Pages 1 - 12

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BEFORE THE HONORABLE PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON, JUDGE

ROBERT-JOHN: FOTI, ET AL.,

Plaintiffs,

COPY

v.

NO. C 04-2567 PJH

OFFICER MCHUGH, ET AL.,

Defendants.

San Francisco, California Wednesday, November 10, 2004

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

APPEARANCES:

For Plaintiff:

(Foti)

ROBERT-JOHN: FOTI

Plaintiff in pro per

General Delivery

Woodacre, California 94973

For Plaintiff:

KENNETH AUGUSTINE

(Augustine)

Plaintiff in pro per

53 Mark Drive

San Rafael, California 94903

For Defendants:

United States Department of Justice

Civil Division

450 Golden Gate Avenue, 10th floor San Francisco, California 94102

BY: TRACIE L. BROWN

Assistant United States Attorney

Reported By:

Leo T. Mankiewicz, CSR 5297 RMR, CRR

Official Reporter

1	Wednesday, November 10, 2004							
2	<u>10:00 a.m.</u>							
3	THE CLERK: Simple action 04-2567, Foti versus							
4	Officer McHugh. Your appearances, please.							
5	MS. BROWN: Good morning, your Honor. Tracie Brown							
6	for the defendants.							
7	THE COURT: Good morning.							
8	MR. FOTI: I am myself Robert-John:Foti.							
9	THE COURT: Good morning.							
10	MR. AUGUSTINE: Ken Augustine, appearing as myself.							
11	THE COURT: Good morning.							
12	MR. AUGUSTINE: Good morning.							
13	THE COURT: And there are two other plaintiffs, or							
14	just one?							
15	MR. FOTI: There is one more, and he's not here.							
16	THE COURT: He's not here, okay. You don't							
17	expect							
18	MR. FOTI: We don't know why. The weather he's							
19	pretty intimidated about the process that's going on							
20	downstairs. He's been handcuffed, I've been manhandled. He							
21	could have been here earlier, and not got access.							
22	THE COURT: All right. That's all right, I've got							
23	the papers. That's all I need. Have a seat.							
24	All right, Ms. Brown, this is your motion to dismiss							
25	for failure to state a claim and for lack of jurisdiction,							

subject matter jurisdiction. 1 2 MS. BROWN: Yes. 3 THE COURT: I have reviewed the papers. Did you 4 wish to be heard further? 5 MS. BROWN: I think everything is set forth in the 6 There's one thing I would like to address, your Honor, 7 which is that -- I don't know if you're aware of this -- I was just served with a First Amended Complaint yesterday. 8 9 know when it was filed, because I didn't get a Filed stamp I understand from Mr. Foti that he mailed it Monday, I 10 believe --11 12 MR. FOTI: Yes, ma'am. -- so it was probably filed, I presume, 13 MS. BROWN: 14 yesterday. I saw it just a few minutes ago. 15 THE COURT: 16 MS. BROWN: Okay, I just received it yesterday 17 It's substantially more lengthy, but I think the afternoon. 18 same issues are raised, and I'm not sure how your Honor would 19 want to proceed on the pending motion to dismiss. I do believe 20 that the same legal issues obtain with respect to --21 THE COURT: Why don't we get clarification first and 22 then you can address those specific arguments. 23 Mr. Foti, if you could, I received a copy of this 24 Amended Complaint just before we commenced this morning. you tell me how -- if the causes of action are the same, and 25

how is it different than your other one? I have not had an 1 2 opportunity to read it. 3 MR. FOTI: There are added causes of action. under Title 18, 1591, which makes it a crime to interfere with 4 5 a court order, and I believe that when a hearing is set, that we are ordered to be here, and 1591 addresses any interference 6 7 with the duty or a right under court order of the Court of the There are additional constitutional counts. United States. 8 9 I would like to ask one question. We requested an 10 emergency hearing. Why was that not granted? THE COURT: You requested an emergency hearing with 11 12 whom? In the original Complaint, right on the 13 MR. FOTI: cover sheet. 14 THE COURT: An emergency hearing before this court? 15 Right, for injunctive relief. 16 MR. FOTI: 17 THE COURT: Did you file You have to file a 18 formal motion for injunctive relief. Did you file a motion for 19 temporary restraining order or for preliminary injunction in 20 this case? 21 It's in the Complaint. MR. FOTI: I didn't see such a motion. 22 THE COURT: No, there was no motion. It was just 23 MR. FOTI: contained in the Complaint. I was unaware that the Complaint 24 25 would not handle that issue.

THE COURT: No. No, I'm sorry, it did not put me on notice that you were asking that we hear something before this motion. Are you telling me that what you intended was that your case be set -- your motion first, before the defendants' motion, motion for a temporary restraining order?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. FOTI: Well, if you look on the cover sheet, right next to our names, in bold type, of the original Complaint, we requested an immediate emergency hearing, and heard nothing back.

THE COURT: I don't know. I have no idea what happened. Generally, we have separately filed motions. don't know how this was treated. We treated it simply as a complaint. The Clerk's Office, when they get a motion for a temporary restraining order, or something for some kind of emergency injunctive relief, notifies us, sends us the documents, and we handle it separately. Yours was treated simply as a complaint. Since you have not filed any separate papers, we would not call you in to court unless you put us on notice that you wanted something other than just the relief that you are seeking in your Complaint. I am sure that that's how it was treated, is that you were seeking injunctive relief in your Complaint.

If what you want, Mr. Foti, is to have a motion for a specific kind of injunctive relief, you're going to have to file a separate set of papers on that. Do you wish to be given

an opportunity to do that?

1.6

MR. FOTI: Well, in the opposition I did ask for --

THE COURT: Well, you can't do it --

MR. FOTI: -- declaratory relief.

THE COURT: You can't do it in an opposition.

MR. FOTI: Ma'am, I'm not a lawyer, please.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FOTI: I'm just trying to do the best I can.

THE COURT: I understand that.

MR. FOTI: Now, I believe that the scarce judicial resources of the Court could be saved by issuing an order....

The whole case hinges on whether or not someone is required to have a state-issued identification. If there's no requirement for someone to have a state-issued identification to carry on normal, everyday affairs like going to court, then there could be no authority for the marshals downstairs to keep us out of court because we do not have a state-issued identification; in a nutshell.

THE COURT: That's how you frame the issue.

However, but the issue is also one of whether or not the United States marshals or the Federal Protective Service have the right to have regulations requiring that people entering the federal building identify themselves in the way in which they require, which is through a state-issued -- a government-issued -- doesn't have to be the state, but it has

to be a government-issued identification card of some kind.

MR. FOTI: This issue has been litigated.

THE COURT: And are you saying that you want to bring a motion on that regard? If you wish to bring a motion for injunctive relief to get me to order the marshals to stop doing that, then you have to file a separate motion. Today we are here because you filed a Complaint; counsel for the defendants has filed a motion to dismiss the Complaint for failure to state a claim. So they are the moving party today.

A motion for injunctive relief means you're the moving party, and you have to submit authority for whatever it is that you're requesting that the Court do. That has not yet been done. So I'm not here to rule on any requests that you have. I'm here today to rule on the request of the government, because they filed the motion.

MR. FOTI: To get off the track here, it appears to me that they're trying to relitigate <u>Bevins</u>, they're trying to relitigate <u>Carey v. Nevada Gaming Commission</u>, they're trying to relitigate <u>Hiibel</u>.

Counsel has lied to you in their motion to dismiss, leaving out key words, and the most egregious one is that the fact that they say, off a court case, that there is no law that requires or prohibits -- excuse me -- there's no law that prohibits an officer from asking for or even demanding -- and they end the quote there -- finish the sentence with

"identification," and put the period after "identification."
What they did was they left out the fact that the words they
omitted said that there's no law that prohibits them from
requiring a suspect's identification.

THE COURT: I've read your papers. You did include that in there. But let's get back to what we're going to do today. Today we have a motion by the defendants to dismiss your initial Complaint. Yesterday you filed a First Amended Complaint. I got a copy this morning; I have not read it. The defendant needs clarification. You've indicated that you've added causes of action, therefore, her motion wouldn't cover it all.

So it's not necessary for us to go forward with the motion on the initial Complaint, because you have, as a matter of right, you have the right to file a first amended complaint before the government has answered. So you've done that. So this is the last complaint, however, that you can file preventing the government from moving to dismiss.

I'm going to give them an opportunity to file any kind of supplement to their -- to the motion that they've already gotten on file, that would address any of the additional causes of action that you've raised in your Complaint. You will be given an opportunity to file an opposition to that, and then I'll make a decision on it.

If you also wish to move for some kind of injunctive

1 relief now, that is, preliminary injunctive relief -- that's 2 generally a temporary restraining order or a motion for preliminary injunction -- you can file a motion for either one 3 4 of those. We can't do that orally right now, while 5 MR. FOTI: 6 we're here? 7 THE COURT: No, no, you can't do that orally. 8 MR. FOTI: Because we can't even get in the 9 courthouse to file papers. We either have to do it by the mail --10 11 I'm sorry, there's nothing I can do THE COURT: 12 about that, Mr. Foti. There's nothing I can do about that. \mathbf{If} 13 you wish to file a motion, it has to be done in writing. 14 simply not done orally, and you have to submit the authority. You are trying to obtain an order requiring that I order the 15 marshals not to require identification. You need to provide 16 authority, in the law, for that proposition. 17 18 MR. FOTI: What authority? Here in America? What 19 authority is there to identify ourselves? Hiibel's gone 20 through that, Carey v. Nevada Gaming Commission. 21 THE COURT: Mr. Foti, then you just need to write it 22 in a paper. I'm not going to --23 It is in the Complaint. MR. FOTI: 24 If you want to simply rely on the THE COURT: Okay. 25 Complaint and not file any additional papers, you may do so. Ι

1 will give the defense an opportunity to oppose any request for 2 preliminary injunctive relief that is found in the Complaint, and then I'll make a decision on it. 3 MR. FOTI: In the meantime, we are kept out of the 5 courts to prosecute other cases. Ma'am, this thing is 6 escalating, and it's an important issue. I was kept out of 7 three hearings, where I --THE COURT: And I'll decide it. 8 9 -- where I had to go downstairs --10 THE COURT: Mr. Foti, I'll decide the issue as soon 11 as you put it before me in a way in which I can understand. You have to put it in writing before me. As soon as you do 12 13 that, I'll decide the issue. Now, if you don't want to file another motion, we'll 14 15 simply look at your Complaint; to the extent you're asking for preliminary injunctive relief, I'll make a decision, on the 16 basis of what you've got in your Complaint, if that's what you 17 18 want to stand on. 19 Well, I think the First Amended Complaint MR. FOTI: 20 pretty much covers --21 The one that you filed yesterday. THE COURT: MR. FOTI: 22 That we mailed on Monday, yes, ma'am. 23 THE COURT: All right, then, we'll look at that. 24 Then this is the schedule: Ms. Brown, if you wish to file an opposition to any 25

request for a preliminary injunctive relief that's contained in the November 9th filing, it shall be your -- your opposition shall be filed within two weeks of today. MS. BROWN: Okay. All right, Mr. Foti, if you wish to THE COURT: reply to her opposition, you have one week to do that; and a decision will be made based upon the papers. There will be no hearing. With regard to the motion for -- the motion to dismiss that's currently pending, the defendant may have two weeks to supplement their motion, if you wish, based upon the November 9th filing. Mr. Foti, you may have two weeks thereafter to submit an opposition to their supplemental motion that would supplement the opposition you already filed; one week thereafter for a reply, and it will be decided on the papers, with no hearing. Okay? All right, we'll issue a short order, we'll plug in the exact dates, just so that you'll have the date for the filings. MS. BROWN: And with respect to the case management conference that was also set --The case management conference is THE COURT: We will reschedule it as soon as we have resolved

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Foti's motion and the defendant's motion, okay? All right.

1	MS.	BROWN:	Thank	you,	your	Honor.	
2	THE	COURT:	We're	adjou	ırned.		
3							10:15 a.m.
4							
5							
6							
7							
8							
9							
10							
11							
12							
13							
14							
1 5							
16							
17							
18							
19							
20							
21							
22							
23							
24							
25							
	l						

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I, LEO T. MANKIEWICZ, Official Reporter for the United States Court, Northern District of California, hereby certify that the foregoing proceedings in Case No. C 04-2567 PJH, Foti, et al. v. Officer McHugh, et al., were reported by me, a certified shorthand reporter, and were thereafter transcribed under my direction into typewriting; that the foregoing is a true record of said proceedings as bound by me at the time of filing.

The validity of the reporter's certification of said transcript may be void upon disassembly and/or removal from the court file.

Leo T. Mankiewicz, CSR 5297, RMR, CRR

Tuesday, September 26, 2006