) Civ. No. 261 MD 2017

Filed 12/11/2017 12:11:00 AM Commonwealth Court of Pennsylvania 261 MD 2017

IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

)

)

League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania, et al.,

Petitioners,

v.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, et al.,

Respondents.

PROPOSED ORDER

AND NOW this _____ day of December, 2017, upon consideration of Petitioners' Motion *in Limine* to Admit Evidence Produced by Speaker Turzai in the *Agre* Litigation and Properly Obtained by Petitioners, and after having heard argument on said Motion, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Petitioners' Motion *in Limine* is DENIED.

The Honorable P. Kevin Brobson

BLANK ROME LLP

Brian S. Paszamant (PA #78410) Jason A. Snyderman (PA #80239) John P. Wixted (PA #309033) 130 North 18th Street Philadelphia, PA 19103-6998 Phone: 215-569-5500 Facsimile: 215-569-5555 *Counsel for Joseph B. Scarnati, III*

HOLTZMAN VOGEL JOSEFIAK TORCHINSKY PLLC

Jason Torchinsky Shawn Sheehy 45 North Hill Drive, Suite 100 Warrenton, VA 20186 Phone: 540-341-8808 Facsimile: 540-341-8809 Admitted Pro Hac Vice Counsel for Michael C. Turzai and Joseph B. Scarnati, III

CIPRIANI & WERNER, P.C.

Kathleen A. Gallagher (PA #37950) Carolyn Batz McGee (PA #208815) 650 Washington Road, Suite 700 Pittsburgh, PA 15228 Phone: 412-563-2500 Facsimile: 412-563-2080 *Counsel for Michael C. Turzai*

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP

Patrick T. Lewis Key Tower 127 Public Square, Suite 2000 Cleveland, OH 44114 Phone: 216-621-0200

Robert J. Tucker 200 Civic Center Drive, Suite 1200 Columbus, OH 43215 Phone: 614-462-2680 Admitted Pro Hac Vice Counsel for Michael C. Turzai

IN THE COMMONWEALTH COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

)

League of Women Voters of Pennsylvania, et al.,

) Civ. No. <u>261 MD 2017</u>

Petitioners,

v.

The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, et al.,

Respondents.

LEGISLATIVE RESPONDENTS' OPPOSITION TO PETITIONERS' "MOTION *IN LIMINE* TO ADMIT EVIDENCE PRODUCED BY SPEAKER TURZAI IN *AGRE* LITIGATION AND <u>PROPERLY OBTAINED BY PETITIONERS"</u>

Legislative Respondents respectfully submit the within Opposition to Petitioners' "Motion *in Limine* to Admit Evidence Produced by Speaker Turzai in the *Agre* Litigation and Properly Obtained by Petitioners" (the "Motion").

In their Motion, Petitioners argue that by obtaining the privileged documents, they would not violate any order by the *Agre* court. But Petitioners' argument misses the point. Legislative Respondents do not suggest that by obtaining the privileged documents, Petitioners have violated any order of the *Agre* court. Rather, Legislative Respondents' argument is, and always has been, that by allowing the *use* of such privileged documents in *this* case, the spirit and intent of the *Agre* court's order would be violated. That order expressly stated that it should

be interpreted to be "respectful" of this Court's privilege orders. The *Agre* court never meant for its order to serve as a means by which Petitioners could circumvent this Court's privilege findings with respect to any documents not admitted in the *Agre* case. Yet, that is exactly what Petitioners request this Court do in their Motion. The Court should deny this request.

Petitioners also suggest that the Court should allow the introduction of the privileged documents because they are in the "public domain." But the subject documents were never admitted into evidence in *Agre*. And, as the following passage from the *Agre* court transcript makes clear, the mere fact that the documents were produced in discovery in the *Agre* case does not mean that they are in the public domain:

MR. ARONCHICK: ... [F]or example ... there were many references to things like ... the Turzai data and expert reports...those kinds of things that weren't actually marked as exhibits and introduced as exhibits, but, they were referenced frequently throughout the record in this case. And is it our understanding that if they were involved in the record in this case that that's in the public domain, even if the actual document that they were referring to wasn't marked and put into the record?

JUDGE SMITH: *The reference is in the public domain. The underlying document is not.*

See Ex. A, Agre, et al. v. Wolf, et al., Tr. Dec 7, 2017, PM Session, at p. 9 (emphasis added).

For these reasons, and the reasons set forth in Legislative Respondents' Motions *in Limine* to Exclude Certain Testimony by Jowei Chen and to Exclude Petitioners' Exhibits 27-31, 33, and 135-161, which Motions are incorporated by reference herein, Legislative Respondents respectfully request that the Court DENY Petitioners' Motion.

December 10, 2017

BLANK ROME LLP

/s/ Brian S. Paszamant BRIAN S. PASZAMANT JASON A. SNYDERMAN JOHN P. WIXTED One Logan Square 130 N. 18th Street Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103 Phone: 215-569-5791 Facsimile: 215-832-5791 Email: paszamant@blankrome.com snyderman@blankrome.com jwixted@blankrome.com Attorneys for Respondent Senator Joseph B. Scarnati, III

Respectfully Submitted

CIPRIANI & WERNER, P.C.

/s/ Kathleen A. Gallagher KATHLEEN A. GALLAGHER CAROLYN BATZ MCGEE 650 Washington Road, Suite 700 Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15228 Phone: 412-563-4978 Email: kgallagher@c-wlaw.com cmcgee@c-wlaw.com Attorneys for Respondent Representative Michael C. Turzai

HOLTZMAN VOGEL JOSEFIAK TORCHINSKY PLLC

/s/ Jason Torchinsky

JASON TORCHINSKY (admitted *Pro Hac Vice*) SHAWN SHEEHY (admitted *Pro Hac Vice*) 45 North Hill Drive, Suite 100 Warrenton, Virginia 20186 Phone: 540-341-8808 Facsimile: 540-341-8809 Email: jtorchinsky@hvjt.law ssheehy@hvjt.law *Attorneys for Respondents Senator Joseph B. Scarnati, III and Representative Michael C. Turzai*

BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP

/s/ Patrick T. Lewis

PATRICK T. LEWIS (admitted *Pro Hac Vice*) Key Tower 127 Public Square Suite 2000 Cleveland, Ohio 44114 Phone: 216-621-0200 Email: plewis@bakerlaw.com

ROBERT J. TUCKER (admitted *Pro Hac Vice*) 200 Civic Center Drive, Suite 1200 Columbus, Ohio 43215 Phone: 614-462-2680 <u>Email: rtucker@bakerlaw.com</u> *Attorneys for Respondent Representative Michael C. Turzai* **EXHIBIT A**

Aronchick/Ballard - Argument

1 are being respectful of -- of those proceedings at the same 2 time, not limiting counsel for their ability to use materials 3 as a part of this case in the way that we've described. 4 MS. HANGLEY: And, Your Honor, --5 MR. ARONCHICK: Could -- could I just amplify a 6 minute, just -- just to say? 7 JUDGE SMITH: Ver -- very quickly, sir. 8 MR. ARONCHICK: Very quickly. So, that in the -- in 9 the record, for example, of this case, there were many 10 references to things like, excuse me, the Turzai data and 11 expert reports, I mean, those kinds of things that weren't 12 actually marked as exhibits and introduced as exhibits, but, 13 they were referenced frequently throughout the record in this 14 case. And is it our understanding that if they were involved 15 in the record in this case that that's in the public domain, 16 even if the actual document that they were referring to wasn't 17 marked and put into the record? 18 JUDGE SMITH: The reference is in the public domain. 19 The underlying document is not. 20 MS. BALLARD: Your Honor, if I may? 21 JUDGE SMITH: Quickly, please. 22 MS. BALLARD: The -- we understood the Court's order 23 regarding not -- not sharing documents to cover the -- the 24 defendants' depositions and any exhibits used at their 25 depositions. That's what the order referred to. Many of the

9