28th, the end of the month, to file a reply. 21 MS. MEYER: That's fine, Your Honor. 22 THE COURT: I'm not sure whether it will be a hearing 23 or not. Give me a chance to at least review the motion, the 24 response and reply. I normally have a lot of questions, but 25

sometimes I can resolve pleadings on the pleadings, so there may not be a hearing in this case. So don't save your best argument for a hearing. So are you able to proceed with discovery notwithstanding the filing of that motion or not? MS. MEYER: We're certainly able to proceed with discovery, Your Honor. The only problem is, in terms of giving you a new pretrial schedule, we need the answers to some of the discovery that's in dispute in order to agree to a discovery cut-off. Because, obviously, some of the discovery that we seek in this case may lead to additional deponents, et cetera. 11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

our expert witnesses.

THE COURT: So are you suggesting that discovery has to then be essentially stayed?

In addition, we need certain records that we want to give to

MS. MEYER: No. We're fine going forward. I'm just saying, we haven't been able to give you a date for when discovery should be cut off, that's all.

THE COURT: That's fine. I don't have any problems with that.

MR. GULLAND: We have one potential problem. The chief plaintiff, the only plaintiff who has standing in the case, according to the D.C. Circuit, we want to depose. And we're told we're not allowed to depose that witness until the discovery issues are resolved. We don't see the relevance of that.

As I understand it, the chief problem is they are concerned that we may have information about this witness' background that would be used for impeachment purposes in a deposition and I want to get that in advance to eliminate the potential of surprise and we don't think that's fair.

THE COURT: So are you referring to, what, the CEO of the plaintiff?

MR. GULLAND: We're talking about Mr. Ryder, Tom Ryder.

THE COURT: There's not been a motion filed for a protective order. Why should his deposition be protected at this point?

MS. MEYER: Your Honor, there hasn't even been a notice of a deposition. We haven't received a notice of deposition. We haven't received a single request to make him available for a deposition.

The reason this came up, Your Honor, is one of our discovery requests is we said give us everything you have on Tom Ryder in your files.

THE COURT: Before he's deposed?

MS. MEYER: We didn't raise it before he was deposed. They didn't give us a single document concerning Mr. Ryder in their initial discovery responses. They gave us absolutely nothing. So we said does that mean you don't have anything.

They didn't claim a privilege for anything. 1 So we've been trying to get to the bottom of, is it 2 that you don't have anything, you're claiming a privilege 3 because it's not in your privilege log, what's the story. And 4 we get cryptic responses. And our position is, even though we 5 haven't received a notice for his deposition, we need to know 6 what you have on him before we're going to make him available 7 8 for a deposition. THE COURT: And they have not said that they don't 9 have anything on him? 10 11 MS. MEYER: Correct. THE COURT: What was the response to the precise 12 request for production of documents? 13 MS. MEYER: Zero, nothing, we have no records 14 15 concerning Mr. Ryder. THE COURT: I mean, question number five just blank? 16 MS. MEYER: That's right. 17 THE COURT: Nothing exists, didn't say that? 18 MS. MEYER: No, they don't say that, Your Honor. 19 THE COURT: Oversight? Did you go on to number six 20 and overlook five? 21 MR. GULLAND: We said that we'll give them all the 22 employment records and that sort of stuff that we have about 23 Mr. Ryder. 24

MS. MEYER: They haven't, Your Honor. They haven't

25

given us a single document.

THE COURT: Wait a minute.

Are there documents that your client maintains there's a privilege for regarding this particular witness?

MR. GULLAND: As I said, there's some documents that we think refer to the background completely unrelated to his employment with our client that could serve as impeachment with Mr. Ryder. It's true, we haven't noticed him for a deposition yet because we have been told specifically in writing and orally by the plaintiffs that they're not going to produce him. And I didn't notice a deposition until we thrashed this out.

THE COURT: Why wouldn't they be entitled to potential impeachment material pursuant to a request for production of documents? If you have, whatever it is, if it's not privileged, why wouldn't they be entitled to that upon request?

MR. GULLAND: Some of it would be privileged in the sense that it's documentation that counsel has gathered, not part of our documents maintained in the ordinary course of business, that would be work product.

MS. MEYER: Not listed in their privilege log, Your Honor. Not a single document is listed in their privilege log or has been provided to us. Their position so far, as far as I can tell, Your Honor, is that the documents concerning Mr. Ryder are not responsive to our document production request.

1.7

Now, I don't know why that would be, but they haven't given us any.

THE COURT: Your document request, let me guess, is any and all?

MS. MEYER: We said, yes, we would like all the records you have on Mr. Ryder, yes, who worked there for two and a half years and is the main plaintiff in our case, we'd like to know what you have on him. And their answer was zip. They didn't give us anything, they didn't claim a privilege for anything. And we said do you want to stipulate that you don't have anything. And the answer was, no, they don't regard anything they have on him as responsive. This is the first time I've heard from Mr. Gulland that, oh, yes, they do regard certain records as responsive, but covered by a privilege. It's not in their privilege log.

THE COURT: You two are doing exactly what you're supposed to be doing without me present, discussing this issue. So I'm going to tell you to finish your discussion. And if you can't resolve it, then make that part and parcel of your motion.

MS. MEYER: We will, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. What else can we talk about?

I saw an interesting documentary the other evening on

TV about heroic elephants and the significant role the

elephants are playing vis-a-vis the Tsunami disaster. It was a

1	farfetched thought. I do have a sense of humor, but I'm
2	completely serious about this. It was a farfetched thought at
3	that point. I said, gee, what could trained elephants lend to
4	this horrible situation, if anything?
5	I mean, how many elephants does Ringling Brothers
6	own?
7	MR. GULLAND: I think the answer to that is in the
8	40s.
9	THE COURT: That's all, really? Down from what?
10	Hundreds, I assume, at one point.
11	MR. GULLAND: I don't think Ringling ever had that.
12	many, but they have about on the order of 40 elephants.
13	THE COURT: Again, I do have a sense of humor, but
14	I'm really dead serious about this. Could those elephants be
15	of any assistance over there?
16	MR. GULLAND: I don't know the answer to that.
17	THE COURT: I don't know how you would get them there
18	anyway. I mean, that's one thought that occurred to me, how
19	would you get them there. But they're trained elephants.
20	Elephants can go places bulldozers can't go.
21	MR. GULLAND: They can go between the trees in ways
22	that vehicles cannot.
23	THE COURT: I don't know if either of you saw it or
24	not, but it was very interesting.
25	MR. GULLAND: I dare say that the plaintiffs would

say that the ways in which those elephants are used would 1 violate the Endangered Species Act, even in Sri Lanka. 2 THE COURT: I shared this thought with a former law 3 clerk and that's the exact same response, well, Judge, do you 4 know what, that sounds like a great idea, but getting them 5 there is problematic. I don't know. Probably so, I guess. I 6 7 don't know. Maybe you can send them back over there to help out. 8 And then if they ever reentered this country again, they would 9 reenter this country pursuant to federal regulations in place. 10 I don't know. Maybe it's farfetched, but it certainly was not 11 humorous. I was amazed at the story. 12 MS. MEYER: It is amazing. Also, the fact that they 13 felt the vibrations of the Tsunami before the humans. 14 THE COURT: Absolutely. 15 There's probably no way to get them over there. Your 16 client wouldn't want to part with those elephants anyway. 17 MR. GULLAND: I don't know the answer to the 18 possibility of that. It's an interesting suggestion. 19 THE COURT: It is interesting. I'm just sharing a 20 thought with you, but I'm dead serious about it. 21 All right. What else can we talk about? 22 MS. MEYER: I think that's it, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: We can't talk about anything else? Well, 24 it's good to see everyone. 25

I should schedule another status hearing. I'm going 1 to take a hard look at your motion. And maybe what I should do 2 is try to resolve it before -- well, certainly look at it as 3 soon as it becomes ripe. Maybe schedule a status hearing for 4 the latter part of March. And I'll either let you know that 5 there will be a hearing on that motion at that time or I will 6 have resolved it and we'll move on to something else. 7 MS. MEYER: Could we do it sooner than that, sort of 8 mid March, Your Honor? 9 THE COURT: You're cutting into my time, which 10 lawyers always do. I'm giving you this big briefing schedule 11 that goes through the end of February and now you don't want to 12 give me 24 hours to read the motions. 13 MR. GULLAND: From my point of view, it's something 14 of a compromise, the week of the 21st of March. 15 MS. MEYER: When is Easter? 16 THE COURT: Good Friday is the 25th. Easter is the 17 27th. 18 MS. MEYER: If we do it before then, Your Honor, 19 that's fine. 20 THE COURT: May I suggest the 24th of March? 21 MS. MEYER: That's fine. 22 MR. GULLAND: That's fine with us, Your Honor. 23 THE COURT: All right. The 24th at 11:00. 24 And I'll let you know if I'm going to convert that 25

status hearing to a hearing on the pending motion. 1 Actually, just a minute. Do you know what? That's a 2 frantic period of time because we're still under the auspices 3 of the Biden Bill, the six month motions reporting period. And 4 the last couple of weeks prior to the expiration reporting 5 period are very, very hectic. 6 So I think what I want to do is to move it to the 7 first full week in April, April 8, at 11:30. 8 MR. GULLAND: That's fine with us. 9 THE COURT: That will be a status hearing or either a 10 hearing on the pending motion. That will give me more than 11 enough time to focus on your motion. I can't tell you how 12 hectic matters are during the last two weeks of a reporting 13 14 period. All right. Thank you. 15 If there is any interest on my thought, let me know. 16 There probably isn't. I mean, I don't know how you would get 17 the elephants over there. I have no idea. But they're true 18 heroes over there in Sri Lanka. 19 MR. GULLAND: It's remarkable. 20 THE COURT: It is remarkable. Have a nice day. 21 (The hearing concluded at 10:55 a.m.) 22

23

24

25

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter. Elcuna a Medehart ELAINE A. MERCHANT, RPR, CRR Official Court Reporter