UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS, et al.,	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	
v.	)	**Civ. No. 03-2006 (EGS/JMF)**
FELD ENTERTAINMENT, INC.,	)	
Defendant.	)	

PLAINTIFFS' MEMORANDUM REGARDING
RELEVANT STATUTORY AND REGULATORY AUTHORITY

Eric R. Glitzenstein
(D.C. Bar No. 358287)
Katherine A. Meyer
(D.C. Bar No. 244301)
Howard M. Crystal
(D.C. Bar No. 446189)
Tanya M. Sanerib
(D.C. Bar No. 473506)
Delcianna J. Winders
(D.C. Bar No. 488056)

MEYER GLITZENSTEIN & CRYSTAL
1601 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20009
(202) 588-5206

Dated: Feburary 13, 2009

Counsel for plaintiffs

Plaintiffs are filing this brief to address the issues posed by the Court on February 6, 2009, i.e., (1) "what is the scope of any statutory or regulatory authority, if any, of any federal agency" with regard to "Asian elephants in captivity in American circuses"; and (2) how, if at all, that authority has been exercised with respect to the "take" allegations on which plaintiffs' claims are predicated here. Feb. 6, 2009 Trial Tr. at 69, 72-73. As discussed further below, because this case has properly been brought pursuant to the citizen suit provision of the Endangered Species Act ("ESA"), and because this Court has already held that the Asian elephants at issue are protected by the "take" prohibition embodied in that statute, see 8/23/07 Mem. Op. (DE 173) at 7-15, it is the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service ("FWS") that has the relevant statutory and regulatory authority to implement the ESA. See Babbitt v. Sweet Home Chapter of Cmtys. for a Great Or., 515 U.S. 687, 697 (1995) (affording Chevron deference to FWS's "reasonable" definition of the statute's prohibition on "harm[ing]" listed species). The FWS has exercised that authority by making clear that captive members of endangered species may not be "harmed," "wounded," "harassed," or otherwise taken without a permit issued under section 10 of the Act, and, although the FWS itself has not brought an enforcement action against defendant, Congress created the ESA's citizen suit provision precisely to ensure that the protection of listed species would ***not*** be dependent on such enforcement.

I. THIS IS AN ESA CASE.

The Court's inquiry can only sensibly be answered with reference to the specific statutory context within which plaintiffs' claims have been asserted. See Navarro v. Pfizer Corp., 261 F.3d 90, 99 (1st Cir. 2001). Despite FEI's persistent efforts to convert this lawsuit into an Animal Welfare Act ("AWA") case, the reality is that, as expressly authorized by Congress, plaintiffs have brought this case pursuant to the citizen suit provision of the ESA, which provides

that "***any person*** may commence a civil suit" in order to "enjoin ***any person*** . . . who is alleged to be in violation of ***any provision of this chapter or regulation issued under the authority thereof.***" 16 U.S.C. § 1540(g)(1)(A) (emphases added).

This capacious language indisputably encompasses plaintiffs' claim that FEI is "in violation" of section 9 of the ESA and that statute's implementing regulations. As the Supreme Court held in a unanimous ruling, the ESA citizen suit provision is "an authorization of remarkable breadth when compared with the language Congress ordinarily uses," and this plain language must be taken "at face value." Bennett v. Spear, 520 U.S. 154, 164-65 (1997). Further repudiating FEI's implication that plaintiffs' pursuit of this citizen suit is somehow foreclosed by the failure of the Executive Branch to initiate an enforcement action of its own, the Supreme Court also declared that the "obvious purpose of the [ESA's citizen suit provision] is to encourage enforcement by so-called 'private attorneys general.'" Id. (emphasis added).[1]

In short, plaintiffs are pursuing precisely the "private attorney general" role carved out by Congress, which made a policy choice ***not*** to rely exclusively (or even primarily) on Executive Branch enforcement of the ESA's take prohibition. Indeed, as explained by former D.C. Circuit

---

[1] Hence, in Bennett, the Supreme Court refused to depart from the ESA's text by engrafting onto the citizen suit provision a limitation that Congress did not adopt (a "zone of interests" test). 520 U.S. at 164-66. That is essentially the same impermissible result for which FEI advocates here through its argument that the Court should decline to adjudicate plaintiffs' claim because an Executive Branch agency has not brought the very same enforcement action. There is simply no such limitation in the citizen suit provision or anywhere else in the ESA. To the contrary, the ESA forecloses pursuit of a citizen suit only where the government "has commenced action to impose a penalty" under the Act's civil penalty provisions. 16 U.S.C. § 1540(g)(3)(B) (emphasis added). The only other limitations that Congress adopted are that: (1) plaintiffs must give the government advance notice of a prospective claim (as plaintiffs have done here), see id. at § 1540(g)(2); and (2) in any citizen suit, the "Attorney General, at the request of the Secretary [of the Interior] may intervene on behalf of the United States as a matter of right," id. at § 1540(g)(3)(B) (emphasis added).

Chief Judge Patricia Wald, when Congress creates such a citizen suit provision, it is acting on the premise that federal regulators and the entities they oversee "may work out 'agreements' that are not necessarily true to the spirit" of the law, and hence Congress ***wants*** the "citizen outsider [to] act[] as a goad in such cases." Patricia M. Wald, *The Role of the Judiciary in Environmental Protection*, 19 B.C. Envtl. Aff. L. Rev. 519, 525 (1992). As Congress contemplated, therefore, many citizen suits asserting unlawful "takings" under the ESA have been brought – and won – by private parties in the absence of any federal agency involvement. See, e.g., Loggerhead Turtle v. County Council of Volusia County, Fla., 896 F. Supp. 1170, 1180 (M.D. Fla. 1995) ("Enforcement of the [ESA] here does not require the resolution of any issues by the [FWS]."); Marbled Murrelet v. Pac. Lumber Co., 880 F. Supp. 1343 (N.D. Cal. 1995), aff'd, 83 F.3d 1060 (9th Cir. 1996). This lawsuit is in no fundamentally different legal posture than other cases in which courts have been called on to make de novo determinations of whether particular conduct "harms," "wounds," "harasses," or otherwise takes members of a listed species.[2]

This by no means suggests that a ruling by the Court would render the FWS's role in implementing the statutory scheme irrelevant. Rather, should the Court hold that defendant's practices do in fact harm, wound, or harass Asian elephants, ***then the permitting scheme that applies to such takings should come into play***, and the Service will thereby be called on to assess whether a permit should be issued and, if so, on what conditions. For example, FEI insists

[2] Indeed, the federal government has traditionally pursued very few section 9 claims of any kind since passage of the ESA. Accordingly, citizen suits by private parties have been the primary means of enforcement of the ESA's take prohibition. Courts have not declined to award appropriate relief in such cases – including those raising novel takings issues – merely because the Executive Branch did not pursue its own enforcement action. See, e.g., Strahan v. Coxe, 127 F.3d 155, 158 (1st Cir. 1997) (affirming district court holding that state officials were taking right whales simply by permitting gillnet and lobster pot fishing in Right whale habitat).

that its operations are somehow conserving Asian elephants in the wild. Although plaintiffs strongly disagree, that dispute has nothing to do with the threshold question of whether FEI is "taking" the elephants. It would however, be critical should the Court rule that disciplining the elephants with bull hooks and/or prolonged chaining of them on hard surfaces constitutes a take, because FEI would then be in the position of applying for a permit under section 10 of the ESA on the rationale that its are somehow necessary to "enhance the propagation or survival of the affected species." 16 U.S.C. § 1539(a)(1)(A). Such an approach would, in turn, result in a Congressionally mandated public notice and comment process, culminating in a judicially reviewable decision by the FWS. See Loggerhead Turtle, 896 F. Supp. at 1177 ("[T]he Court is called upon to ascertain whether the County's activities will likely result in future takings of protected sea turtles. This is no invasion of the [FWS's] expertise. The Service shall apply its expertise when it considers Volusia County's application" for a permit) (emphasis added).[3]

II. FEI'S CAPTIVE ASIAN ELEPHANTS ARE SUBJECT TO THE ESA'S TAKE PROHIBITION.

FEI's ongoing insistence that the ESA has nothing to do with its treatment of the endangered Asian elephants flies in the face of the Court's ruling that the ESA's take prohibition ***does*** apply to the "pre-Act" elephants at issue. As held by the Court, the ESA provides that certain of the Act's prohibitions – but ***not*** the take prohibition – "do not apply to any fish or

[3] Indeed, the Court, in a remedial order, could order defendant to apply for such a permit. See Strahan v. Coxe, 127 F.3d at 158 1997) (affirming remedial order requiring state officials to pursue a section 10 permit); see also Center for Biological Diversity v. Pirie, 201 F. Supp. 2d 113, 120-22 (D.D.C. 2002) (Sullivan, J.), vacated as moot, 2003 WL 179848 (D.C. Cir. Jan. 23, 2008) (recognizing the court's authority to order the Secretary of the Navy to apply to the FWS for a permit following a finding that the Navy was unlawfully taking migratory birds, but declining to frame relief in those terms because "in this case, the FWS has denied defendants' permit applications *at least twice*").

wildlife which was held in captivity" prior to the date the ESA was passed or the species was listed. DE 173 at 7 (emphasis added) (citing 16 U.S.C. § 1538(b)(1)). The necessary import of this ruling is that Congress knew well how to exempt particular captive members of listed species from the ESA's safeguards, but that it intentionally did ***not*** do so with respect to the take prohibition as applied to the elephants at issue here. Id. at 12.

FEI's argument is also impossible to harmonize with other statutory language, the Supreme Court's rulings on how that language should be construed, and the FWS's own longstanding recognition that the ESA's take prohibition clearly applies to captive members of listed species. As plaintiffs have explained in prior briefing, see, e.g., DE 96 at 5, section 9 prohibits the take of "any endangered species of fish or wildlife," 16 U.S.C. § 1538(a)(1) (emphasis added), and the term "fish or wildlife" means "any member of the animal kingdom," regardless of where, or under what circumstances, it was born, id. § 1532(8) (emphasis added). There is no ambiguity in this expansive language, see, e.g., Dep't of Hous. & Urban Dev't v. Rucker, 535 U.S. 125, 131 (2002) ("the word 'any' has an expansive meaning, that is, 'one or some indiscriminately of whatever kind'" [(internal citation omitted)]), and, even if there were, the FWS's longstanding construction establishes that the "Act applies to both wild and captive populations of a [listed] species." 44 Fed. Reg. 30044 (May 23, 1979) (emphasis added); see also 63 Fed. Reg. 48634, 48636 (Sept. 11, 1998) (explaining that "take" was defined by Congress to apply to endangered or threatened species "whether wild or captive" and that the "statutory term cannot be changed administratively").[4]

[4] Other regulations issued by the FWS also recognize that the Act's take prohibitions apply to listed species in captivity. Indeed, there would have been no need for the Service to issue the "captive-bred wildlife regulations" on which FEI has relied for elephants born in

FEI's contention that the take prohibition should be construed so narrowly that anyone may harm, wound, harass, or even kill a captive member of a listed species with impunity under the ESA, also runs afoul of the Supreme Court's ruling that Congress intended to "provide comprehensive protection for endangered and threatened species," and specifically "stressed that '[t]ake' is defined . . . in the broadest possible manner to include every conceivable way in which a person can 'take' or attempt to 'take' any fish or wildlife.'" Sweet Home, 515 U.S. at 699, 704 (emphases added) (quoting S. Rep. No. 93-307 at 7 (1973)); see also id. ("The House Report stated that 'the broadest possible terms' were used to define restrictions on takings." [(quoting H.R. Rep. No. 93-412 at 15 (1973)]).[5]

Also groundless is FEI's notion that, because Congress did not specifically refer to the use of endangered species in circuses when it enacted the ESA, then this must mean that such animals are unprotected by the Act. That argument not only ignores how Congress ordinarily legislates – i.e., by enacting general requirements and prohibitions rather than enumerating each specific covered activity – but clearly runs afoul of the Supreme Court's landmark construction

---

captivity if the take prohibition did not generally apply to Asian elephants in captivity. See 50 C.F.R. § 17.21(g); see also id. at § 17.40(c)(3) (creating a "special rule" delineating the circumstances under which captive chimpanzees listed as threatened may be taken); 71 Fed. Reg. 28881 (May 18, 2006) (requesting public comment on whether the Service should issue a "permit to include lethal take of up to twenty captive born white-collared mangabeys" per year for "the purpose of enhancement of the survival of the species").

[5] FEI's contention that its treatment of the Asian elephants does not implicate the ESA at all is predicated on its argument that "take" should be accorded its narrow common law meaning and that the various statutory words used to define take – i.e., harm, harass, wound, etc. – should likewise be construed narrowly to conform to that common law understanding. But that is precisely the approach to statutory construction that the Supreme Court rejected in Sweet Home. See 515 U.S. at 701 n.15 ("Because such conduct would not constitute a taking at common law, the dissent would shield it from § 9 liability, even though the words 'kill' and 'harm' in the statutory definition could apply to such deliberate conduct. We cannot accept that limitation.").

of the ESA in TVA v. Hill, 437 U.S. 153 (1978). In that case, the Attorney General argued that, notwithstanding the plain language of the ESA, Congress could not possibly have intended the Act to halt construction of a nearly completed $ 100 million public works project and that if Congress had desired that "curious" result then it would have specifically said so. Id. at 172.

The Court rejected that approach, explaining that "[i]t is not for us to speculate, much less act, on whether Congress would have altered its stance had the specific events of this case been anticipated." Id. at 185. Rather, because "Congress has spoken in the plainest of words, making it abundantly clear that the balance has been struck in favor of affording endangered species the highest of priorities," the Court was obligated to apply the Act's safeguards to the situation before it. Id. at 194. Since that analysis was applied in Hill to a massive public works project that Congress continued to fund after enactment of the ESA, and the blocking of which would impose a "burden on the public through the loss of millions of unrecoverable dollars," id. at 187, there is certainly no legitimate reason why the Court should read defendant's treatment of its endangered elephants out of the Act's protections here.[6]

III. CONGRESS DELEGATED AUTHORITY TO ISSUE REGULATIONS IMPLEMENTING THE ESA'S TAKE PROHIBITION TO THE FWS.

Because this case arises under the ESA, and because the elephants at issue are protected by that Act, the FWS is the only federal agency with any statutory or regulatory authority pertinent ***to this case***. Indeed, as FEI flatly admits, "Congress vested FWS with the authority to implement the ESA." FEI's Pretrial Brief (DE 362) at 32 (emphasis added). Accordingly, under

---

[6] Indeed, the Court in Hill further observed that "[v]irtually all dealings with endangered species, including taking, possession, transportation, and sale were prohibited [by the ESA] . . . except in extremely narrow circumstances." 437 U.S. at 180 (emphasis added).

elementary administrative law principles, because the FWS is the agency to which Congress delegated "administrative and interpretive power" over endangered species such as the Asian elephant, Sweet Home, 515 U.S. at 708, it is the FWS – and ***only*** the FWS – to which the Court could look for any interpretive guidance should the Court perceive some ambiguity in how the ESA's take prohibitions apply to the conduct at issue. See Chevron U.S.A. Inc. v. Natural Res. Def. Council, 467 U.S. 837, 842 (1984) (a court may defer only to an agency's interpretation of an ambiguous "statute which it administers").[7]

This analysis is not altered by the fact that one part of one of the FWS's regulations elaborating on the meaning of one of the take definitions (that of "harass") makes reference to standards of the United States Department of Agriculture ("USDA") implementing the AWA. See 50 C.F.R. § 17.3. Plaintiffs' take claim focuses on three distinct parts of the take definition, any one of which, if satisfied, is sufficient for plaintiffs to prevail in this case. As to "wound[ing]," the FWS has adopted no regulatory definition, and hence under basic principles of statutory construction, the dictionary definition of that word applies. See, e.g., Pub. Citizen v. U.S. Dep't of Health & Human Serv., 332 F.3d 654, 662-63 (D.C. Cir. 2003). As for "harm," the FWS has defined that word to mean "an act which actually kills or injures wildlife," 50 C.F.R. §

---

[7] Because the evidence clearly demonstrates that FEI's routine chaining practices and bullhook use have "harmed," "harassed," and "wounded" the animals – within the plain meaning of those terms, as well as within their regulatory definitions – there is no need for the Court to consider the views of any Executive Branch agency to resolve this citizen suit. However, if the Court does consider soliciting the views of the FWS, plaintiffs suggest that the Court do so only ***after*** making factual findings but before issuing any legal conclusions, so that any input the agency provides on the meaning or application of the ESA to the facts of this case is based on the same record off which the Court is operating. Cf. Auer v. Robbins, 519 U.S. 452, 461 (1997) (soliciting Secretary of Labor's views regarding the correct application of regulations to the factual record compiled in the lower courts in litigation between non-federal litigants).

17.3, and the regulatory definition makes no mention of AWA standards.

Finally, as to "harass," the FWS has defined that word to mean conduct which "creates the likelihood of injury" by "significantly disrupt[ing] normal behavioral patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding, or sheltering." Id. However, the FWS has also provided that "[t]his definition, when applied to captive wildlife, does not include" certain activities, including "generally accepted [] [a]nimal husbandry practices that meet or exceed the minimum standards for facilities and care" under the AWA. Id. Thus, before the AWA standards would even be consulted, a particular activity would ***first*** have to be deemed a "generally accepted animal husbandry practice" for the particular listed species at issue.[8]

In any event, the mere fact that FWS opted to cross-reference the AWA standards has no bearing on which Executive Branch agency has statutory or regulatory authority with regard to the proper application of the legislative scheme before the Court. See, e.g., Paralyzed Veterans of America v. D.C. Arena, L.P., 117 F.3d 579, 585 (D.C. Cir. 1997) (deferring to Justice Department's interpretation of implementing regulations that had been copied verbatim from another agency because the statute at issue made the regulations solely "the Justice Department's responsibility"); Sec'y of Labor v. Excel Mining, LLC, 334 F.3d 1, 7 (D.C. Cir. 2003) (following Paralyzed Veterans); Navarro, 261 F.3d at 92, 99 (although the Secretary of Labor, in implementing the Family and Medical Leave Act ("FMLA") "simply co-opted existing

---

[8] It is plaintiffs' position that routinely striking Asian elephants with bullhooks, and chaining them in railroad cars and on concrete surfaces for prolonged periods, are not even "husbandry practices," let alone "generally accepted" practices. See DE 96 at 35-38. Indeed, in adopting this definition of harassment, the FWS emphasized that the ESA would ***never*** permit the "physical mistreatment" of captive animals, or any other conditions that "might create the likelihood of injury or sickness," or result in animals "not being treated in a humane manner." 63 Fed. Reg. 48634, 48638 (Sept. 11, 1998) (emphasis added).

definitions by a different agency [the EEOC] for use in a different statute," the court declined to afford any Chevron deference to the EEOC's interpretations of the definitions because the "EEOC itself has been granted no rulemaking power under the FLMA, and therefore its interpretive guidance is certainly not entitled to deference"); cf. Aeronautical Repair Station Ass'n, Inc. v. FAA, 494 F.3d 161, 176 (D.C. Cir. 2007) (refusing to defer to an agency's interpretation of a statute that the agency "does not administer").[9]

---

[9] Accordingly, FEI's position that the Court should invoke the doctrine of "primary jurisdiction" by deferring to the USDA's enforcement of the AWA is groundless. USDA has ***no***, let alone "primary," jurisdiction, over the ESA take prohibition. See United States v. Philadelphia Nat. Bank, 374 U.S. 321, 352-54 (1963) (the doctrine allows a court only to defer review "in cases where protection of the integrity of a regulatory scheme dictates preliminary resort to the agency which administers the scheme") (emphasis added). Further, the doctrine only comes into play when ongoing administrative proceedings are pending before an agency, see Envtl.Def. Fund v. EPA, 852 F.2d 1316, 1330-31 (D.C. Cir. 1988), or where there is some formal process whereby the plaintiff may seek relief from the agency. Local Union No. 189, Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of N. Am., AFL-CIO v. Jewel Tea Co., 381 U.S. 676, 687-88 (1965). Neither is the case here; to the contrary, although USDA investigators have routinely documented serious violations of the AWA in connection with FEI's treatment of its endangered elephants, FEI has in the past been highly successful in persuading high-ranking USDA officials to avoid enforcement actions entirely or to settle for minor penalties that FEI merely regards as a cost of doing business. See ASPCA *et. al*, *Government Sanctioned Abuse: How the [USDA] Allows Ringling Brothers Circus to Systematically Mistreat Elephants* (Sept. 2003) (excerpts attached as Ex. A); see also Pf. WC Ex. 53 (Ex. B). Unfortunately, this pattern of non-enforcement is commonplace when it comes to the AWA; recent investigations by USDA's own Inspector General have found that the agency "is not aggressively pursuing enforcement actions against violators of the AWA," and has generally imposed "minimal" fines that do not effectively deter repeat violations. USDA Office of Inspector General, Report. No. 33002-3-SF, Audit Report, APHIS Animal Care Program Inspection and Enforcement Activities, Exec. Summ. (Sept. 2005) (available at http://www.usda.gov/oig/webdocs/33002-03-SF.pdf. (Pl. WC Ex. 89). Not surprisingly, therefore, in the entire history of the AWA, only two elephants have been confiscated by the USDA and plaintiffs are aware of only two elephant exhibitors who have lost their licenses for even the most egregious AWA violations. See http://www.elephants.com.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Eric R. Glitzenstein

Eric R. Glitzenstein (D.C. Bar No. 358287)
Katherine A. Meyer (D.C. Bar No. 244301)
Howard M. Crystal (D.C. Bar No. 446189)
Tanya M. Sanerib (D.C. Bar No. 473506)
Delcianna J. Winders (D.C. Bar No. 488056)

Meyer Glitzenstein & Crystal
1601 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20009
(202) 588-5206

Dated: February 13, 2009

Counsel for Plaintiffs

A Report by The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, The Fund For Animals, and the Animal Welfare Institute

Government Sanctioned Abuse:

How the United States Department of Agriculture Allows Ringling Brothers Circus to Systematically Mistreat Elephants

September 2003

ASPCA
The American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
424 E. 92nd St.
New York, NY 10128-6804
(212) 876-7700
www.aspca.org

The Fund for Animals
we speak for those who can't
200 West 57th St.
New York, NY 10019
(888) 405-FUND
www.fund.org

Animal Welfare Institute
P.O. Box 3650
Washington, D.C. 20027
(703) 836-4300
www.awionline.org

PLAINTIFFS' EXHIBIT J
To Plaintiffs' Opposition to Defendants' Motion
For Summary Judgment
Civ. No. 03-2006 (EGS/JMF)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Memo from Dr. Kohn to Miava Binkley with attachments;
Expert Responses summary (4/12/99)
Letter to Julie Strauss from Ron DeHaven informing RB that the handling of 2 baby elephants is not in compliance with the Animal Welfare Act (5/11/99)
Letter from Jacqueline Freeman to Charmain Zordan with attachment; affidavit of Dr. Gary West (2/16/01)
Letter to Julie Strauss from Ron DeHaven re:
investigation is closed with no action (7/23/01)
Letter to Ron DeHaven from Jeannie Perron re:
the use of the word "investigation" (8/9/01)
Letter to Jeannie Perron from Ron DeHaven re:
the investigation was more of a "fact gathering process" (8/10/01)

V. The Death of Benjamin

Documents:

Affidavit of Hugh Patrick Harned, Benjamin's trainer (7/29/99)
USDA Report of Investigation (9/1/99)
Memorandum to Ron Stanley from Kenneth Vail (11/24/99)
Memo fromCraig Reed to Ron DeHaven re:
insufficient basis to support prosecution (12/2/99)

VI. The Santa Clara Valley Humane Society's Complaints of Routine Bullhook Use

Documents:

Investigations Report, Officer Franco (9/8/99)
Investigations Report. Officer Revier (9/8/99)
Investigations Report, Officer Wallace (9/8/99)
Investigations Report, Officer Reeve (11/15/99)
Affidavit of Dr. Joel Parrot re: review of 62 photographs (7/25/00)
Memo to Ron DeHaven from Barbara Kohn (7/5/01)
Letter to Alan Christian from Ron DeHaven re: case closed with no action (7/17/01)

VII. Allegations by Former Ringling Bros. Employee Tom Rider

Documents:

Complaint Letter to USDA (4/10/2000)
Memo to Robert Gibbens from Diane Ward (7/21/00)
Email to Diane Ward from Betty Goldentyer (8/7/00)
Memo to Alan Christian from Diane Ward (11/24/00)
Memo to Alan Christian from Diane Ward (3/26/01)
Email to Diane Ward from Alan Christian (8/8/01)

Case 1:03-cv-02006-EGS Document 96-12 Filed 10/06/2006 Page 5 of 8

Memo to Diane Ward from Charmain Zordan (8/27/01)

VIII. Abuse In San Francisco

Documents:

Affidavit of Joseph Patrick Cuviello (9/25/00)
Anonymous letter re: eye-witness to elephant abuse by Ringling handler (8/23/00)
USDA Inspection Report (9/7/00)

IX. Striking of Asia With A Bullhook

Documents:

Humane Society of Santa Clara Valley citation to Mark Oliver Gebel (8/25/01)

X. Tuberculosis

Documents:

Ringling Brothers Elephant Inventory noting positive TB elephants (6/9/98)
Email reporting on a visit to Williston Elephant Retirement Center
and "Dolly's" euthanasia (12/10/98)
USDA Inspection Report re: lack of treatment for positive TB elephant (2/10/99)
Email to Miava Binkley from Janet Payeur re: another TB positive elephant (9/10/99)
Florida Dept. of Agriculture Inspection Report (10/14/99)
Deposition of Joel Kaplan (excerpts)
Memorandum to Samuel Santiago from Diane Ward re: TB and "Tillie" (8/30/00)
USDA Inspection Report re: Tillie not receiving TB treatment (9/6/00)
Memo to Dr. Miava Binkley from Tom Callahan re:
TB treatment of Tillie (9/7/00)
Memorandum to Alan Christian from Diane Ward (11/24/00).
Letter to Dr. Jeannie Perron from Ron DeHaven
re: withdrawing Animal Welfare Act violation (1/31/01)
Memorandum to Diane Ward from Frank Keyser (2/5/01)
Record of conversation with Dr. Miava Binkley
re: Dr. DeHaven's overriding a citation (2/20/01)
Two letters to Dr. M. Binkley from William Lindsay
re: positive TB elephant "India" (3/26/01)
Memorandum to Alan Christian from Diane Ward (3/26/01)
Affidavit of Dr. Janet Payeur
listing RB elephants who tested positive for TB (4/16/01)

Executive Summary

Hundreds of documents released as a result of litigation under the Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) reveal that the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) – charged with enforcing the federal Animal Welfare Act – routinely looks the other way when the Ringling Brothers Barnum and Bailey circus beats and otherwise mistreats the elephants in its circus. The records also demonstrate that many elephants have tested positive for Tuberculosis – a disease that is highly communicable to humans – and that the USDA has failed to disclose this information to the public.

The records, released as a result of litigation by the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, the Fund for Animals, and the Animal Welfare Institute, show that in case after case brought to the USDA in the last five years by animal welfare organizations, state humane agencies, former Ringling Bros. employees, and even USDA's own inspectors, the USDA purposely ignored crucial evidence, closed investigations prematurely, and overrode its own inspectors' and investigators' determinations – allowing Ringling to insist to the public that there is no truth to any allegations that it abuses its elephants.

- In one instance, although internal documents show that USDA investigators found that a trainer's use of a bullhook on a baby elephant named Benjamin "created behavioral stress and trauma which **precipitated in the physical harm and ultimate death of the animal**,"[1] the USDA memorandum closing the case omitted all references to this finding and instead stated that "suddenly, and without any signs of distress or struggle, Benjamin became unconscious and drowned." No enforcement action was taken by the USDA.

- In another incident, although the USDA determined that Ringling's use of chains and ropes to forcibly remove nursing elephants from their mothers at Ringling's "Center for Elephant Conservation" caused the animals "**unnecessary trauma, behavioral stress, [and] physical harm**," and "was not in compliance with the Animal Welfare Act," the agency quietly closed the investigation without taking any enforcement action.

- The records also show that the USDA has been extremely cooperative in helping Ringling keep the public from knowing that as many as 8 elephants have tested positive for TB and many more have been exposed to the disease. In one instance, although a USDA investigator originally cited Ringling for failing to provide any medical treatment for an elephant who had tested positive, a high level USDA official later "overrode" that citation when Ringling's attorneys complained.

The records also reveal an extraordinarily cozy relationship between Ringling and the USDA. Ringling runs "training" seminars for USDA personnel at its multi-million dollar "conservation" facility in Polk City, Florida, where it breeds elephants for its circus, and Ringling hired as its "Vice President for Animal Care" the former Deputy Director of the USDA's Division of Animal Care. The records also indicate that the agency provides Ringling with advance notice of inspections,

[1] All bold, italicized or underlined emphasis herein have been supplied by the authoring organizations.

routinely allows Ringling's lawyers and other officials to accompany USDA inspectors on "unannounced" inspections, and allows Ringling to refuse inspectors and investigators access to records. The records also demonstrate that USDA officials instruct inspectors to refrain from issuing "citations" to Ringling Bros. for violations of the Animal Welfare Act and even "overrides" or "retracts" citations that are issued, retroactively. The records further show that the USDA's Office of General Counsel allows Ringling's officials to determine what records the investigators may see, that the USDA does not follow-up on obvious investigatory leads or even interview eye-witnesses to abuse, and that the USDA issues statements exonerating Ringling, and has even agreed to change the wording of letters it has already sent to Ringling – all to accommodate Ringling's well financed public relations efforts.

Congress enacted The Animal Welfare Act (AWA) in 1966 and amended it in 1970 to ensure that animals used for exhibition purposes, including circuses, "are provided humane care and treatment." The USDA has exclusive authority to enforce the statute, and may seek both civil and criminal penalties for violations of the law. Unlike many environmental laws, there is no "citizen suit" provision. Therefore, only the USDA can enforce the statute. When it fails to do so, it makes a mockery of the statute's intent to protect animals from inhumane treatment.

This Report traces nine different investigations over a five-year period – all but one of which was closed with absolutely no enforcement action taken against Ringling Bros. The single enforcement action brought by the USDA was based on the agency's conclusion that top-level officials at Ringling – famed animal trainer Gunther Gebel Williams and his son, Mark Oliver Gebel – had insisted on publicly displaying a gravely ill baby elephant three times in one day against the explicit advice of Ringling's own veterinarian. The baby, Kenny, died soon after the third performance. When Ringling refused to admit any culpability, the agency charged it with violations of the AWA. However, the agency then settled the case by allowing Ringling to contribute $10,000 to a "sanctuary" in Thailand that trains elephants to work in the timber industry and that employs the same expert Ringling hired to testify that Kenny was treated humanely. Under the settlement, Ringling also hired as its new "Vice President for Animal Care" the same individual who for 27 years had been the Deputy Director of the USDA's Division of Animal Care, i.e., the office responsible for enforcing the Animal Welfare Act. The USDA also provided Ringling with a written statement that "Ringling Bros. has never been adjudged to have violated the Animal Welfare Act or the Regulations and Standards issued thereunder" – a statement that to this day is touted by Ringling as proof that it does not mistreat its elephants.

Feld Entertainment, which, in addition to the circus, also owns Siegfried and Roy (a Las Vegas magic act), the Ice Follies, Holiday on Ice, Walt Disney's World on Ice, and several other entertainment operations, bills itself as "the largest provider of live action family entertainment in the world," with "the circus as the hub."[2] Elephants, and especially baby elephants, are extremely popular attractions at circuses and zoos in this country, bringing in hundreds of millions of dollars in ticket sales each year. According to Kenneth Feld, CEO of Feld Entertainment, without the elephants, Ringling's highly profitable circus would go out of business.[3]

---

[2] Feld Entertainment website.

[3] See USA Today (January 6, 2000), 9D.

From: Wiedner, Ellen
Sent: Saturday, October 23, 2004 06:51 PM
To: Lindsay, William
Subject: RE: WQ Animal Welfare Training

Sounds like Ringling has a fairly regular history of letting its vets hang out to dry...

From: Lindsay, William
Sent: Sat 10/23/2004 2:48 AM
To: Wiedner, Ellen
Subject: RE: WQ Animal Welfare Training

I am on an airplane with too much time to kill. I sent out an official response to you separately.

This is different from ACO training.

Many years ago, probably 1997, there was a young DVM, Gary West, between Dick Houck and myself. There was a young ele, 3 or 4 years old, on the Red with Gunther. He was named "Kenny" after Mr. Feld. The ele got sick in Miami I think, Gary W. ok'ed him to stand in the ring to watch the performance - rather than get anxious in the tent all by himself. He died in the train that night enroute to Jacksonville. Gary lived in Orlando, so he drove to JAX and did post in the train car. Nothing on PM – just enteritis. Oh – the clinical signs were sudden onset of anorexia, then several hours of dysentery, then death. All cultures normal; no Herpes; C. perfringens was put out as the cause of death.

So far so good, eh?

Then comes the USDA investigation, the first one ever I think. There was the usual corporate casting of blame in many directions, but Gary W. lost. No one really stood behind him, he eventually quit. We lost the investigation – oops, I mean we "settled" with the USDA. So I think legal did not do a good job. The terms of the settlement were that we gave about $ 10,000 to an elephant orphanage in Asia. This may not have been the best place or best way to help the Asian elephant, but it looked good.

We also agreed to what is called Animal Welfare training. Twice a year for 4 years I think, we had a retired USDA veterinarian come in and read the rules to us – often in Winter Quarters. He was a nice man, with some good info, but a very dry speaker. Dry means boring, Dr. Wiedner. There never was an interpreter, so imagine how long he held the attention of the Russian Cossacks, or the Red Show horse crew. I have been suggesting we alter this so it is an educational opportunity for our animal handlers, and actually challenged you and Allison on the porch at the CEC about 9 mos ago to get creative with this. You probably had no idea what I was talking about!!!!!!!

I have suggested topics like – dress code
Animal nutrition
How to behave in front of activists
Animal behaviour – imprint training, "don't shoot the dog" stuff (have you read this?)
How to lead and tie up an animal
Interpreters were recommended
We usually have dart gun training at the same time

REDACTED NON - RESPONSIVE

End of story.

W. A. Lindsay, D.V.M.
Director of Veterinary Care, Ringling Bros. and Barnum & Bailey Circus.