1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA		
2	X		
3	AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE Docket No. 03-2006 PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS, ET AL,		
4	Plaintiffs,		
5	v. Washington, D.C. October 15, 2010 1:00 p.m.		
6	FELD ENTERTAINMENT, INC.,		
7	Defendant. AND		
8	FELD ENTERTAINMENT, INC., Docket No. 07-1532 Plaintiffs,		
9	V.		
10	AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY		
11	TO ANIMALS, ET AL,		
12	Defendants. X		
13	STATUS HEARING BEFORE THE HONORABLE EMMET G. SULLIVAN		
14	UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE		
15	APPEARANCES:		
16	For the Plaintiffs: HOWARD M. CRYSTAL, ESQUIRE ERIC GLITZENSTEIN, ESQUIRE		
	Meyer, Glitzenstein & Crystal		
17	1601 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Suite 700		
18	Washington, D.C. 20009 202.588.5206		
19			
20	STEPHEN L. BRAGA, ESQUIRE Ropes & Gray		
21	One Metro Center 700 12th Street, N.W., Suite 900		
22	Washington, D.C. 20005 202.508.4600		
23	LAURA N. STEEL, ESQUIRE		
24	KATHLEEN H. WARIN, ESQUIRE Wilson Elser Moskowitz Edelman & Dicker		
25	700 11th Street, N.W., Suite 400 Washington, D.C. 20001		
۷)	202.626.7660		

ı	ı	
1	APPEARANCES: (CONT'D	.)
2	For the Defendant:	JOHN M. SIMPSON, ESQUIRE MICHELLE C. PARDO, ESQUIRE
3		RICHARD C. SMITH, ESQUIRE Fulbright & Jaworski, LLP
4		801 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Suite 500
5 6		Washington, D.C. 20004 202.724.6522
7	Court Reporter:	Catalina Kerr, RPR, CRR U.S. District Courthouse
8		Room 6509 Washington, D.C. 20001
9		202.354.3258
10	produced by computer.	by mechanical stenography, transcript
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
1617		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S 2 (1:00 P.M.; OPEN COURT.) 3 THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please remain seated and come to order. Civil Action 03-2006, American Society for the 4 5 Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, et al versus Feld Entertainment, Inc. and 07-1532, Feld Entertainment, Inc. 6 7 versus American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to 8 Animals, et al. Would counsel please identify yourselves for 9 the record. 10 MR. GLITZENSTEIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. 11 Glitzenstein on behalf of the Plaintiffs in the ASPCA versus 12 Feld case. 13 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. 14 MR. BRAGA: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Stephen 15 Braga on behalf of the nonlawyer defendants in the RICO case. 16 THE COURT: Counsel. 17 MS. STEEL: Good afternoon, Your Honor. I'm Laura Steel. I'm here on behalf of the lawyer defendants in the 18 19 RICO case. 20 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. 21 MR. CRYSTAL: Howard Crystal on behalf of the 22 Plaintiffs in the ASPCA case. 23 THE COURT: All right. Counsel. 24 MS. WARIN: Your Honor, Kathleen Warin here on behalf of the lawyer defendants in the RICO case.

1 THE COURT: Counsel. 2 MR. SIMPSON: Good afternoon, Your Honor. John 3 Simpson for the Defendant in 07 -- or 03-2006 as the Plaintiff and 07-1532 as Defendant. 4 5 THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon. MS. PARDO: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Michelle 6 7 Pardo for the Defendant, Feld Entertainment. 8 THE COURT: Ms. Pardo. 9 MR. SMITH: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Richard 10 Smith for the Plaintiff in the RICO matter. 11 THE COURT: All right. Sorry to hear you weren't 12 able to settle, but you know, we'll go forward. And I've had 13 a chance to reflect on your suggestions, your recommendations. Here's -- and I'll hear from counsel briefly, but here's what 14 15 I think should happen with respect to the RICO case. Well, first of all, the attorney's fee issue. 16 17

Well, first of all, the attorney's fee issue.

Notwithstanding counsel's assurances that I won't be reversed,

I think the better part of wisdom is to resolve the question

of cost and attorney's fees after -- you know, after the

Circuit has resolved and issued a mandate in its case.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The RICO case should go forward. There's been no responsive pleading filed. I understand that. It's one interest thing that made me chuckle. If I understand Plaintiffs' position in the RICO matter, Plaintiffs have no problem with giving the Defendants in that case 30 days within

which to file a motion to dismiss, but they want three months to file a response. I think that both sides — I mean, given the gravity of the significance of the issues raised, I think it's probably wise to give both sides the reasonable amount of additional time that each side needs.

So, having said that, what I think is fair and reasonable with respect to the two RICO cases, to give the Defendants in that case, I think you've asked until December to file a potentially dispositive motion, I believe. I think it's December, first part of December. If I'm wrong, tell me, and give — and be just as courteous to the Plaintiffs to file a response in 60 days.

I haven't really given a lot of thought to reply, although reply briefs are extremely helpful, and if you need 60 days, then I should probably give you 60 days. Resolve that — and right, it's December 3rd, right. And actually the Plaintiffs asked until March 4th. I don't have any problems with that. And Defendants to file their reply by April the 1st.

Apparently everyone agrees with respect to that, that the -- that the reply should be no longer than a month after, and the Court will -- Will I schedule a hearing on that? I don't know whether I will or not. I want to see your pleadings first and then I'll make a decision as to whether the Court would benefit from argument on that, and let the

appeal wind its way through. The parties believe there's a basis for expedited consideration of the appeal, they can seek it. I'm not so sure there is, but that's between the parties and the Circuit Court.

You've exhausted your efforts at trying to settle the case, I assume; is that right? Or you still talking?

MR. SIMPSON: That's correct, Your Honor.

MR. BRAGA: Correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Which one? You still talking or you exhausted?

MR. SIMPSON: We've exhausted.

THE COURT: Exhausted. All right. Yeah, I'll hear from anyone. I mean, I don't think there's anything else to be done here today. I'm sorry you weren't able to settle the case. It's been ten years now, but there's a lot of money involved, though, and I guess the demand to settle is significant, I'm sure.

But whatever happened, happened between counsel and the mediators, I have no idea what happened, so I'm going to make an assumption everyone made a good faith effort. That's fine. Those things happen. It wasn't settled, so let's move on with litigation life. Anyone want to be heard about anything?

MR. BRAGA: Your Honor, just -- Just one second, John. I'm sorry.

1 On behalf of the nonlawyer defendants in the RICO 2 case, the schedule you've outlined is acceptable to us. It's 3 going to take a particular effort to try to get everybody to file one consolidated motion to dismiss for Your Honor. 4 5 There's lots of Defendants. There may be some short 6 supplemental filings, but that time period will give us the 7 ability to do that. We may need some extra pages. We'll ask 8 for that later. 9 THE COURT: I had to consider that issue when I had 10 to craft an order in the multi-district litigation involving 11 polar bears. So we'll probably look at that and use some of

that language. I invite counsel to look at that. Some of the attorneys in that case are here now.

But I want to be fair about that, but I don't need, you know, two or three briefs saying the same thing either. So I need you to take a look at it, but we'll take some language from that as well.

MR. BRAGA: Okay. Very good. Otherwise the schedule is great, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. That's fine. Thank you for your assurances that I'll be affirmed, but you know, who knows.

MR. SIMPSON: I could be wrong, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Absolutely.

I don't think so. MR. SIMPSON:

24

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

2.3

25

THE COURT: Absolutely. Sure. I think that's -- I understand the Circuit's position. The Circuit would like to get everything, but I think probably more judges probably resolve issues of costs and attorney's fees after the mandate's issued. That would be my guess.

MR. SIMPSON: Well, that's certainly within your discretion, Your Honor, and I don't strongly disagree with that. It's just my client was concerned because of the 20-million dollar fee claim that it made a little more sense now that since the D.C. Circuit had actually held the appeal in abeyance, we actually had an opportunity now --

THE COURT: To settle.

MR. SIMPSON: -- for you to go forward, they would hold onto the appeal and we'd have the whole thing there at once. That is possible to do.

And the other part of this, I mean, we've already got a briefing schedule proposed in the D.C. Circuit, and even if that holds and it's perfectly followed, the briefs won't even be filed for seven months once that schedule goes in. So we're looking at a year-and-a-half, two years before we even have an opportunity to come back.

And as Judge Lamberth indicated in the *Brown versus* NFL case that I filed in my notice of filing, you don't get interest on attorney's fees. So that was our thinking, but it's within your discretion under Rule 54.2 to do this, so we

don't -- we'll accept that.

With respect to the RICO matter, Your Honor, we think that it's important today that you -- that you indicate that we go forward in discovery as well.

We've asked that you set a -- that the parties conduct a Rule 26(f) conference on November 15th. We think that this case is going to be complicated. The discovery could be contentious. We think there are a lot of issues to be addressed. We think you should consider appointing a magistrate judge to supervise that.

But I say that, Your Honor, because this case was filed, as you know, in August of 2007, and it was stayed by Your Honor in -- on November 2007. So it was stayed for two -- more than two years before you ruled in the ESA case in December of 2009. And since that time, although there has been a stay period for mediation, the other side has had eight months to think about what they're going to say in response to this complaint, and --

THE COURT: They've had longer than that. I mean, I stayed it for a couple of years, so they've been thinking about it for a long time, I'm sure.

MR. SIMPSON: But my point is, if they want to file a motion to dismiss, that's their right as long as what they're doing is consistent with Rule 11. But what they shouldn't be allowed to do is lodge in this case and get an

embargo on discovery. Because what's going to happen is they're going to file the motion, whatever papers are going to be filed are going to stack up on your desk, and Your Honor — one thing I learned in that trial is you have a nightmare of a schedule. So, inevitably what's going to happen is it's going to sit there and the case will languish.

THE COURT: Maybe I'll send it to a new judge. I haven't thought about that.

MR. SIMPSON: That can happen, too, but then he's going to have cases as well. But what ought not to happen, they shouldn't be allowed to profit from the congestion of this court by embargoing discovery. I think the just thing to do is to move ahead and do the discovery and get this thing started. Make the parties do the plan, get the parties going on discovery on production requests and taking depositions, because we're going to have a lot of issues we need to deal with.

And I would just make an observation here. When we came into the ESA case in 2006, the Defendant filed a motion for summary judgment in August of that year and we asked for a stay of discovery on the ground that we've got a dispositive motion and it would waste resources to do discovery in the interim, and Your Honor denied that motion. And we went forward and did the discovery, and it was during the period of time that year that ensued when all we — when we got involved

in all these disputes about the elephant documents and so forth and so on. And at the end of that period you granted that motion in part and excluded half the elephants from the case. We went ahead and did all the discovery on them anyway.

So I think that's what has to happen in the reality of modern proceedings in modern federal court. We have to go forward on both tracks because otherwise they get the benefit of a delay that they're not entitled to get, and we need to move forward. This is a serious case. I'm not talking about a slip and fall at the Safeway. We're talking about what we think is a criminal conspiracy that resulted in a perpetration on a fraud on the Court. Those are serious allegations.

My client was injured, at a minimum, by a tune of \$20 million as a result, and we want to get this case ready for trial and to proceed. We think the just thing is to proceed with discovery.

THE COURT: All right. Counsel.

MR. BRAGA: Yes, Your Honor. If I might just address that discovery point raised by Mr. Simpson. I mean, certainly the ordinary practice in this case is that the motion to dismiss is ruled on before discovery is undertaken.

I do agree with Mr. Simpson about two things, that discovery is likely to be complicated and it's likely to be contentious. Those are exactly the kinds of cases where when you look at the Supreme Court's decisions in *Twombly versus*

Bell Atlantic and Ashcroft versus Iqbal, that the Court should take a good hard look at whether the pleadings justify going down that discovery road before you open up that can of worms.

like antitrust cases. They're a potential nightmare of discovery. There are many, and I say in all good faith to the Court, there are many substantial grounds for dismissing this RICO complaint, and at the very least what I suggest is that, Your Honor, if you don't want to follow the ordinary practice of postponing discovery until after the motion is ruled on, at the very least wait to make that decision till you see our motion to dismiss filed on December 3rd and you will then see that there is very good grounds for this case never going forward into discovery and not starting in precipitously as Mr. Simpson would like. Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Counsel, anything else?

MR. SIMPSON: Well, I just want to point out, I've been a member of this bar since 1979, and every case I've been involved in but two has been a Defendant's case. I've never gotten a stay of discovery on the basis of a dispositive motion. I've never had that experience.

Maybe I've drawn the wrong judges but I've never had that experience. As far as I know, there is no such custom.

The custom is you go forward on all fronts.

THE COURT: Motions to dismiss?

```
1
               MR. SIMPSON: Motions to dismiss --
 2
               THE COURT: Am I the only one that --
 3
               MR. SIMPSON: -- motions for summary judgment.
               THE COURT: We are the only one that doesn't allow
 4
5
     it for --
6
               MR. SIMPSON: I must have been unlucky, but I've
 7
     never had --
8
               THE COURT: I'm the only one? I can't believe that.
9
               MR. SIMPSON: I've never had that experience.
10
               THE COURT:
                           I need to have a brown bag lunch with my
11
     colleagues if I'm the only one.
12
               (LAUGHTER.)
13
               THE COURT: Seriously. Is that right?
14
               MR. SIMPSON: That's right, Your Honor.
15
    when he said that in that filing, I thought, well, what court
    has he been practicing in because it's different than my
16
17
     experience. But I think, you know, in all seriousness, Your
18
    Honor --
19
               THE COURT: These are complicated issues. You know
20
     look, sure my calendar is demanding but everyone else's
21
     calendar is just as demanding as well, and this motion to
22
    dismiss, which I haven't seen, it's not going to get lost.
23
               I mean, I'm not going to sit here and promise I'll
24
    give you a decision by a certain date. I'm not going do that,
     but I'm not going to let this get lost in the office either.
```

So, you know, counsel's suggestion is a good one. It may well be after December 3rd I take a look at it, and you know, this strikes me as somewhat unusual. Maybe discovery should go forward, I don't know. I think for the time being I'm not going to allow discovery to go forward, but that's something I can revisit on my own at any point in time. I can take a look at the motion and say, you know, I don't think I'm going to be persuaded to dismiss this and this right now or then. There is not a compelling reason to stay discovery. I think I at least owe it to myself to take a look at the motion and then make some preliminary decisions and observations about merit.

But even if I deny -- continue to deny discovery or stay discovery after December, you know, no one's going to do anything to intentionally drag this out. I'm not going to extend the time for filing. These are firm dates that the parties have suggested and I'll give you a prompt decision, but I'm not going to promise a decision by a certain day. I'm not going to do that, but I will give you a prompt decision.

So I'll deny the request to go forward with discovery without prejudice. It's something I can review at, you know, at any point between now and the resolution of the motion to dismiss, and I'll do that.

MR. SIMPSON: Very well, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Anything else?

I	
1	MR. BRAGA: Nothing, Your Honor.
2	THE COURT: All right. Good to see everyone and
3	have a nice weekend.
4	MR. BRAGA: Thank you, Your Honor.
5	THE COURT: All right.
6	THE DEPUTY CLERK: This honorable court now stands
7	in recess.
8	(PROCEEDINGS END AT 1:15 P.M.)
9	*_*_*
10	
11	
12	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER
13	I, Catalina Kerr, certify that the foregoing is a
14	correct transcript from the record of proceedings in the
15	above-entitled matter.
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	Catalina Kerr Date
21	Catalina Kerr Date
22	
23	
24	
25	