

NO. 17-1593

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT**

SEXUAL MINORITIES UGANDA

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

SCOTT LIVELY, individually and as President of Abiding Truth Ministries,

Defendant-Appellant.

**APPELLANT SCOTT LIVELY'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF DENIAL OF MOTION
TO SET ORAL ARGUMENT AND TO EXCLUDE APPELLEE
FROM ORAL ARGUMENT FOR DEFAULT IN FILING BRIEF**

Mathew D. Staver
Horatio G. Mihet
Roger K. Gannam
Daniel J. Schmid
Mary E. McAlister
LIBERTY COUNSEL
P.O. Box 540774
Orlando, FL 32854
Phone: (407) 875-1776
Facsimile: (407) 875-0770
Email: court@LC.org

Defendant-Appellant Scott Lively (“Lively”), pursuant to Fed R. App. P. 27(a)(4), and in support of his Motion for Reconsideration of Denial of Motion to Set Oral Argument and to Exclude Appellee from Oral Argument for Default in Filing Brief (EID 6140152, the “Reconsideration Motion”), submits this reply to the Opposition (EID 6141632) filed by Plaintiff-Appellee Sexual Minorities Uganda (“SMUG”):

1. In SMUG’s Opposition, SMUG’s counsel tell the Court far more than they ever told Lively’s counsel about their reasons for not filing a brief, but SMUG still fails to identify any authority for disregarding the Court’s briefing schedule apart from exclusive, *ex-parte* personal assurances from the Clerk.

2. In reply to Mr. McNeely’s e-mail of October 3, 2017 (Opp’n, EID 6141632, ¶ 13), Mr. Mihet wrote to Mr. McNeely, “We do not share the understanding that the pendency of SMUG’s motions tolls briefing deadlines – if you care to share the basis for your understanding, please do.” (Declaration of Horatio G. Mihet, dated January 3, 2018 (“Mihet Declaration”), ¶ 3, Ex. A.) **Mr. McNeely never responded.** (Mihet Decl., ¶ 3.) Tellingly, Mr. McNeely does not himself reveal to this Court his failure to respond to Mr. Mihet’s express inquiry, which makes SMUG’s decision to fault Lively’s counsel for supposedly failing to apprise the Court of SMUG’s undisclosed, secret “authority” even more troubling. (Opp’n, EID 6141632, ¶ 20).

3. Further, in the telephone call between Mr. McNeely and Mr. Gannam on November 9, 2017 (Opp'n, EID 6141632, ¶ 19), Mr. McNeely stated that he had not spoken to anyone in the Clerk's office regarding SMUG's briefing deadline, but that SMUG's position, based on an unidentified person's oral communication with the Clerk's office, was that SMUG's brief was not due because of SMUG's pending motion to stay. (Declaration of Roger K. Gannam, dated January 3, 2017 ("Gannam Declaration"), ¶ 3.) Mr. McNeely did not advise Mr. Gannam of the number or content of the several conversations between SMUG's counsel and the Clerk's office now revealed in SMUG's Opposition. (Gannam Decl., ¶ 3; *see* Opp'n, EID 6141632, ¶¶ 7-10, 14-16, 18.) This failure, coupled with Mr. McNeely's failure to respond to Mr. Mihet's written request, makes SMUG's accusation against Lively's counsel plainly dishonest. (Opp'n, EID 6141632, ¶ 20).

4. Also on November 9, 2017, Jill M. Schmid, Senior Litigation Assistant to Lively's counsel, called and spoke to Mr. Gerry Claude in the Clerk's office, and was advised that SMUG's brief was not due because of SMUG's pending motion to stay. (Declaration of Jill M. Schmid, dated January 3, 2018 ("Schmid Declaration"), ¶ 3.) However, when Ms. Schmid advised Mr. Claude that Lively's counsel could not locate any rule, procedure, or other authority excusing SMUG from filing its brief in accordance with the Court's briefing schedule, Mr. Claude advised Ms. Schmid to "keep looking" and that Mr. Claude could not dispense legal advice. (Schmid Decl., ¶ 3.) Lively's counsel is still looking, to this day.

5. SMUG’s complaint, that “Counsel for Lively made no mention of the explanations SMUG’s counsel had provided as to why SMUG’s merits brief had not actually been due” (Opp’n, EID 6141632, ¶ 20), is not only misleading, but outright dishonest. First, Lively’s counsel’s representation to the Court in Lively’s original Motion to Set Oral Argument and to Exclude Appellee from Oral Argument for Default in Filing Brief (EID 6134651, the “Motion to Set”), that Lively’s counsel “was advised that SMUG’s position is that no brief is due because of SMUG’s pending stay motion” (Mot. Set, EID 6134651, ¶ 10), was entirely accurate, and complete. Second, at the time of Lively’s Motion to Set, SMUG’s counsel had not provided “explanations”—because SMUG’s counsel declined to provide an explanation when invited to do so by Mr. Mihet (*see supra* ¶ 2), the only explanation that Lively’s counsel had received from SMUG’s counsel at the time of filing was the second-hand, “the Clerk said so to an unidentified person” “explanation” provided by Mr. McNeely. To this day, Lively still has not been provided any authority from either SMUG’s counsel or the Clerk. SMUG’s additional protestation, that “Lively was well aware of the statements made by the Clerk of this Court regarding the fact that there were no deadlines for SMUG’s merits brief” (Opp’n, EID 6141632, ¶ 24), is false.

6. SMUG also complains that filing its brief would “moot its own Motion to Stay.” (Opp’n, EID 6141632, ¶ 28.) This argument presupposes that SMUG is entitled to a stay by simply filing its motion, which is a proposition without any authority whatsoever.

7. The prejudice to Lively is self-evident: Lively has been required to comply with the Court's briefing schedule while SMUG has been excused from compliance, and this benefit was conferred on SMUG by the secret policy of the Clerk which was hidden from Lively. Furthermore, SMUG has received from the Clerk a *de facto* stay of this appeal based solely on SMUG's filing a contested motion to stay. Lively complied with the Court's deadlines but is prevented from moving forward in his appeal; SMUG did not comply with the Court's deadlines but nonetheless has received the stay it wanted.

8. If SMUG's declarations and version of facts are to be believed, Lively is troubled by the apparent fact that the same Clerk who answered numerous *ex-parte* calls from SMUG's counsel and provided repeated assurances to SMUG's counsel about an issue that is the subject of a contested motion, would only tell Lively's counsel to "keep looking" for the answer to a simple and basic question: On what authority can the Clerk impose a *de facto* stay simply upon the filing of a contested motion to stay, when nothing in the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedures, this Court's local rules, and this Court's internal operating procedures would seem to authorize such action?

9. Also troubling are the numerous *ex parte* calls themselves, which SMUG's counsel now admit to have had with the Clerk about an issue that is the subject of a contested motion—that is, whether or not there is or should be a stay of this appeal. The mere fact that SMUG's counsel felt it necessary to make all those

calls should have alerted them of the perils of relying on verbal assurances instead of published rules and procedures. Be that as it may, at the very least SMUG's counsel could have involved Lively's counsel in those communications, so that all parties operate from the same set of rules and facts. Tellingly, SMUG chose another way.

10. In sum, Lively's Reconsideration Motion and Motion to Set should be granted. If the Court, however, concludes that SMUG should not be defaulted and excluded from oral argument, despite SMUG's disregard of the Court's briefing deadlines based solely on *ex-parte, ultra vires* verbal assurances from the Clerk, then the Court should order SMUG to file its brief forthwith, so that this matter may be scheduled for oral argument.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Roger K. Gannam

Mathew D. Staver

Horatio G. Mihet

Roger K. Gannam

Daniel J. Schmid

Mary E. McAlister

LIBERTY COUNSEL

P.O. Box 540774

Orlando, FL 32854

Phone: (407) 875-1776

Facsimile: (407) 875-0770

Email: rgannam@LC.org

*Attorneys for Defendant-Appellant,
Scott Lively*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this January 3, 2018, I caused the foregoing to be electronically filed with this Court. Service will be effectuated on all counsel of record via this Court's ECF/electronic notification system.

/s/ Roger K. Gannam
Roger K. Gannam
Attorney for Defendant-Appellant
Scott Lively

NO. 17-1593

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT**

SEXUAL MINORITIES UGANDA

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

SCOTT LIVELY, individually and as President of Abiding Truth Ministries,

Defendant-Appellant.

**DECLARATION OF HORATIO G. MIHET
IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT-APPELLANT SCOTT LIVELY'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF DENIAL OF MOTION
TO SET ORAL ARGUMENT AND TO EXCLUDE APPELLEE
FROM ORAL ARGUMENT FOR DEFAULT IN FILING BRIEF**

Mathew D. Staver
Horatio G. Mihet
Roger K. Gannam
Daniel J. Schmid
Mary E. McAlister
LIBERTY COUNSEL
P.O. Box 540774
Orlando, FL 32854
Phone: (407) 875-1776
Facsimile: (407) 875-0770
Email: court@LC.org

I, Horatio G. Mihet, do hereby declare as follows:

1. I am over the age of eighteen years and am one of the attorneys for Defendant-Appellant, Scott Lively (“Lively”), in this appeal. The statements in this Declaration are true and correct, based upon my personal knowledge (unless otherwise indicated), and if called to testify to them, I would and could do so competently.

2. I am submitting this Declaration in support of Defendant-Appellant Scott Lively’s Motion for Reconsideration of Denial of Motion to Set Oral Argument and to Exclude Appellee from Oral Argument for Default in Filing Brief (EID 6140152, the “Reconsideration Motion”), and in reply to certain facts in the Opposition to Lively’s Reconsideration Motion (EID 6141632, the “Opposition”) filed by Plaintiff-Appellee Sexual Minorities Uganda (“SMUG”).

3. In reply to Mr. McNeely’s e-mail of October 3, 2017, identified in paragraph 13 of SMUG’s Opposition (Opp’n, EID 6141632, ¶ 13), I wrote by e-mail to Mr. McNeely, “We do not share the understanding that the pendency of SMUG’s motions tolls briefing deadlines – if you care to share the basis for your understanding, please do.” A true and correct copy of my e-mail reply is attached hereto as Exhibit A. Mr. McNeely never responded.

DATED this January 3, 2018.

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that the foregoing statements are true and correct.

/s/ Horatio G. Mihet
Horatio G. Mihet

From: [Horatio Mihet](mailto:Horatio.Mihet)
To: "mcneely.kaleb@dorsey.com"
Cc: [Roger Gannam](mailto:Roger.Gannam); pspees@ccrjustice.org
Subject: RE: SMUG v. Lively - motion for extension of time nunc pro tunc
Date: Tuesday, October 3, 2017 2:41:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Thank you for your prompt response and consent, Kaleb. We do not share the understanding that the pendency of SMUG's motions tolls briefing deadlines – if you care to share the basis for your understanding, please do.

Regards,

Horatio G. Mihet, Esq.
*Vice President of Legal Affairs &
Chief Litigation Counsel*
Liberty Counsel
407-875-1776 phone
407-875-0770 fax
www.LC.org • hmihet@LC.org

This message (including any attached files) is intended for the person to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us immediately by replying to this message and deleting it from your computer, because any distribution or use of this message by you is strictly prohibited. Email cannot be guaranteed secure or error-free. We do not accept responsibility for errors or omissions herein that result from email transmission. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Liberty Counsel.

From: mcneely.kaleb@dorsey.com [mailto:mcneely.kaleb@dorsey.com]
Sent: Tuesday, October 3, 2017 1:52 PM
To: Horatio Mihet <hmihet@lc.org>
Cc: Roger Gannam <rgannam@lc.org>; pspees@ccrjustice.org
Subject: RE: SMUG v. Lively - motion for extension of time nunc pro tunc

Harry,

It is our understanding that, in light of the pending motion to dismiss and motion to stay, there are currently no deadlines for the parties to file their briefs on the merits. Given that, if Lively nevertheless intends to file the motion referenced below for an extension of time *nunc pro tunc*, SMUG does not oppose said motion.

Regards,

Kaleb McNeely

Associate



DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
51 West 52nd Street | New York, NY 10019-6119
P: 212.415.9215 F: 212.953.7201 C: 9178162491

EXHIBIT A

CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATION

E-mails from this firm normally contain confidential and privileged material, and are for the sole use of the intended recipient. Use or distribution by an unintended recipient is prohibited, and may be a violation of law. If you believe that you received this e-mail in error, please do not read this e-mail or any attached items. Please delete the e-mail and all attachments, including any copies thereof, and inform the sender that you have deleted the e-mail, all attachments and any copies thereof. Thank you.

From: Horatio Mihet [<mailto:hmihet@lc.org>]
Sent: Tuesday, October 3, 2017 10:39 AM
To: McNeely, Kaleb <mcneely.kaleb@dorsey.com>; pspees@ccrjustice.org
Cc: Roger Gannam <rgannam@lc.org>
Subject: SMUG v. Lively - motion for extension of time nunc pro tunc
Importance: High

Kaleb or Pam – we encountered technical difficulties in filing Lively’s brief last night, and missed the midnight deadline by 23 minutes. Out of an abundance of caution, we are filing a quick motion asking the First Circuit for an extension, nunc pro tunc. We would like to file it in the next couple hours. May we have your quick confirmation that SMUG does not oppose the relief?

Thanks.

Horatio G. Mihet, Esq.*
*Vice President of Legal Affairs &
Chief Litigation Counsel*

Liberty Counsel

PO Box 540774
Orlando, FL 32854
407-875-1776 phone
407-875-0770 fax

Offices in FL, VA and DC
www.LC.org • hmihet@LC.org

*Licensed in Florida and Ohio

Subscribe to *Liberty Alert*: <https://www.lc.org/newsroom/liberty-alert>

Support Liberty Counsel: <https://www.lc.org/make-a-donation>

This message (including any attached files) is intended for the person to whom it is addressed and may contain confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us immediately by replying to this message and deleting it from your computer, because any distribution or use of this message by you is strictly prohibited. Email cannot be guaranteed secure or error-free. We do not accept responsibility for errors or omissions herein that result from email transmission. Any views or opinions expressed in this email are solely those of the author and do not necessarily represent those of Liberty Counsel.

NO. 17-1593

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT**

SEXUAL MINORITIES UGANDA

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

SCOTT LIVELY, individually and as President of Abiding Truth Ministries,

Defendant-Appellant.

**DECLARATION OF ROGER K. GANNAM
IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT-APPELLANT SCOTT LIVELY'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF DENIAL OF MOTION
TO SET ORAL ARGUMENT AND TO EXCLUDE APPELLEE
FROM ORAL ARGUMENT FOR DEFAULT IN FILING BRIEF**

Mathew D. Staver
Horatio G. Mihet
Roger K. Gannam
Daniel J. Schmid
Mary E. McAlister
LIBERTY COUNSEL
P.O. Box 540774
Orlando, FL 32854
Phone: (407) 875-1776
Facsimile: (407) 875-0770
Email: court@LC.org

I, Roger K. Gannam, do hereby declare as follows:

1. I am over the age of eighteen years and am one of the attorneys for Defendant-Appellant, Scott Lively (“Lively”), in this appeal. The statements in this Declaration are true and correct, based upon my personal knowledge (unless otherwise indicated), and if called to testify to them, I would and could do so competently.

2. I am submitting this Declaration in support of Defendant-Appellant Scott Lively’s Motion for Reconsideration of Denial of Motion to Set Oral Argument and to Exclude Appellee from Oral Argument for Default in Filing Brief (EID 6140152, the “Reconsideration Motion”), and in reply to certain facts in the Opposition to Lively’s Reconsideration Motion (EID 6141632, the “Opposition”) filed by Plaintiff-Appellee Sexual Minorities Uganda (“SMUG”).

3. In the telephone call between Mr. McNeely and me on November 9, 2017, identified in paragraph 19 of SMUG’s Opposition (Opp’n, EID 6141632, ¶ 19), Mr. McNeely stated that he had not spoken to anyone in the Clerk’s office regarding SMUG’s briefing deadline, but that SMUG’s position, based on another, unidentified person’s communication with the Clerk’s office, was that SMUG’s brief was not due because of SMUG’s pending motion to stay. Mr. McNeely did not advise me of the number or content of the several conversations between SMUG’s

counsel and the Clerk's office now revealed in SMUG's Opposition at paragraphs 7-10, 14-16, and 18. (Opp'n, EID 6141632, ¶¶ 7-10, 14-16, 18.)

DATED this January 3, 2018.

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that the foregoing statements are true and correct.

/s/ Roger K. Gannam
Roger K. Gannam

NO. 17-1593

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FIRST CIRCUIT**

SEXUAL MINORITIES UGANDA

Plaintiff-Appellee,

v.

SCOTT LIVELY, individually and as President of Abiding Truth Ministries,

Defendant-Appellant.

**DECLARATION OF JILL M. SCHMID
IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT-APPELLANT SCOTT LIVELY'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION OF DENIAL OF MOTION
TO SET ORAL ARGUMENT AND TO EXCLUDE APPELLEE
FROM ORAL ARGUMENT FOR DEFAULT IN FILING BRIEF**

Mathew D. Staver
Horatio G. Mihet
Roger K. Gannam
Daniel J. Schmid
Mary E. McAlister
LIBERTY COUNSEL
P.O. Box 540774
Orlando, FL 32854
Phone: (407) 875-1776
Facsimile: (407) 875-0770
Email: court@LC.org

I, Jill M. Schmid, do hereby declare as follows:

1. I am over the age of eighteen years and am the Senior Litigation Assistant to the attorneys for Defendant-Appellant, Scott Lively (“Lively”), in this appeal. The statements in this Declaration are true and correct, based upon my personal knowledge (unless otherwise indicated), and if called to testify to them, I would and could do so competently.

2. I am submitting this Declaration in support of Defendant-Appellant Scott Lively’s Motion for Reconsideration of Denial of Motion to Set Oral Argument and to Exclude Appellee from Oral Argument for Default in Filing Brief (EID 6140152, the “Reconsideration Motion”), and in reply to certain facts in the Opposition to Lively’s Reconsideration Motion (EID 6141632, the “Opposition”) filed by Plaintiff-Appellee Sexual Minorities Uganda (“SMUG”).

3. On November 9, 2017, I called and spoke to Mr. Gerry Claude in the Clerk’s Office of the United States Court of Appeals for the First Circuit, and was advised by Mr. Claude that SMUG’s brief was not due because of SMUG’s pending motion to stay. I advised Mr. Claude that Lively’s counsel could not locate any rule, procedure, or other authority excusing SMUG from filing its brief in accordance with the Court’s briefing schedule. I asked Mr. Claude what authority allows SMUG to miss a brief-filing deadline expressly ordered in writing by the Court. Mr. Claude

would not provide me any authority. Instead, he advised me to “keep looking” and that he could not dispense legal advice.

DATED this January 3, 2018.

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the United States and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts that the foregoing statements are true and correct.

/s/ Jill M. Schmid
Jill M. Schmid