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THE CLERK: Calling item No. 3, CV-14-9448-R: Americans For Prosperity Foundation versus Kamala Harris.

Counsel, please step forward and make your appearances.

MR. BARZA: Good morning, Your Honor.
Harold Barza, of Quinn Emanuel, on behalf of the plaintiff Americans For Prosperity.

This morning, our argument will be handled by my partner --

THE COURT: Well, we haven't had the other side yet. All right.

MR. BARZA: I apologize. Go ahead.
MS. GORDON: Good morning, Your Honor.
Alexandra Robert Gordon from the office of the Attorney General, on behalf of defendant Attorney General Kamala Harris.

MS. PACHTER: Good morning, Your Honor.

Tamar Pachter.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. BARZA: Thank you. Your Honor, this
morning my partner, Derek Shaffer, from our Washington office will be arguing. And with us will also be Jonathan Cooper from that office.

And we have here our clients, Victor Bernson, the general counsel of our client, and Peter Schalestock, the deputy general counsel.

THE COURT: All right. Counsel have anything to add to the documents which have been filed in this matter?

MR. BARZA: Your Honor, not unless the Court has any questions about it.

THE COURT: I don't have any questions.

Anything to add?
MS. GORDON: No, Your Honor, not unless the Court has questions for the defendant.

THE COURT: All right, then. In this circuit there two interested -- inter-related legal tests for the issuance of a preliminary injunction. These tests are not separate, but rather represent the outer reaches a single continuum.

At one end of the continuum, the moving party is required to show both a probability of success on the merits and possibility of irreparable injury.

At the other end of the continuum, the moving party must demonstrate that serious legal
questions are raised and that the balance of hardship tips so sharply in its favor. The relative hardship to the parties is the critical element in deciding at which point along the continuum a stay is justified.

In addition, in cases such as the one before us, the public interest is a factor to be strongly considered.

Lopez versus Heckler, 713 F.2d 1342 (Ninth Circuit 1983).

Plaintiff Americans For Prosperity
Foundation seeks to enjoin defendant Kamala Harris, in her official capacity as Attorney General of California, from demanding or from taking any action to implement or enforce her demand for the names and addresses of the Foundation's donors, as contained in schedule B to IRS Form 990 .

Defendant maintains that the preliminary injunction test should not be reached because plaintiff must first and has failed to -- to make a prima facie showing of a First Amendment violation. Plaintiff denies such a showing is necessary, but maintains that in any case such a showing has been made here.

Instructive here is a related case, Center
For Competitive Politics verus Harris, No. 14-15978 (Ninth Circuit) herein after referred to as the CCP
case, a case in which a plaintiff -- plaintiff Center also challenges the attorney general's demand for the Schedule B of a $501(\mathrm{c})(3)$ charity on First Amendment and preemption grounds.

The District Court in that case denied the Center's motion for preliminary injunction, finding that the plaintiff had failed to even attempt to make a prima facie showing of a First Amendment violation.
C.C.P. 2014, WL 2002244 , at paragraph 6 the Eastern District of California May 14, 2014.

However, on January 6, 2015, the Ninth Circuit issued an injunction pending appeal in C.C.P. That injunction prohibits the attorney general from taking any action against the Center For Competitive Politics for failure to file an unredacted IRS Form 990 Schedule B, pending further order of this Court.
C.C.P. No. 14-5978, Docket 34, Ninth Circuit, January 6, 2015 .

The Ninth Circuit issued an injunction following the attorney general's letter to that plaintiff threatening to find the Center's employees and suspend its registration if it did not hand over its Schedule B. An almost identical letter was sent to plaintiffs in this case.

In deciding whether to issue a stay pending
appeal the Court considers (1) whether the stay applicant has made a strong showing that he is likely to succeed on the merits, (2) whether the applicant will be irreparably injured absent a stay, (3) whether issuance of the stay will substantially injure the other parties interested in the proceeding and, (4) where the public interest lies. Humane Society of U.S. versus Gutierrez, 523 F.3d 990 (Ninth Circuit 2008). Thus, the four-factor test for evaluating a preliminary injunction pending appeal appears to be identical to that for a preliminary injunction.

Assumably, then, because the Ninth Circuit issued the preliminary injunction pending appeal despite the Center's failure to even attempt to make a prima facie showing of a First Amendment violation such showing is not necessary. Defendant has not identified any reason why the two cases are in -- are distinguishable.

Moreover, defendant clearly believes one to be instructive of the other, as she heavily relied on the C.C.P. District Court opinion in her opposition.

Moreover, even if it were not the case, plaintiff in this case has made -- has made such a showing. The Court notes it may at this juncture consider inadmissible evidence.

See, that is, Republic of the Philippines verus Marcos, 862 F.2d 1355 (Ninth Circuit 1988) (en banc).

Defendant's objections are therefore overruled, and the Court considers the full record of proffered evidence.

As explained in this Court's February 11, 2015, order, Plaintiff has proffered sufficient evidence establishing that public disclosure would have a chilling effect on free speech.

Additionally, plaintiff has made a prima facie showing even if a Schedule B was only disclosed to defendant because (1) defendant's policy to keep such information confidential is not binding and might not withstand legal challenge under Government Code section 12590, California's charity act public inspection law; (2) defendant's policy is impermissibly entirely discretionary and could change at any moment, See Doe versus Harris, 772 F.3d 563; and (3) defendant has no regulation regarding who has access to such information; and (4) even if only defendant and the identified individuals had access, plaintiff's doer -- donors who have witnessed harassment of those perceived to be connected with plaintiff's co-founders have experienced their unwillingness to continue to participate if such
limited disclosure is made.
Accordingly, plaintiff has made a sufficient prima facie showing of a First Amendment violation.

Regarding the substance of plaintiff's
request, plaintiff has raised serious questions going to the merits and demonstrated that the balance of hardship sharply favor plaintiff.

Again, the Ninth Circuit's issuance of an injunction in the $C C P$ case is instructive. Once any necessary prima facie showing is made, the burden shifts and a defendant must demonstrate the existence that both a compelling state interest exists and a substantial relationship between the information sought and that overriding the compeling state interest.

Brown versus Socialist Workers '74 Campaign Com. Ohio, 459 U.S. 87 (1982).

Plaintiff has sufficiently questioned the nature of defendant's interest, noting it pertains to national donor information, and the defendant lacks expressive statutory authority to access such information.

Moreover, even such interest was -moreover, even such interest was compelling, plaintiff has offered numerous less intrusive alternatives which could satisfy defendant's oversight of law enforcement
goals, including (1) defendant could promulgate a formal regulation exempting Schedule B from public disclosure and limiting the uses of and access to donor information, (2) defendant could limit her demands for Schedule B to charities she chooses to audit perhaps because they have engaged in fraudulent or illegal activity, (3) defendant could require charities to complete a new form answering questions to elicit, quote, the fact that alternatives could advance the government asserting a manner less intrusive to First Amendment rights indicates that a law is more extensive than necessary.

Thomas versus Western States Medical Center, 533 U.S. 357 (2002).

Finally, the balance of hardship sharply favors plaintiff because defendant has not suffered harm from not possessing plaintiff's schedule B for the last decade. The hardship plaintiff would face from disclosure, however, is far greater and likely irreparable.

When, as here, an ordinance infringes on First Amendment rights of those seeking to express their views, the balance of equities and the public interest tip in favor of -- in favor of enjoining the ordinance. Klein versus City of San Clemente, 584 F.3d

1196 (Ninth Circuit 2009).
For all these reasons, a preliminary
injunction is proper here where plaintiff has, at the very least, raised serious questions as to the merits and demonstrated that the balance of hardships and public interest sharply flavor -- favor plaintiff.

Accordingly, the Court declines to address plaintiff's preemption arguments. Plaintiff's for motion for preliminary injunction is therefore granted.

Petitioner to submit the order consistent with this ruling.

That's it, gentlemen.
MR. BARZA: Thank you, Your Honor.
Thank you very much.
THE COURT: And ladies. (PROCEEDINGS CONCLUDED.)
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