

1 Mariah Gondeiro, Esq., CA Bar No. 323683  
mgondeiro@faith-freedom.com  
2 Julianne Fleischer, Esq., CA Bar No. 337006  
jfleischer@faith-freedom.com  
3 ADVOCATES FOR FAITH & FREEDOM  
4 25026 Las Brisas Road  
Murrieta, California 92562  
5 Telephone: (951) 600-2733  
Facsimile: (951) 600-4996

6 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
7

8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
9 **FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 **OUR WATCH**, a California non-profit  
organization;

11 Plaintiff,

12 vs.

13 **ROB BONTA**, Attorney General of California;

14 Defendant.  
15  
16  
17

Case No.: 2:23-CV-00422-DAD-DB

**JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT  
STATEMENT**

Date: August 8, 2023  
Time: 1:30 p.m.  
Dept.: Courtroom 4  
Judge: Hon. Dale A. Drozd

18 **I. SUMMARY OF CLAIMS AND LEGAL THEORIES**

19 **A. Plaintiffs Position**

20 This lawsuit challenges California Senate Bill (“SB”) 107, also known as  
21 California’s Transgender Sanctuary Bill. Plaintiffs allege SB 107 violates the right  
22 of parents to direct the upbringing and care of their children because it allows minors  
23 to obtain gender reassignment care without parental involvement and denies parents  
24 access to their child’s medical information. Plaintiffs also allege SB 107 violates the  
25 Full Faith and Credit Clause to the United States Constitution because it overrides  
26 the jurisdiction of a family’s home state, and it was passed as a direct policy of  
27 hostility towards the laws of other states. Plaintiffs seek declaratory judgment that  
28

1 the bill violates the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, the right to  
2 familial association under the First and Fourteenth Amendments, and the Full Faith  
3 and Credit Clause under the Fourth Amendment.

4 **B. Defendant's Position**

5 For the reasons outlined in Defendant's prior motions to dismiss, Defendant  
6 believes that Plaintiff lacks Article III and prudential standing, has failed to state a  
7 claim upon which relief can be granted, and cannot meet the high bar required to  
8 strike down a statute on its face.

9 **II. STATUS OF SERVICE**

10 Defendant Rob Bonta has been served. Plaintiff does not anticipate adding  
11 another Defendant.

12 **III. POSSIBLE JOINDER OF PARTIES**

13 Plaintiff anticipates adding another plaintiff to its Second Amended  
14 Complaint (SAC).

15 **IV. CONTEMPLATED AMENDMENTS TO PLEADINGS**

16 Plaintiff anticipates filing a SAC on or before August 1, 2023.

17 **V. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

18 Plaintiffs contend that this Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over the  
19 federal claims pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1343. Plaintiffs assert that  
20 jurisdiction to grant declaratory relief is conferred by 28 U.S.C. 2201 and 2202 and  
21 by Rule 57 and 65, Fed. R. Civ. P. 7. Plaintiffs aver that jurisdiction to grant  
22 injunctive relief is conferred by 28 U.S.C. § 1343(a).

23 **VI. SCHEDULING OF DISCOVERY**

24 The parties agree that the issues pertaining to the scope and schedule of  
25 discovery are premature until the Court rules on the Defendant's anticipated motion  
26 to dismiss Plaintiff's SAC because, until that time, it will be unclear what claims and  
27 issues, if any, will remain to be litigated in this case and therefore what discovery, if  
28 any will be relevant and appropriate. The parties agree to meet and confer regarding



1 the scope of discovery and discovery deadlines after Defendant responds to  
2 Plaintiff's amended complaint. If the Court denies the motion to dismiss and the case  
3 proceeds in this court, the parties agree to simultaneously make their Rule 26(a)(1)  
4 disclosures on an agreed upon date that is within 30 days of the Court's ruling.

5 **VII. CONTEMPLATED DISPOSITIVE MOTIONS**

6 As noted above, Defendant anticipates filing a motion to dismiss the SAC.  
7 The parties agree that it is possible that all claims in this case could be resolved by  
8 cross-motions for summary judgment.

9 **VIII. METHODS OF EVIDENCE AND RESTRICTIONS ON TESTIMONY**

10 The parties do not contemplate any limitations or restrictions on the use of  
11 evidence under Federal Rules of Evidence 702 at this time.

12 **IX. DATE FOR FINAL PRETRIAL CONFERENCE**

13 The parties agree that it is premature to set pretrial and trial dates. The parties  
14 agree to meet and confer regarding trial and pretrial dates after the Court has ruled  
15 on Defendant's next motion to dismiss.

16 **X. DATE FOR TRIAL**

17 The parties agree that it is premature to set pretrial and trial dates. The parties  
18 agree to meet and confer regarding trial and pretrial dates after the Court has ruled  
19 on Defendant's next motion to dismiss.

20 **XI. SPECIAL PROCEDURES**

21 The parties do not contemplate utilizing any special procedures such as the  
22 appointment of a special master or independent expert.

23 **XII. PROPOSED MODIFICATIONS**

24 The Plaintiffs do not anticipate any proposed modifications of standard  
25 pretrial procedures.



**XIII. RELATED CASES**

The parties are not aware of any related cases.

Respectfully submitted,

ADVOCATES FOR FAITH & FREEDOM

Dated: July 25, 2023

/s/Mariah R. Gondeiro  
Mariah R. Gondeiro  
Attorney for Plaintiffs

Dated: July 25, 2023

/s/ Nimrod Pitsker Elias  
Nimrod Pitsker Elias  
Deputy Attorney General  
Attorney for Defendant



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28