UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO :

ANIMALS, et al.,

:

Plaintiffs,

•

v. : Case No. 1:03-CV-02006 (EGS/JMF)

FELD ENTERTAINMENT, INC.,

:

Defendant.

EXHIBIT 4

TO

DEFENDANT'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR CLARIFICATION OF COURT'S ORDER CONCERNING THE CLOSE OF FACT DISCOVERY

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

In the Matter of:

- - - - - x

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

Plaintiffs,

vs.

: Civil Action No. : 03-2006

RINGLING BROTHERS AND
BARNUM & BAILEY CIRCUS,
et al.,

Defendants.

: Washington, D.C. : February 7, 2008

NIC CTATUS COMPRESSOR

TRANSCRIPT OF TELEPHONIC STATUS CONFERENCE BEFORE THE HONORABLE JOHN M. FACCIOLA UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

On behalf of the Plaintiffs:

KIMBERLY D. OCKENE, Esq.

On behalf of the Defendants:

LISA ZEILER JOINER, Esq.

Proceedings recorded by the Court, transcript produced by Pro-Typists, Inc., 1012-14th Street, N.W., Suite 307, Washington, D.C. 20005, 202-347-5395

PROCEEDINGS

THE CLERK: This is Civil Case 03-2006, American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty of Animals, et al., versus Ringling Brothers and Barnum & Bailey Circus, et al. Kimberly Ockene is for the Plaintiff, Lisa Joiner for the Defendant. This is a telephone status conference.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Good afternoon, everybody, this is Judge Facciola. Just a couple of things I want to go over with you. I have reviewed the documents that were redacted and I have seen the nature of the redactions. They are redactions of the name of a human being and in a couple of instances, identifying information about that person, such as phone numbers.

Obviously, these documents were prepared by government officials and people had to give that kind of information. One was really remarkable, he had to give his driver's license and all this other stuff. So I appreciate that.

The one issue I had that I needed some guidance on is that, that if the person is affiliated with the institution or organization, there has been a redaction of the affiliation. So in other words, if it is John Doe of the XYZ Institution, both John Doe and XYZ have been obliterated. I chatted with Judge Sullivan about that and he has no recollection or could not find in the papers a source where he gave guidance as to

the nature of those redactions. So I was just wondering, why did you redact that the way you did?

MS. OCKENE: Your Honor, this is Kimberly Ockene for the Plaintiff. It was actually our intention in most instances I think not to redact the organizational name, but only to redact the names of individuals. So if we did that in certain places, that's something we would actually be willing to turn over.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Okay, because on occasion -I'm glad you said that because I wanted to know that. On
occasion, it seems to be that the people were affiliated with
people for the Ethical Treatment of Animals.

MS. OCKENE: Right.

25 l

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: All right, we found -- we have a list and Sara will coordinate this to save you the time. We have an independent list of all of the instances where that occurred.

MS. OCKENE: Okay.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: And we will get that to you. Otherwise, I can say, having looked at them, that the redactions are only of identifying information of the human beings.

MS. OCKENE: That was our intention, Your Honor, and (inaudible).

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: And you seem to have --

1 MS. OCKENE: -- to redact the organizational name. 2 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: All right, well, we'll clean that up and then I'll issue an order to the effect that I 3 4 don't see any reason for additional judicial action. 5 Okay, now let's take up right now --6 MS. JOINER: Could I be heard and put Defendant's 7 position on the record on this? THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Well, I don't know what you're 8 going to say, because they did what they said they were going 9 to do. Now wasn't that your complaint that they didn't do? 10 MS. JOINER: No, our complaint was that it happened 11 12 at all. 13 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Oh, I see. 14 MS. JOINER: When the government produced these documents to Plaintiffs, it did not make these redactions. 15 This was Plaintiffs filtering the documents as they passed to 16 us as the result of a Rule 45 subpoena. So our objection here 17 is why are these documents being filtered in the version 18 that's coming to us? It wasn't the government that did this, 19 20 it was Plaintiffs as they were passing through them. 21 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: See, this is why I'm a little confused. I had thought that the two sides had -- since Judge 22

Sullivan did not recollect the source of the redaction power,

I thought it had something to do with a preexisting agreement

23

24

you had. That's not true?

MS. JOINER: No, there was no agreement by Defendants to do this. We asked to get them in the exact same form that the USDA produced them and when we contacted the AUSA, she said, "Oh, procedurally, this is hard. Get them from Plaintiffs."

We agreed to abide by protective orders. These particular documents are under two sets of protective orders, one from the ancillary litigation that the subpoenas spawned, which was heard and decided by Judge Sullivan, resulting in an order that the government give these documents to Plaintiffs, and a second protective order that you've issued in this case regarding it. We've agreed to be bound by all of that.

And what our complaint is is why are these things being filtered when they're going completely to Plaintiffs, but when they come to us, they've got big black boxes all over them?

MS. OCKENE: I'd be happy to address that, Your Honor.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Well, let me see if I understand something. I'll have to talk again to Ms. Lyons because this puts a little different spin on what I was chatting with her. Under FOIA or other government collections, I would understand why the government would invoke an informant's privilege upon the theory that people will not cooperate with government investigations if their

identity is disclosed to third parties. Did Lyons and the United States at any point invoke that privilege and redact the names of the informants who gave the information?

MS. OCKENE: May I address that, Your Honor?

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Sure. Identify yourself for the record when you say, "May I," say your name.

 $\ensuremath{\mathsf{MS}}.$ OCKENE: Okay, Kimberly Ockene for the Plaintiffs.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: All right.

MS. OCKENE: I'd like to address that point for the record. We had a long litigation with the USDA over this matter. Through the course of that litigation, they initially did produce all of the material, the many of the materials to us in heavily redacted form, including among others by redacting all the names and identifying information of individuals who provided information to the government.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Okay, so in --

MS. OCKENE: And we ended up settling that litigation through a settlement stipulation, protective order, through which the government, the agency, the USDA, agreed to give us in unredacted form all of these materials that they had previously redacted. And although we didn't memorialize this point, we also contemplated through our discussions that we, in turn, the Plaintiffs, would, if it came to turning over these materials to the Defendants, Feld Entertainment, that we

would undertake to redact only identify information of
informants.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: And that is the deal that you made with the government.

MS. OCKENE: That was our understanding, yes. And Jane Lyons, I believe, will confirm that.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: I'll check with her. That is an aspect of this we did not discuss, but I will.

MS. OCKENE: And I also, Your Honor, I understand, based on my discussions with the agency, that if Feld Entertainment wanted to issue a subpoena to the USDA for these materials, they would settle it in a different way with Felt than they would, than they did with us and, for example, by redacting the names of informants.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: So it's your understanding it is the position of the United States that if Feld were to seek this by FOIA or Rule 45 --

MS. OCKENE: I'm sorry, repeat that, Your Honor.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: If Feld was to seek this, the information, either by FOIA or Rule 45, the government would redact the same information that you redacted.

MS. OCKENE: Correct. In fact, they would probably redact more than we redacted because they have less familiarity with the I guess you could call the players in this matter. We actually did not redact individuals who we

had reason to believe Feld was already familiar with and individuals who were outspoken about the subject in the public domain. And I actually believe that the government would probably do more heavy redactions than we did.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: All right, and your position then would be Feld actually has gotten the benefit in the sense that by getting the documents from you, rather than the United States, there are fewer redactions than there would be if they got them from the United States.

MS. OCKENE: Correct, Your Honor.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: And on the basis of that is your discussion with Ms. Lyons.

MS. OCKENE: That's right.

MS. JOINER: And Judge, this is Lisa Joiner. There are a few things that I would like to address in there.

Number one, it's not accurate to say that the names that were redacted were only people unknown to us. I sat through a deposition of Ms. Archelle Hemley, one of the major complainants, and it was ridiculous. I had to use a USDA document that had her name and her contact information redacted and the same thing had been publicly filed by Plaintiffs in the case almost a year earlier on the record here. So it's not accurate to say that it's only people not known to us.

Secondly, Mr. Gasper, our associate here, had several

conversations with Ms. Lyons. She never once said to us, you know, "If you seek these from us, I'm going to put these redactions in there."

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Okay.

MS. JOINER: And I have read the protective order and the stipulation in that case and I certainly have no recollection of anything entered in those papers that were filed with the Court resolving this matter saying, "Well, we're only going to give it to you, Plaintiffs, but not to Feld or anybody else."

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: All right, what we'll have to do, obviously, is convene a hearing in this matter and ask Ms. Lyons to join us. I don't see any other way to resolve this, since she's the central player in the piece and my having ex parte informal conversations doesn't get us where we want to go. So Sara will be in touch with you and Ms. Lyons and we'll set that up.

The next item on the agenda would be the desire of parties to resume their motion practice, now that the fact discovery has ended. Outstanding already was an application made by Feld, I believe, to force HSUS to participate in the February 28th hearing. I understand from Sara that an opposition to that has been filed by HSUS today -- will be today. And so then we'll receive that and obviously, I'll have to read that and decide where we go from there.

Could you both explain to me what other motions you wish to file? I know from correspondence, e-mails we've had there is a desire to review the deposition of Rider because Rider was instructed not to answer certain questions. Is that true?

MS. JOINER: Yes, Judge, if I can try to run through the -- this is Lisa Joiner, I'm sorry. I can kind of run through the list of our various motions that are --

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Well, before --

MS. JOINER: -- accumulating now.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: All right, well --

MS. JOINER: The motion to file with HSUS, the motion that we did file I guess a week or two ago, that -- my understanding is that you granted our right to do that at the hearing that was held January 8th and that was done. And HSUS filed its response, I believe it was yesterday.

What we have from Plaintiffs today is their response to our motion to enforce against HSUS. So we don't understand why Plaintiffs are weighing in and we want to know if we're supposed to respond to that. Plaintiffs also filed a motion to compel against us yesterday.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Okay, just a second, let's go back to the HSUS. The briefing as that now stands is Feld went first, made a motion to join them; HSUS filed and Plaintiffs filed as well. Ms. Joiner, are you seeking

permission to respond to that? 2 MS. JOINER: Yeah, the question is if Plaintiffs are going to be allowed to weigh in on this, right -- it's a 3 4 motion against HSUS. 5 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Well, all right --6 MS. JOINER: If Plaintiffs are going to be allowed to 7 weigh in on this --8 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Okay --9 MS. JOINER: -- to be filed today --THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: I'm about to permit you to do 10 that, so you probably don't want to talk me out of it, okay? 11 So how much time do you need to do that? 12 13 MS. JOINER: Well, what I would propose, what we would like to do is to if it's okay with you is when we 14 15 respond to the HSUS -- reply, excuse me, when we file our 16 reply to the HSUS reply, we could do it in one document. 17 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: That's fine. 18 MS. JOINER: So our reply would be to both the HSUS reply to answer this thing that Plaintiffs filed today. 19 20 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: That's appropriate, thank you. 21 MS. JOINER: Okay. THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Now let's go on, you said you 22 23 had another motion. MS. JOINER: Well, there is Plaintiffs' motion to 24 25 | compel which was filed on the 5th.

MS. OCKENE: This is Kimberly Ockene for the Plaintiffs. The Court had granted us permission to file 2 3 that --4 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Okay. MS. OCKENE: -- during an e-mail exchange with Ms. 5 6 Podger, from my understanding. THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Yes, we understand that. 7 Okay, what would you like to do with that, Ms. Joiner? 8 MS. JOINER: Well, I wasn't aware that permission had 9 been granted. So if Plaintiffs' motion to compel, the 10 permission had been granted, if that's their stand, we'll 11 12 proceed with the normal briefing. THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: That's fine, and then that I 13 guess takes us to the Rider deposition. 14 MS. JOINER: And that would take us to the motion 15 that we have, which we would need permission to file. 16 17 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Okay, could you --18 MS. JOINER: And there are three different depositions where instructions not to answer were given. One 19 is the Rider deposition and he was instructed not to answer 20 questions as to when he was instructed to save e-mails, why he 21 didn't go to the inspection, and his understanding as to what 22 kind of documents he was supposed to save for discovery. 23 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Okay, and you want to move to 24 25 compel his answers.

MS. JOINER: That's correct.

25 l

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Okay, what's the other one?

MS. JOINER: Okay, then the second one, during the

30(b)(6) deposition of WAP, the Wildlife Advocacy Project,
there was outright refusal by the witness to answer certain
questions. And one of the categories, I believe, was inquiry
that was made about HSUS payments for Rider and we want to be
able to compel on that.

Then there were also questions that were limited in -- well, in my -- the deponent, the individual who appeared in the 30(b)(6) was Eric Glitzenstein, Plaintiffs' counsel, so a lot of his answers were couched in, "In my capacity at WAP ...," and refused to answer based on the knowledge that that particular witness had. So that particular motion to compel would be part of that.

MS. OCKENE: Your Honor, this is Kimberly Ockene. I just want to say that I do have a couple of things to say about each of these matters, but I'm reserving until the end, if that's appropriate.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Well, I guess, Ms. Ockene, what we have to decide right now is both sides obviously want to speak to these issues. I should grant permission for both sides to do so. So Ms. Joiner will make her motions, you'll respond in the ordinary course, she'll reply and I'll resolve them.

MS. OCKENE: That's all good, Your Honor. I'll just 1 mention that will respect to the deposition of the Wildlife 2 Advocacy Project, they are separately represented, their 3 counsel is not, obviously, on the phone at the moment, so I 4 have no understanding of the matter involved in that case. But I do understand that to my knowledge, there's been no meet 6 and confer regarding that matter to date. 8 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Okay, well, given where we are right now, I'm going to relieve both of you of any obligation 9 of _____ to meet and confer, let's -- if we're going to 10 go to war, we're going to go to war, so --11 12 MS. OCKENE: All right. MS. JOINER: And Judge, this is Lisa Joiner here and 13 I -- you know, when things happen at depositions, right, the 14 decision is made on the spot. So I can send, I'm more than 15 happy to send a follow-up letter to say, "Yes, as we told you 16 at the deposition, we're going to move to compel, " right? 17 But when a person interrupts the deposition and ruins 18 the flow of the questions and tells the witness not to answer, 19 you've done your meet and confer right there by doing that. 20 21 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Okay, well, I'm not --22 MS. JOINER: It's a little different than back and forth with documents and written discovery and whatnot. 23 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Okay, I'm relieving both sides 24 of any meet and confer obligations, so that's not a problem.

MS. JOINER: Right. Then the third deposition with 1 instructions not to answer, the Animal Protection Institute. 2 And this again went back to questions that pertain to 3 communications, conference calls that occurred regarding 4 payments with Rider, and the witness was instructed to limit her answers to not specifics, but only generally speaking, and 6 7 I stated at the deposition that I would not accept that. MS. OCKENE: This is Kimberly Ockene. And the reason 8 the depositions were taken were based on Judge Sullivan's 9 order, Your Honor, to develop the background. 10 11 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Okay, well, fine. Would you want to set -- I know you're busy with your expert discovery, 12 so I didn't know if the two of you just wanted to stay on the 13 phone and come up with some schedules that are consistent with 14 your other obligations. I have no schedule I'm going to 15 superimpose on you. How much -- since you're the moving 16 party, Ms. Joiner, when would you like to file? 17 18 MS. JOINER: One of the depositions we just got, I think actually two of them we just got back today. 19 20 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Okay. MS. JOINER: So we want to try to go through those, 21 obviously, and be thorough. So if we could file let's say by 22 23 the 15th? THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: You read my mind, I was just 24

going to say the 15th. All right, we can make it one

25

```
comprehensive omnibus motion.
  1
  2
              MS. JOINER: Yes, I would, fine.
              THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Let me -- I'm just thinking it
  3
  4
     seemed to me --
              MS. JOINER: Then we have a couple of other
  5
     potential disputes which I am not yet sure of, right?
  7
              THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Well, before they write
  8
     them --
  9
              MS. JOINER: -- hear about those now or not?
 10
              THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Hold on.
             MS. OCKENE: And I have one or two matters I might
11
    raise, as well, Your Honor.
12
13
             THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Okay, just before we go any
    further, to keep the size of all this to a minimum, would you
14
    want to give me -- I don't know what your arrangements with
15
    your court reporters are -- would you want to give me those
16
17
    transcripts on CD-ROM?
18
             MS. JOINER: We can do that.
             THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Why don't we do that? And is
19
    there any impediment to my _____ them into a WPDF file so
20
21
    I can search?
             MS. JOINER: I don't think so, I think you can do
22
23
    that.
24
             THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: All right, why don't you check
25 with the reporters? The best of all possible worlds for me is
```

from the reporting and PDF format, that would be great.

MS. JOINER: Okay.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Then we won't have hundreds of pages of deposition transcript all over the place. Okay, now you've got some other issues that you think are not yet ripe and I don't know if you want to bring them up now or if we should just wait until they ripen.

MS. OCKENE: And can I have -- you know, this is Kimberly Ockene again, with a couple of matters. We can finish with Ms. Joiner first.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Ms. Joiner, anything else?
MS. JOINER: Yes. We have an issue with the
document subpoena to Meyer, Glitzenstein and Crystal to
inspect originals of certain documents and to inspect
Medidata. And we had gotten an initial response roughly a
week ago and said we would hear more from them tomorrow.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Okay.

MS. JOINER: So in light of that, you know, we think that's on the horizon. There's also an issue with subpoenas that were issued by Plaintiffs to the group PETA and I have timely filed objections to those. I think they're procedurally flawed, as well as substantively. And interestingly enough, I have PETA's counsel hopping up and down, jumping on my doorstep, telling me he's going to produce all kinds of transcripts that are under protective orders by

other courts.

So I've asked Plaintiffs' counsel twice if they're going to withdraw those. If they voluntarily do, that's it. If they're going to proceed with these subpoenas, then I think that we will have to move to quash. And if we can't get this worked out, can we have leave to so move?

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Certainly.

MS. OCKENE: And this is Kimberly Ockene on that matter, Your Honor. We are not planning to withdraw our subpoena to People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals for highly relevant depositions in a matter that they had, again, Feld Entertainment for spying. And we are prepared to move to compel if that's the preferred course of action, rather than Defendant moving to quash, and we would move to compel before Your Honor and ask permission to do so.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Is that acceptable to you, Ms. Joiner?

MS. JOINER: You know, however, I don't really care, if it comes up as a motion to quash or a motion to compel --

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Well, why don't we do this --

MS. JOINER: -- as long as we get a chance to be heard on this.

 $\mbox{MS. OCKENE:}\ \mbox{This is Kim Ockene again.}\ \mbox{We'd prefer}$ to move to compel.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Granted. Okay, that finishes

Ms. Joiner. Now Ms. Ockene, you have some stuff?

MS. OCKENE: Yes. Well, the one matter was the matter we just covered regarding the subpoenas to the People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals. And the other matter is the motion to compel that we just filed with Your Honor, that I just wanted to make clear that it was understanding that we had permission to do that.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: You do.

MS. OCKENE: And the only other matter that's possibly on the horizon is that the Defendant has refused to cover the expenses that the Plaintiffs had to expend for redeposing Mr. Gary Jacobson, which we had to do because of Defendants' instructions not to answer for a matter that Your Honor later compelled them to answer. So we had to spend a lot of money and resources redeposing him and Defendant has refused to cover those costs.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: I'll relieve you of your obligation to further meet and confer and you may have leave to compel that expenditure.

MS. OCKENE: Okay, thank you, Your Honor.

THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: So we'll add that instruction. I would hope that everybody could file their first group of papers, let's call them their affirmative papers seeking relief, on the 15th. And then we'll just follow the local rules in terms of times for oppositions and replies. Is that

acceptable to everyone? 1 2 MS. OCKENE: Yes, Your Honor. 3 MS. JOINER: That would be fine. 4 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Okay, anything else? 5 MS. OCKENE: I have nothing further, Your Honor. 6 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Okay. 7 MS. JOINER: I have one more question, sorry. think that you had, at the earlier hearing in January which I 8 was not there for, but I thought that you had referenced at 9 some point setting forth some kind of an order about the date 10 for exchange of witness lists and exhibits. And we just 11 wanted to check, is it still your intention to do that or --12 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: I'll have to check that 13 transcript and my notes, I don't remember. 14 15 MS. JOINER: It's our understanding that Your Honor issued an order on that matter. 16 THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: I can just about remember what 17 I had for lunch, so I'm going to have to go back and check my 18 notes, Sara will check her notes, and we'll check the docket 19 and we'll get back to you on that. I'm not going to guess, I 20 just have absolutely no recollection, so give me a moment. 21 MS. JOINER: I think it was -- well, you know, the 22 hearing has been -- the order's already set the hearing date 23 24 This pertained to I think you had referenced a for the 26th. date for exchange of witnesses and exhibits.

```
THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: We'll take a look. It's
   1
     coming back to me, but as I said, I don't remember. We'll
   2
     look at it and we'll try to get to you, we'll clarify that by
   3
  4
             ___ tomorrow, okay?
  5
              MS. JOINER:
                             Thank you.
  6
              THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: Thank you.
  7
              MS. OCKENE: Thank you, Your Honor.
  8
              THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE: All right, good day.
  9
              (Whereupon, the hearing concluded.)
 10
 11
 12
 13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA)

Civil Action No. 03-2006

I, PAUL R. CUTLER, do hereby certify that a recording of the foregoing proceedings in the above matter was duplicated from an original recording by the Office of the Clerk, United States District Court for the District of Columbia and that said duplicate recording of the proceedings was transcribed under my direction to typewritten form.

PAUL R. CUTLER

I, DORIS A. CUTLER, do hereby certify that the foregoing transcript was typed by me and that said transcript is a true record of the recorded proceedings to the best of my ability.

DORIS A CUTLER