UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

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

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR ENTITLEMENT TO ATTORNEYS' FEES

EXHIBIT 2

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

FELD ENTERTAINMENT, INC. : Civil Action No. 07-1532

Plaintiff

v. : June 23, 2011

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR THE PREVENTION OF CRUELTY TO

ANIMALS, et al.,

Defendants : 10:10 a.m.

TRANSCRIPT OF MOTION HEARING
BEFORE THE HONORABLE EMMET G. SULLIVAN
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiff: JOHN M. SIMPSON

MICHELLE PARDO

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP 801 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20004-2623

(202) 662-4539

For Defendants STEPHEN L. BRAGA
Tom Rider and ROPES GRAY LLP

TOM KIGEL and KOPES GRAL INF

Wildlife Advocacy Project: 700 12th Street, NW

Suite 900 Washington, DC 20005

(202) 508-4655

For Defendants ANDREW B. WEISSMAN

Jonathan Lovvorn and WILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE

Kimberly Ockene: & DORR, LLP

1875 Pennsylvania Avenue NW

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 663-6612

For Defendant Humane Society

of the United States:

WILLIAM B. NES

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

9th Floor

Washington, DC 20004-2541

(202) 739-5779

1 THE COURT: Not at this point. I'll take a short Did you want a minute or two to make a point? 2 recess. 3 MS. STEEL: Thank you, Your Honor. As Your Honor knows, I represent the lawyers, and I would like an opportunity 5 to tell you exactly where the lawyers were in connection with this case. 6 This whole theory, this whole construct that 7 Mr. Simpson comes up with is based upon a house of cards. 8 9 house of cards is, you have a client who you call as a witness who is impeached. I have been practicing for 20 years as a 10 litigator; every single lawyer who is worth his or her salt has 11 12 a client or a witness who is put up on the witness stand where 13 there is something to impeach them about, whether it's a prior 14 inconsistent statement, whether it's --15 THE COURT: I think the word I used during the trial 16 was he was pulverized. And quite frankly, my years on the 17 bench, I don't think I've seen a witness as totally discredited 18 on just about every aspect of his testimony as I did during the 19 course of that trial. 20 MS. STEEL: Your Honor, that's true. 21 It wasn't just simple impeachment, it THE COURT: 22 wasn't just a prior inconsistent statement. 23 MS. STEEL: But just because a witness or a client is 24 impeached doesn't mean --25 THE COURT: He wasn't just impeached. He was

(202) 354-3249

thoroughly discredited.

MS. STEEL: But it doesn't mean that the entire lawsuit was fraudulent. If you have a group of lawyers --

THE COURT: Isn't plaintiff entitled to pursue his theory, though? He can demonstrate, and he's alleged, a pattern or practice of Rider being paid for years. Rider didn't work anywhere else, he paid no taxes during the time he was whatever his capacity was on behalf of the -- well, in this lawsuit. And it wasn't as if this was just a part-time job he had. They made a pretty compelling -- they painted a pretty compelling picture of him being literally a paid employee. Essentially that's what I found, a paid plaintiff.

MS. STEEL: Well, *Iqbal* and *Twombly* only allow a case to proceed if the allegations, the theory, the construct is plausible.

I submit to you that it's not plausible to say that just because a witness is impeached necessarily means they're intentionally lying, necessarily means that ergo everybody who comes into contact with him knows he's lying; with ergo everything he does is a lie, everything he advocates for is a lie, ergo every lawyer who comes into contact with him should find he's a liar and not put him on the witness stand; and everybody who comes into contact with him is therefore involved in this RICO conspiracy based upon the initial construct: He was impeached at trial.