

1 PAUL HASTINGS LLP
JAMES A. ZAPP (SB# 94584)
2 jameszapp@paulhastings.com
CAMERON W. FOX (SB# 218116)
3 cameronfox@paulhastings.com
MELINDA A. GORDON (SB# 254203)
4 melindagordon@paulhastings.com
515 South Flower Street
5 Twenty-Fifth Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2228
6 Telephone: (213) 683-6000
Facsimile: (213) 627-0705
7

8 Attorneys for Defendant
CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

9 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
10 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

11 DAVID COPPEDGE, an Individual,
12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 JET PROPULSION LABORATORY,
form unknown; CALIFORNIA
15 INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, form
unknown; GREGORY CHIN, an
16 Individual; CLARK A. BURGESS, an
Individual; KEVIN KLENK, an Individual;
17 and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive,

18 Defendants.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

FILED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

NOV 30 2011

John A. ... Clerk/Clerk
By GLORIETTA ROBINSON Deputy

CASE NO. BC 435600

MOTION *IN LIMINE* #2

**DEFENDANT CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE
OF TECHNOLOGY'S NOTICE OF
MOTION AND MOTION *IN LIMINE* #2
("DML 2") FOR AN ORDER EXCLUDING
TESTIMONY, EVIDENCE, ARGUMENT
AND COMMENT REGARDING THE
CONTENT OF DVDS COPPEDGE
DISTRIBUTED TO CO-WORKERS AND
FILMS REGARDING ALLEGED
HOSTILITY PROPONENTS OF
INTELLIGENT DESIGN HAVE
EXPERIENCED; MEMORANDUM OF
POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN
SUPPORT THEREOF; DECLARATION
OF CAMERON W. FOX IN SUPPORT
THEREOF; [PROPOSED] ORDER**

FSC Date: December 2, 2011
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Place: Department 54
Judge: Hon. Ernest M. Hiroshige

Trial Date: December 14, 2011

27 ORIGINAL
28

1 TO PLAINTIFF DAVID COPPEDGE AND TO HIS ATTORNEY OF RECORD, WILLIAM J.
2 BECKER, JR., ESQ., AND THE BECKER LAW FIRM:

3 Defendant California Institute of Technology ("Caltech") will and hereby does move the
4 Court *in limine* for an order precluding Plaintiff David Coppedge ("Coppedge"), his counsel and
5 witnesses from offering, making reference to, commenting upon, introducing testimony or
6 documents regarding, or presenting any argument pertaining to the **content** of any DVDs
7 Coppedge distributed to his co-workers, as well as any films regarding other proponents of
8 intelligent design (including those who allegedly experienced hostility).

9 This Motion is made on the grounds that such evidence is inadmissible because it is
10 irrelevant, unduly prejudicial to Caltech, and inadmissible hearsay. *See* Cal. Evid. Code §§ 210,
11 350, 352, and 1200.

12 On November 23, 2011, counsel for Caltech satisfied the meet and confer requirements of
13 Local Rule 3.57 by speaking with counsel for Coppedge regarding the substance of this Motion.
14 *See* Declaration of Cameron W. Fox ¶ 4. Plaintiff's counsel stated that Coppedge would not
15 agree to limit the evidence at trial in a manner consistent with the limitations requested in this
16 Motion. *Id.*

17 This Motion is based on this Notice of Motion and Motion, the accompanying
18 Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Declaration of Cameron W. Fox, the complete files
19 and records in this action, and on such oral and documentary evidence as may be presented at or
20 before the hearing of this Motion.

21 DATED: November 30, 2011

PAUL HASTINGS LLP
JAMES A. ZAPP
CAMERON W. FOX
MELINDA A. GORDON

22
23
24 By: 

CAMERON W. FOX

25 Attorneys for Defendant
26 CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
27
28

1 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

2 **I. INTRODUCTION**

3 Defendant California Institute of Technology ("Caltech") anticipates that Plaintiff David
4 Coppedge ("Coppedge") will attempt to show at trial DVDs or films about intelligent design
5 and/or Christianity. Specifically, Caltech expects that Coppedge will try to show DVDs that he
6 passed out to his co-workers, such as the intelligent design films entitled, "The Privileged Planet,"
7 "Unlocking the Mystery of Life," and "Icons of Evolution;" and/or the religious films entitled,
8 "The Case for a Creator," "The Case for Christ," "The Case for Faith," and "Jesus."¹ Caltech also
9 anticipates that Coppedge may attempt to show films regarding proponents of intelligent design
10 who allegedly experienced hostility, such as "Expelled" (a comedic film starring Ben Stein).

11 Coppedge and his counsel will use this trick to promote and publicize intelligent design;
12 the contents of these films are not relevant here. There is no evidence that any of the Caltech
13 employees to whom Coppedge distributed DVDs was offended by their subject matter, or that the
14 DVDs' content was considered as part of Caltech's investigation into Coppedge's actions.²
15 Moreover, films about intelligent design proponents that Coppedge did not distribute at work, like
16 "Expelled," are irrelevant because they have no tendency to prove any issue in this case. These
17 films are inadmissible on other grounds too. Permitting Coppedge to show all or portions of
18 these films will waste considerable amounts of time, confuse the jury, and unduly prejudice
19 Caltech. And the films are inadmissible hearsay. As such, the films should be excluded pursuant
20 to California Evidence Code Sections 210, 350, 352, and 1200.

21 **II. THE CONTENT OF THE FILMS SHOULD BE EXCLUDED**

22 **A. These Matters Are Irrelevant And Should Be Excluded Under California**
23 **Evidence Code Sections 210 and 350.**

24 The content of the films Coppedge distributed is wholly irrelevant to the question of
25 whether Caltech's investigation and subsequent discipline of Coppedge were based on religious

26 ¹ See Deposition of David Coppedge at 55:1-11; 56:19-23; 72:15-21, attached to the Declaration
of Cameron W. Fox ("Fox Declaration") as Exhibit A, filed concurrently herewith.

27 ² In fact, Coppedge's expert, Lawrence Ball, criticizes Jhertane Huntley for not looking into the
subject of intelligent design as part of her investigation into the March 2, 2009 incident. See
28 Declaration of Lawrence P. Ball regarding Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion for Summary
Judgment. ¶ 12-13, 21, attached to Fox Declaration as Exhibit E.

1 animus. After all, none of the Caltech employees to whom Coppedge distributed DVDs
2 complained that they were offended by the subject matter of those DVDs. See Deposition of
3 Margaret Weisenfelder at 21:16-22:7³; Deposition of Clark Burgess at 36:12-14.⁴ And it is
4 undisputed that Caltech investigator Jhertaune Huntley did not view the DVDs as part of her
5 investigation into Coppedge's actions. Deposition of Jhertaune Huntley at 182:19-22, 183:17-
6 21.⁵ Because the content of these films was not at issue or considered in the investigation, it is
7 irrelevant to any issue in the case.

8 Films about the experiences of other intelligent design proponents (who never worked for
9 Caltech) are similarly irrelevant. The only relevant inquiry in this action is whether Caltech
10 engaged in religious discrimination or retaliation against Coppedge – an inquiry that necessarily
11 is tethered to the specific facts of *this* case. The experiences of unrelated individuals who support
12 intelligent design have no tendency to prove or disprove what motivated Caltech's actions here.
13 Thus, Coppedge should be precluded from showing any such films, including "Expelled," at trial.

14 **B. These Matters Should Be Excluded Under California Evidence Code Section**
15 **352.**

16 The content of the DVDs Coppedge distributed and films such as "Expelled" also should
17 be excluded because allowing Coppedge and his counsel to turn this trial into venue for intelligent
18 design propaganda would waste time, confuse the jury, and unduly prejudice Caltech.

19 First, this trial is already likely to be lengthy: it involves numerous claims, events, and
20 witnesses. Permitting Coppedge and his counsel to show portions of films, let alone entire
21 DVDs, will only add time to the trial, and for no legitimate reason. Second, the jury could be
22 confused about the claims at issue here, and be misled into thinking this case is a forum for
23 deciding whether intelligent design and/or religious doctrines are "right" or "wrong," rather than
24 a lawsuit to determine whether religious discrimination or retaliation took place. Third, such
25 evidence would unduly prejudice Caltech. To the extent jurors agree with material in the films,
26 they may be persuaded to find in Coppedge's favor without adequate basis. Allowing Coppedge

27 ³ See Fox Declaration, Exhibit B.

28 ⁴ See Fox Declaration, Exhibit C.

⁵ See Fox Declaration, Exhibit D.

1 to show movies instead of focusing on the events and communications actually at issue will only
2 increase the risk of the jury deciding this case on improper grounds.

3 **C. The Films Are Hearsay.**

4 Finally, the films must be excluded because they are out-of-court statements that will be
5 offered for nothing more than the truth of what they assert. They are classic hearsay evidence for
6 which no exception exists. The films should be excluded under Evidence Code Section 1200.

7 **III. CONCLUSION**

8 For the foregoing reasons, Caltech respectfully requests that the Court grant its Motion
9 and preclude Coppedge, his counsel and witnesses from offering, making reference to,
10 commenting upon, introducing testimony or documents regarding, or presenting any argument
11 pertaining to the content of the films Coppedge distributed to his co-workers or films regarding
12 intelligent design proponents, such as "Expelled."

13 DATED: November 30, 2011

PAUL HASTINGS LLP
JAMES A. ZAPP
CAMERON W. FOX
MELINDA A. GORDON

14
15
16 By:



CAMERON W. FOX

17 Attorneys for Defendant
18 CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

DECLARATION OF CAMERON W. FOX

I, Cameron W. Fox, declare:

1. I am an attorney at law duly admitted to practice before this Court and all of the courts of the State of California. I am an associate with the law firm of Paul Hastings LLP ("Paul Hastings"), counsel of record for the California Institute of Technology ("Caltech") in this action. I have personal knowledge of the facts contained in this Declaration, or know of such facts by my review of the files maintained by Paul Hastings in the normal course of its business, and if called as a witness, could and would testify as to their accuracy.

2. This Declaration is submitted in support of Defendant's Motion *In Limine* For An Order Excluding Testimony, Evidence, Argument And Comment Regarding The Content Of DVDs Coppedge Distributed To Co-Workers And Films Regarding Other Proponents Of Intelligent Design ("Motion").

3. The specific matter alleged to be inadmissible in Caltech's Motion *In Limine* is any reference, comment, testimony, document, or argument pertaining to the content of DVDs Coppedge distributed to co-workers and films regarding other proponents of intelligent design.

4. On November 23, 2011, I spoke with counsel for Plaintiff David Coppedge, William J. Becker, regarding the substance of this Motion. Mr. Becker stated that Coppedge would not agree to limit the evidence at trial in a manner consistent with the limitations requested in this motion.

5. Caltech will suffer prejudice if this Motion *In Limine* is not granted because the evidence sought for exclusion is irrelevant, inadmissible under California Evidence Code Section 352, and akin to improper character evidence.

6. Attached hereto as **Exhibit A** are true and correct copies of excerpts from Day One of the deposition of David Coppedge, taken on September 30, 2011.

7. Attached hereto as **Exhibit B** are true and correct copies of excerpts from Day One of the deposition of Margaret Weisenfelder taken on February 28, 2011.

8. Attached hereto as **Exhibit C** are true and correct copies of excerpts from Day One of the deposition of Clark Burgess taken on April 15, 2011.

9. Attached hereto as **Exhibit D** are true and correct copies of excerpts from Day One of the deposition of Jhertaune Huntley taken on February 15, 2011.

10. Attached hereto as **Exhibit E** is a true and correct copy of the Declaration of Lawrence P. Ball, which Coppedge filed and served on my office in support of his Opposition to Caltech's Motion for Summary Judgment Or, In the Alternative, Motion for Summary Adjudication of Issues.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed this 30th day of November, 2011, at Los Angeles, California.

Cameron W. Fox
CAMERON W. FOX

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DAVID COPPEDGE, an Individual,
Plaintiff,

vs.

JET PROPULSION LABORATORY,
form unknown; CALIFORNIA
INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, form
unknown; GREGORY CHIN, an
Individual; CLARK A. BURGESS, an
Individual; KEVIN KLENK, an Individual;
and DOES 1 through 25, inclusive,
Defendants.

CASE NO. BC 435600

MOTION *IN LIMINE* #2

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
DEFENDANT'S MOTION *IN LIMINE* #2
("DML 2") FOR AN ORDER
EXCLUDING TESTIMONY, EVIDENCE,
ARGUMENT AND COMMENT
REGARDING THE CONTENT OF DVDS
COPPEDGE DISTRIBUTED TO CO-
WORKERS AND FILMS REGARDING
ALLEGED HOSTILITY PROPONENTS
OF INTELLIGENT DESIGN HAVE
EXPERIENCED**

FSC Date: December 2, 2011
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Place: Department 54
Judge: Hon. Ernest M. Hiroshige

Trial Date: December 14, 2011

1 Defendant California Institute of Technology's Motion *In Limine* For An Order Excluding
2 Testimony, Evidence, Argument And Comment Regarding The Content Of DVDs Coppedge
3 Distributed To Co-Workers And Films Regarding Other Proponents Of Intelligent Design came
4 on for hearing before this Court on December __, 2011.

5 The Court, having reviewed and considered the Motion and all papers and pleadings on
6 file herein, and the oral argument of counsel, HEREBY ORDERS, ADJUDGES AND
7 DECREES:

8 That Plaintiff David Coppedge, his counsel and witnesses are precluded from offering,
9 making reference to, commenting upon, introducing testimony or documents regarding, or
10 presenting any argument pertaining to the content of DVDs Coppedge distributed to co-workers
11 and films regarding other proponents of intelligent design.

12
13 DATED: _____

Ernest M. Hiroshige
Judge of the Superior Court

14
15
16
17 Presented by:

18 PAUL HASTINGS LLP
19 JAMES A. ZAPP
20 CAMERON W. FOX
21 MELINDA A. GORDON

22 By: _____

CAMERON W. FOX

23
24 Attorneys for Defendant
25 CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
26
27
28

12/28/81

EXHIBIT A

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DAVID COPPEDGE, an Individual,)	CASE NO. BC 435600
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	
)	
JET PROPULSION LABORATORY,)	
form unknown; CALIFORNIA)	
INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, form)	
unknown; GREGORY CHIN, an)	
Individual; CLARK A. BURGESS,)	
an Individual; KEVEIN KLENK,)	
an Individual; and DOES 1)	
through 25, inclusive,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

DEPOSITION OF DAVID COPPEDGE

SEPTEMBER 30, 2010

VOLUME 1

(Pages 1 through 256)

REPORTED BY:

Deborah R. Meyers
CSR No. 8569

HOMAN ASSOCIATES
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTERS
4287 JACKSON AVENUE
CULVER CITY, CALIFORNIA 90232
(310) 838-7734

EX A

10:53:29 1 A There's a man who became a Christian named
10:53:34 2 Lee Strobel, and he has a trilogy of films about his
10:53:40 3 story, and one of them deals with origins.
10:53:52 4 Q Is that the name of the DVD?
10:53:55 5 A It's called The Case for a Creator.
10:54:12 6 Q Any other DVDs that you've distributed that
10:54:16 7 you would consider religious in nature?
10:54:19 8 A Yes.
10:54:20 9 Q What else?
10:54:22 10 A Part of his trilogy was The Case for
10:54:26 11 Christ, and the third was The Case for Faith.
10:54:35 12 Q And did you distribute all three of these
10:54:38 13 DVDs at JPL?
10:54:44 14 A Only on occasion to people that I felt
10:54:50 15 already were accepting of that point of view.
10:54:54 16 Q So the answer is yes, but to those people
10:54:57 17 that you described?
10:54:58 18 A Yes.
10:55:06 19 Q Any other DVDs that you distributed that
10:55:09 20 you considered to be religious in nature?
10:55:11 21 A There was the Jesus film.
10:55:17 22 Q Is the name of the film Jesus?
10:55:20 23 A Yeah.
10:55:21 24 Q All right. Any others?
10:55:25 25 A No.

11:17:40 1 do you report that under your d/b/a?

11:17:43 2 A Yes.

11:17:50 3 Q And when I say report that, I mean, in
11:17:52 4 other words, you attribute that revenue to the
11:17:54 5 d/b/a?

11:17:54 6 A Yes.

11:18:16 7 Q And are the DVDs that you sell any
11:18:21 8 different from those that -- well, strike that.

11:18:25 9 We only talked about religious ones. What
11:18:29 10 are DVDs that you consider not to be religious but
11:18:33 11 dealing with intelligent design that you distributed
11:18:36 12 to employees at JPL?

11:18:38 13 MR. BECKER: Misstates his testimony.

11:18:39 14 MR. ZAPP: I'll restate the question.

11:18:39 15 Q Besides the DVDs you described -- that is,
11:18:41 16 the Lee Strobel trilogy and the Jesus film -- what
11:18:45 17 other DVDs have you distributed to JPL employees?

11:18:51 18 A The Privileged Planet and Unlocking the
11:18:52 19 Mystery of Life.

11:18:55 20 Q Any others?

11:18:58 21 A Icons of Evolution but not as often.

11:19:03 22 Q And who produces those films?

11:19:07 23 A Illustra produces The Privileged Planet and
11:19:10 24 Unlocking the Mystery of Life. And another company
11:19:15 25 produced Icons of Evolution.

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION

2
3 I, Deborah R. Meyers, a Certified
4 Shorthand Reporter, do hereby certify:

5 That prior to being examined, the witness
6 named in the foregoing proceedings was by me duly
7 sworn to testify to the truth, the whole truth, and
8 nothing but the truth;

9 That said proceedings were taken before me
10 at the time and place therein set forth and were
11 taken down by me in shorthand and thereafter reduced
12 to computerized transcription under my direction and
13 supervision;

14 That the dismantling of the transcript
15 will void the reporter's certificate.

16 I further certify that I am neither
17 counsel for, nor related to, any party to said
18 proceedings, nor in any way interested in the
19 outcome thereof.

20
21 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
22 subscribed my name this 12th day of October, 2010.

23 
24 DEBORAH R. MEYERS, CSR NO. 8569
25

11/10/11

1
2 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
3 FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
4

5 DAVID COPPEDGE, AN INDIVIDUAL,)
6)
7) PLAINTIFF,)
8)
9 VS.) CASE NO.
10) BC 435600
11 JET PROPULSION LABORATORY, FORM)
12 UNKNOWN; CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE)
13 OF TECHNOLOGY, FORM UNKNOWN;)
14 GREGORY CHIN, AN INDIVIDUAL;)
15 CLARK A. BURGESS, AN INDIVIDUAL;)
16 KEVIN KLENK, AN INDIVIDUAL; AND)
17 DOES 1 THROUGH 25, INCLUSIVE,)
18)
19 DEFENDANTS.)
20)
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)

ORIGINAL

26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000
1001
1002
1003
1004
1005
1006
1007
1008
1009
1010
1011
1012
1013
1014
1015
1016
1017
1018
1019
1020
1021
1022
1023
1024
1025
1026
1027
1028
1029
1030
1031
1032
1033
1034
1035
1036
1037
1038
1039
1040
1041
1042
1043
1044
1045
1046
1047
1048
1049
1050
1051
1052
1053
1054
1055
1056
1057
1058
1059
1060
1061
1062
1063
1064
1065
1066
1067
1068
1069
1070
1071
1072
1073
1074
1075
1076
1077
1078
1079
1080
1081
1082
1083
1084
1085
1086
1087
1088
1089
1090
1091
1092
1093
1094
1095
1096
1097
1098
1099
1100
1101
1102
1103
1104
1105
1106
1107
1108
1109
1110
1111
1112
1113
1114
1115
1116
1117
1118
1119
1120
1121
1122
1123
1124
1125
1126
1127
1128
1129
1130
1131
1132
1133
1134
1135
1136
1137
1138
1139
1140
1141
1142
1143
1144
1145
1146
1147
1148
1149
1150
1151
1152
1153
1154
1155
1156
1157
1158
1159
1160
1161
1162
1163
1164
1165
1166
1167
1168
1169
1170
1171
1172
1173
1174
1175
1176
1177
1178
1179
1180
1181
1182
1183
1184
1185
1186
1187
1188
1189
1190
1191
1192
1193
1194
1195
1196
1197
1198
1199
1200
1201
1202
1203
1204
1205
1206
1207
1208
1209
1210
1211
1212
1213
1214
1215
1216
1217
1218
1219
1220
1221
1222
1223
1224
1225
1226
1227
1228
1229
1230
1231
1232
1233
1234
1235
1236
1237
1238
1239
1240
1241
1242
1243
1244
1245
1246
1247
1248
1249
1250
1251
1252
1253
1254
1255
1256
1257
1258
1259
1260
1261
1262
1263
1264
1265
1266
1267
1268
1269
1270
1271
1272
1273
1274
1275
1276
1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392
1393
1394
1395
1396
1397
1398
1399
1400
1401
1402
1403
1404
1405
1406
1407
1408
1409
1410
1411
1412
1413
1414
1415
1416
1417
1418
1419
1420
1421
1422
1423
1424
1425
1426
1427
1428
1429
1430
1431
1432
1433
1434
1435
1436
1437
1438
1439
1440
1441
1442
1443
1444
1445
1446
1447
1448
1449
1450
1451
1452
1453
1454
1455
1456
1457
1458
1459
1460
1461
1462
1463
1464
1465
1466
1467
1468
1469
1470
1471
1472
1473
1474
1475
1476
1477
1478
1479
1480
1481
1482
1483
1484
1485
1486
1487
1488
1489
1490
1491
1492
1493
1494
1495
1496
1497
1498
1499
1500
1501
1502
1503
1504
1505
1506
1507
1508
1509
1510
1511
1512
1513
1514
1515
1516
1517
1518
1519
1520
1521
1522
1523
1524
1525
1526
1527
1528
1529
1530
1531
1532
1533
1534
1535
1536
1537
1538
1539
1540
1541
1542
1543
1544
1545
1546
1547
1548
1549
1550
1551
1552
1553
1554
1555
1556
1557
1558
1559
1560
1561
1562
1563
1564
1565
1566
1567
1568
1569
1570
1571
1572
1573
1574
1575
1576
1577
1578
1579
1580
1581
1582
1583
1584
1585
1586
1587
1588
1589
1590
1591
1592
1593
1594
1595
1596
1597
1598
1599
1600
1601
1602
1603
1604
1605
1606
1607
1608
1609
1610
1611
1612
1613
1614
1615
1616
1617
1618
1619
1620
1621
1622
1623
1624
1625
1626
1627
1628
1629
1630
1631
1632
1633
1634
1635
1636
1637
1638
1639
1640
1641
1642
1643
1644
1645
1646
1647
1648
1649
1650
1651
1652
1653
1654
1655
1656
1657
1658
1659
1660
1661
1662
1663
1664
1665
1666
1667
1668
1669
1670
1671
1672
1673
1674
1675
1676
1677
1678
1679
1680
1681
1682
1683
1684
1685
1686
1687
1688
1689
1690
1691
1692
1693
1694
1695
1696
1697
1698
1699
1700
1701
1702
1703
1704
1705
1706
1707
1708
1709
1710
1711
1712
1713
1714
1715
1716
1717
1718
1719
1720
1721
1722
1723
1724
1725
1726
1727
1728
1729
1730
1731
1732
1733
1734
1735
1736
1737
1738
1739
1740
1741
1742
1743
1744
1745
1746
1747
1748
1749
1750
1751
1752
1753
1754
1755
1756
1757
1758
1759
1760
1761
1762
1763
1764
1765
1766
1767
1768
1769
1770
1771
1772
1773
1774
1775
1776
1777
1778
1779
1780
1781
1782
1783
1784
1785
1786
1787
1788
1789
1790
1791
1792
1793
1794
1795
1796
1797
1798
1799
1800
1801
1802
1803
1804
1805
1806
1807
1808
1809
1810
1811
1812
1813
1814
1815
1816
1817
1818
1819
1820
1821
1822
1823
1824
1825
1826
1827
1828
1829
1830
1831
1832
1833
1834
1835
1836
1837
1838
1839
1840
1841
1842
1843
1844
1845
1846
1847
1848
1849
1850
1851
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857
1858
1859
1860
1861
1862
1863
1864
1865
1866
1867
1868
1869
1870
1871
1872
1873
1874
1875
1876
1877
1878
1879
1880
1881
1882
1883
1884
1885
1886
1887
1888
1889
1890
1891
1892
1893
1894
1895
1896
1897
1898
1899
1900
1901
1902
1903
1904
1905
1906
1907
1908
1909
1910
1911
1912
1913
1914
1915
1916
1917
1918
1919
1920
1921
1922
1923
1924
1925
1926
1927
1928
1929
1930
1931
1932
1933
1934
1935
1936
1937
1938
1939
1940
1941
1942
1943
1944
1945
1946
1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100
2101
2102
2103
2104
2105
2106
2107
2108
2109
2110
2111
2112
2113
2114
2115
2116
2117
2118
2119
2120
2121
2122
2123
2124
2125
2126
2127
2128
2129
2130
2131
2132
2133
2134
2135
2136
2137
2138
2139
2140
2141
2142
2143
2144
2145
2146
2147
2148
2149
2150
2151
2152
2153
2154
2155
2156
2157
2158
2159
2160
2161
2162
2163
2164
2165
2166
2167
2168
2169
2170
2171
2172
2173
2174
2175
2176
2177
2178
2179
2180
2181
2182
2183
2184
2185
2186
2187
2188
2189
2190
2191
2192
2193
2194
2195
2196
2197
2198
2199
2200

1 A. I DON'T REMEMBER. I JUST REMEMBER HIM
2 TELLING ME WHAT IT WAS CALLED AND ASKING ME IF I
3 WANTED TO BORROW IT.

4 Q. YOU DON'T RECALL ANY DISCUSSION WITH
5 DAVID ABOUT THE CONTENT OF THE DVD?

6 A. THERE MIGHT HAVE BEEN SOME, BUT I JUST
7 DON'T RECALL THOSE DETAILS.

8 Q. HAD DAVID EVER LOANED YOU ANY OTHER
9 DVD'S IN THE PAST?

10 A. NO.

11 Q. DO YOU REMEMBER ANYTHING OTHER THAN WHAT
12 YOU'VE JUST TESTIFIED TO REGARDING ANY OFFENSIVE
13 CONTENT THAT WAS IN THE DOCUMENTARY?

14 A. I'M SORRY. COULD YOU REPEAT THAT,
15 PLEASE.

16 Q. OTHER THAN WHAT YOU JUST TESTIFIED
17 ABOUT, DO YOU RECALL ANY OFFENSIVE CONTENT IN THE
18 DOCUMENTARY?

19 A. OH, IN THE DOCUMENTARY.

20 Q. YES.

21 MS. FOX: OBJECTION. VAGUE AS TO "OFFENSIVE
22 CONTENT" AND "DOCUMENTARY."
23 BY MR. BECKER:

24 Q. CONTENT THAT OFFENDED YOU.

25 A. I WAS NOT OFFENDED BY THE CONTENT OF THE

1 DVD.

2 Q. WAS THERE SOMETHING ABOUT THE CONTENT
3 THAT MADE YOU FEEL THAT YOU WERE BEING TARGETED TO
4 CHANGE AN OPINION YOU MIGHT HOLD?

5 A. IT WAS NOT THE CONTENT OF THE DVD THAT
6 MADE ME FEEL TARGETED; IT WAS THE STICKY NOTE ON THE
7 BACK OF THE COVER.

8 Q. OKAY. DO YOU HAVE A VIEW ABOUT
9 INTELLIGENT DESIGN?

10 MS. FOX: I'LL OBJECT THAT IT'S VAGUE.

11 THE WITNESS: AS FAR AS THE IDEA THAT THERE
12 IS A DIVINE BEING BEHIND THE CREATION OF EVERYTHING,
13 I HAVE NO PROBLEM WITH THAT. AND THAT'S WHAT I
14 UNDERSTAND INTELLIGENT DESIGN, THAT THERE'S AN
15 INTELLIGENCE BEHIND THE DESIGN OF CREATION. *mzn*
16 EFFECTIVELY... *mzn*

17 BY MR. BECKER:

18 Q. DO YOU RECALL ANYTHING WITHIN THE
19 DOCUMENTARY THAT MENTIONED THAT THE INTELLIGENT AGENT
20 BEHIND THE DESIGN OF ANYTHING -- THE DESIGN OF LIFE,
21 FOR INSTANCE -- IS GOD OR A DIVINITY OR A DIVINE
22 BEING?

23 A. I DON'T REMEMBER SPECIFICALLY. I DID
24 FAST-FORWARD THROUGH LARGE CHUNKS OF IT.

25 Q. DO YOU BELIEVE THAT THIS WAS A RELIGIOUS

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)

2 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

3

4

5 I, HEIDI SULLIVAN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER

6 LICENSED BY THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, CERTIFY:

7

8 THAT THE FOREGOING DEPOSITION OF Margaret Weisenfelder

9 WAS TAKEN BEFORE ME PURSUANT TO NOTICE

10 AT THE TIME AND PLACE THEREIN SET FORTH, AT WHICH TIME

11 THE WITNESS WAS PUT UNDER OATH BY ME;

12

13 THAT THE TESTIMONY OF THE WITNESS AND ALL OBJECTIONS

14 MADE AT THE TIME OF THE EXAMINATION WERE RECORDED

15 STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND WERE THEREAFTER

16 TRANSCRIBED;

17

18 THAT THE FOREGOING IS A TRUE RECORD OF THE TESTIMONY

19 AND OF ALL OBJECTIONS AT THE TIME OF THE EXAMINATION.

20

21 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I HAVE SUBSCRIBED MY NAME THIS

22 22 DAY OF March, 2011.

23

24

Heidi Sullivan

25

LICENSE NUMBER 6600

11/10/2011

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

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DAVID COPPEDGE, AN INDIVIDUAL,)
)
 PLAINTIFF,)
)
 VS.) CASE NO.
) BC 435600
 JET PROPULSION LABORATORY, FORM)
 UNKNOWN; CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE)
 OF TECHNOLOGY, FORM UNKNOWN;)
 GREGORY CHIN, AN INDIVIDUAL;)
 CLARK A. BURGESS, AN INDIVIDUAL;)
 KEVIN KLENK, AN INDIVIDUAL; AND)
 DOES 1 THROUGH 25, INCLUSIVE,)
)
 DEFENDANTS.)
 _____)

**CERTIFIED
COPY**

DEPOSITION OF CLARK BURGESS,
VOLUME I, PAGES 1 - 171
TAKEN ON FRIDAY, APRIL 15, 2011

24 || A. SULLIVAN REPORTERS
25 || COURT REPORTERS

REPORTED BY:
HEIDI SULLIVAN
CSR NO. 6600
FILE NO.: 11-131

2420 W. CARSON STREET, SUITE 210
TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA 90501
PHONE 310 • 787 • 4497
FAX 310 • 787 • 1024

ERC

1 THAT THE PRIVILEGED PLANET CONTAINED ANY RELIGIOUS
2 CONTENT?

3 MR. ZAPP: OBJECTION. VAGUE.

4 GO AHEAD.

10:32:10AM 5 THE WITNESS: YOUR UNDERSTANDING OF WHAT THE
6 WORD "RELIGIOUS" IS AND MINE MAY NOT BE THE SAME. I
7 DON'T KNOW HOW TO ANSWER THAT.

8 BY MR. BECKER:

9 Q. LET'S GO WITH YOURS, YOUR UNDERSTANDING.

10:32:19AM 10 A. WELL, THEY TALKED ABOUT A DEITY. I
11 DON'T KNOW THAT THEY ACTUALLY SPECIFIED GOD AS PER
12 SE, BUT THEY DID TALK ABOUT A DEITY AS PROBABLY THE
13 SOURCE OF THE DESIGN.

14 BUT TO SAY THAT IT WAS RELIGIOUS WAS --
10:32:46AM 15 I CAN'T SAY THAT IT WAS TOTALLY WHAT I THOUGHT
16 RELIGIOUS WAS.

17 Q. WELL, IN THE INTELLIGENT DESIGN/
18 CREATIONIST DEBATE, THERE'S AN ARGUMENT, I'LL
19 REPRESENT TO YOU, THAT IF THERE'S AN INTELLIGENT
10:33:08AM 20 DESIGNER, THEN SOME BELIEVE THAT THEY CAN ATTRIBUTE
21 THE IDENTITY OF THAT DESIGNER TO A DEITY, TO GOD.

22 BUT DO YOU RECALL FROM THE PRIVILEGED
23 PLANET ANY DISCUSSION AT ALL WITH SUBJECT?


24 A. WHAT I -- NO. BUT I DO RECALL
10:33:24AM 25 DISCUSSIONS WITH DAVE ABOUT THE CONTENT, AND I DID

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)
3
4
5 I, HEIDI SULLIVAN, A CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
6 LICENSED BY THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, CERTIFY:
7
8 THAT THE FOREGOING DEPOSITION OF CLARK BURGESS
9 WAS TAKEN BEFORE ME PURSUANT TO NOTICE
10 AT THE TIME AND PLACE THEREIN SET FORTH, AT WHICH
11 TIME THE WITNESS WAS PUT UNDER OATH BY ME;
12
13 THAT THE TESTIMONY OF THE WITNESS AND ALL OBJECTIONS
14 MADE AT THE TIME OF THE EXAMINATION WERE RECORDED
15 STENOGRAPHICALLY BY ME AND WERE THEREAFTER
16 TRANSCRIBED;
17
18 THAT THE FOREGOING IS A TRUE RECORD OF THE TESTIMONY
19 AND OF ALL OBJECTIONS AT THE TIME OF THE EXAMINATION.
20
21 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I HAVE SUBSCRIBED MY NAME THIS
22 4TH DAY OF MAY, 2011.

23

24

25



LICENSE NUMBER 6600

11/16/01

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

DAVID COPPEDGE, AN INDIVIDUAL,)

)

PLAINTIFF,)

)

VS.

) CASE NO. BC435600

)

JET PROPULSION LABORATORY,)

FORM UNKNOWN; ET AL.,)

)

DEFENDANTS.)

)

**CERTIFIED
COPY**

DEPOSITION OF:

JHERTAUNE HUNTLEY

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 15, 2011

FILE NO. 11-116

REPORTED BY:

TRACEY L. KUHLLIN

CSR NO. 7735

24

25

A. SULLIVAN REPORTERS
COURT REPORTERS

2420 W. CARSON STREET, SUITE 210

TORRANCE, CALIFORNIA 90501

PHONE 310 • 787 • 4497

FAX 310 • 787 • 1024

RD

1 BY MR. BECKER:

2 Q. DID YOU EVER LEARN THAT THE DISCOVERY INSTITUTE
3 IS THE LEADING THINK TANK ON INTELLIGENT DESIGN?

4 MS. FOX: OBJECTION. ASSUMES FACTS.

5 THE WITNESS: NO.

6 BY MR. BECKER:

7 Q. DID YOU EVER TALK TO ANYONE VERSED IN
8 INTELLIGENT DESIGN TO FIND OUT HOW YOU COULD LEARN MORE
9 ABOUT IT?

10 A. NO.

11 Q. DID YOU ASK DAVID WHERE YOU MIGHT BE ABLE TO GO
12 TO LEARN MORE ABOUT INTELLIGENT DESIGN?

13 A. NO.

14 Q. DID YOU ASK HIM TO REVIEW THE DVDS THAT HE WAS
15 HANDING OUT?

16 MS. FOX: OBJECTION. VAGUE.

17 THE WITNESS: COULD YOU CLARIFY THAT QUESTION.

18 BY MR. BECKER:

19 Q. DID YOU ASK HIM IF YOU COULD HAVE A COPY OF THE
20 DVDS THAT HE WAS HANDING OUT SO THAT YOU COULD WATCH
21 THEM?

22 A. NO.

23 Q. WOULDN'T THE FIRST THING YOU WOULD WANT TO DO
24 IN AN INVESTIGATION TO LEARN WHETHER SOMEBODY IS BEING
25 HARASSED BY BEING GIVEN A DVD WITH CERTAIN CONTENT IS TO

1 LOOK AT THE DVD?

2 MS. FOX: OBJECTION. MISCHARACTERIZES THE
3 RECORD AND THE INVESTIGATION; ARGUMENTATIVE; COMPOUND.
4 BY MR. BECKER:

5 Q. IF NOT THE FIRST THING, THE SECOND THING. I
6 DON'T KNOW.

7 MS. FOX: SAME OBJECTIONS.

8 BY MR. BECKER:

9 Q. WASN'T IT IMPORTANT TO YOU TO KNOW WHAT THE
10 DVD'S CONTENTS WERE?

11 MS. FOX: THAT'S A DIFFERENT QUESTION.
12 ARGUMENTATIVE.

13 THE WITNESS: WHAT I WAS INVESTIGATING WAS THE
14 CONDUCT THAT THE INDIVIDUALS COMPLAINED ABOUT DURING
15 WORK HOURS.

16 BY MR. BECKER:

17 Q. SO THE CONTENT OF THE DVDS WAS NOT IMPORTANT TO
18 YOUR DETERMINATION AS TO WHETHER DAVID WAS VIOLATING THE
19 UNLAWFUL HARASSMENT POLICY, ETHICS POLICIES OR OTHER
20 POLICIES OF JPL; IS THAT TRUE?

21 A. NO.

22 Q. IT WAS IMPORTANT?

23 A. CAN YOU REPEAT THE QUESTION.

24 (RECORD READ.)

25 THE WITNESS: YES, THAT'S TRUE.

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) ss.
3

4 I, TRACEY KUHLIN, CSR No. 7735, a certified
5 shorthand reporter in and for the County of Los Angeles,
6 State of California, do hereby certify:

7 That prior to being examined, the witness named
8 in the foregoing deposition was by me duly sworn to
9 testify the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the
10 truth.

11 That said deposition was taken before me at the
12 time and place set forth and was taken down by me in
13 shorthand and thereafter reduced to computerized
14 transcription under my direction and supervision, and I
15 hereby certify that the foregoing deposition is a full,
16 true and correct transcript of my shorthand notes so
17 taken.

18 I further certify that I am neither counsel for
19 nor related to any party to said action, nor in any way
20 interested in the outcome thereof.

21 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed
22 my name this 2 ND day of March,
23 2011

24 
25 _____
TRACEY KUHLIN, CSR No. 7735

11/18/81

1 William J. Becker, Jr., Esq. (SBN 134545)

2 **THE BECKER LAW FIRM**

3 11500 Olympic Blvd., Suite 400

4 Los Angeles, California 90064

5 Phone: (310) 636-1018

6 Fax: (310) 765-6328

7 Attorneys for Plaintiff, David Coppedge

RECEIVED
SEP 02 2011
PAUL, HASTINGS

8 **SUPERIOR COURT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
9 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES – CENTRAL DISTRICT**
10

11 **DAVID COPPEDGE**, an individual;

12 Plaintiff,

13 vs.

14 **JET PROPULSION LABORATORY**, form
15 unknown; **CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF**
16 **TECHNOLOGY**, form unknown;
17 **GREGORY CHIN**, an Individual; **CLARK**
18 **A. BURGESS**, an Individual; **KEVIN**
19 **KLENK**, an Individual; and Does 1 through
20 25, inclusive,

21 Defendants.

Case No. BC435600

DECLARATION OF LAWRENCE P. BALL

HEARING DATE: September 16, 2011

HEARING TIME: 8:45 a.m.

DEPT: 54

Trial Date: October 19, 2011

22 I, LAWRENCE P. BALL, declare as follows:

23 1. I have been retained by the Becker Law Firm to provide my opinions regarding
24 matters within my expertise concerning employment issues raised in this case. If called as a
25 witness, I could and would competently testify to the facts and opinions contained herein.
26
27
28

LR E

1 **I. QUALIFICATIONS/BACKGROUND**

2 2. I am the proprietor of The Human Resources Management Network, a human
3 resources management consulting firm. My practice focuses on management of human
4 resources. I have been retained, and have testified, as an expert witness on numerous occasions.
5 I have opined on management policies and practices in connection with allegations of
6 employment discrimination on several occasions.
7

8 3. Over the past 48 years, I have occupied professional and management workplace
9 positions in executive management and the field of human resources. My responsibilities have
10 ranged from technical recruiter to vice president of human resources in a variety of industries,
11 including service, warehouse, and manufacturing and as general manager of a prominent nursery
12 materials grower.
13

14 4. I have conducted myriad training courses and seminars in all aspects of human
15 resources management, including sexual harassment, discipline and discharge, supervisory and
16 management skills, documentation, and others.
17

18 5. For nine years I managed the Orange County district for the Employer's Group. They
19 are a non-profit association whose purpose is to provide expert counseling regarding appropriate
20 management practices and procedures for managing people to Human Resources professionals
21 and operating Executives. Over 1000 member companies in Orange County, California relied on
22 me and my staff to provide them with technical and professional guidance in the management of
23 their people.
24

25 6. I have completed an 18-month Certified Arbitrator Development training program at
26 UCLA sponsored by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the American Association
27 and other agencies and have served as an Arbitrator on workplace issues.
28

1 7. I obtained my Bachelor of Science degree from the University of Kansas and have
2 worked toward a Masters in Business Economics, Claremont Graduate School.

3 8. Attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit A is a true and correct copy of my
4 current curriculum vitae. Attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit B is a true and
5 correct copy of listings of my trial and deposition testimony.

6 9. I have attached Exhibit C to my report to reflect documents which I have reviewed up
7 through the date of this report.

8
9 **II. ISSUES AND CONCLUSIONS**

10 10. My assignment relating to this declaration was to review and analyze the material
11 presented based upon my knowledge of the required standard of care regarding discrimination
12 and other employment law issues in the workplace. I was further asked to comment upon my
13 conclusions relating to adverse employment actions undertaken by JPL against Plaintiff, David
14 Coppedge ("Coppedge"), paying particular attention to the sufficiency of the harassment
15 investigation conducted by the Defendant Jet Propulsion Laboratory's ("JPL") human resources
16 ("HR") department, Coppedge's demotion from the role of Team Lead and the circumstances
17 surrounding Coppedge's termination from JPL.

18
19 11. Based upon my years of experience, training in the field of human resources and
20 other factors, it is my opinion Coppedge suffered adverse employment action by JPL (1) when
21 JPL carried out an inadequate and one-sided investigation of charges of harassment resulting in
22 his demotion and disparagement, (2) by being demoted from Team Lead, a position Coppedge
23 had held for nine years in which he was given significantly added responsibilities and which
24 distinguished him as a leader among his colleagues, (3) by giving Coppedge undeserved low
25 performance ratings and (4) by being terminated.

26
27
28

1 **A. JPL's Investigation Was Incompetent.**

2 12. In a variety of ways the investigation conducted by HR representative Jhertaune
3 Huntley ("Huntley") was inadequate, faulty, unfair and fell far below the standard of care
4 required of a professional investigator looking into charges of employee harassment. In fact, I
5 found it fell unacceptably below professional standards in its inattention to detail, lack of
6 objectivity, disregard for Coppedge's rights and superficiality. This is not an objective case of
7 religious proselytizing. Coppedge's views were *perceived* to be religious and attacked on that
8 basis. At minimum, a competent investigator would have examined the nature of the subject
9 matter. Most disturbing here was the investigator's utter failure to find convincing facts to show
10 a violation of the company unlawful harassment policy.
11

12 13. As explained in more detail below, JPL's HR investigator Huntley was confronted
13 with claims made by a management employee that Coppedge had been pushing his religious
14 views on other co-workers by discussing the subject of intelligent design ("ID") and handing out
15 DVDs on that subject yet failed to determine the threshold question as to whether ID expresses a
16 religious viewpoint. When the investigator was confronted with the fact that complaints made
17 by co-workers against Coppedge were based on ideological differences, she failed to question the
18 hidden biases, state of mind or motivating animus of those individuals, ignoring a vital key to
19 understanding why they would react harshly to Coppedge's benign actions. Additionally, the
20 investigator accepted the subjective and bare claims of co-workers that Coppedge's actions made
21 them feel "uncomfortable" while giving no weight to the evidence showing that Coppedge had
22 not acted in any objectively improper manner. The investigator ignored Coppedge's claims of a
23 hostile work environment, civil rights violations and harassment, thereby treating the claims of
24 harassment against him as conclusive. The investigator failed to interview favorable witnesses
25
26
27
28

1 who might have discredited the complaints of disgruntled individuals and thereby challenged her
2 assumption that Coppedge was engaged in a pattern of offensive conduct. The investigator
3 discredited the favorable statements supplied by one individual. Finally, the investigator failed to
4 revisit Coppedge to give him an opportunity to correct or contradict prejudicial statements made
5 by the complaining parties.
6

7 **B. Several Factors Lead To My Conclusion That JPL'S Termination Of Coppedge**
8 **Was Pretextual.**

9 14. It is my further opinion that Coppedge's termination was not based on any objective
10 criteria, such as a documented record of poor job performance, but was the product of suspicious
11 behind-the-scenes activity occurring after Coppedge had already filed his lawsuit. I describe
12 below the following reasons why I have concluded that Coppedge's termination was a response
13 to his having challenged the disciplinary actions taken against him, and not due to relevant
14 criteria JPL would have evaluated in reducing its workforce. Based on the material I have
15 reviewed and considered, (1) the temporal proximity between the filing of the lawsuit and
16 Coppedge's termination was suspiciously close in time; (2) Coppedge's transitional supervisors
17 who would become responsible for determining that he would be laid off in late 2010
18 suspiciously attended an attorney-client confidential meeting concerning this lawsuit several
19 months before they assumed their supervisory positions; (3) the hiring of two new personnel to
20 Coppedge's team in October 2010 conveniently provided management with an excuse to
21 terminate Coppedge in January 2011 in conformity with the number of reductions contemplated
22 as early as April/May 2010; (4) Coppedge had no documented critical record of his job
23 performance over a career span of 14 years until *after* he filed this lawsuit in 2010; (5) criticisms
24 in Coppedge's 2010 performance evaluation were made by individuals with motives for wanting
25
26
27
28

1 Coppedge terminated, and in one case, accusations of misuse of business time by Coppedge were
2 manufactured by a named defendant in this case and the person he had appointed to replace
3 Coppedge in a position the defendant had demoted him from; (6) subjective criteria was used to
4 rank employees who were under consideration to be part of the reduction in force; and (7) the list
5 of employees considered for lay off was "padded" to include favored employees that were not
6 even part of the group designated for staff reductions.
7

8 15. These multiple factors raise serious questions concerning JPL's true reason for
9 terminating Coppedge, and offer ample basis to conclude that Coppedge's termination was not
10 based upon legitimate, objective criteria, but was imposed because Coppedge had challenged his
11 discipline and filed this lawsuit.
12

13 **III. HUNTLEY'S INVESTIGATION WAS INCOMPETENT, INADEQUATE AND**
14 **UNFAIR.**

15 16. JPL's "investigation" into harassment charges made by employees against Coppedge
16 did not conform to the accepted conduct of a fair and objective investigation in compliance with
17 JPL's policy or as established by the California Supreme Court's decision *Cotran v. Rollins*
18 *Hudig Hall Intern., Inc.* (1998) 17 Cal.4th 93 and as accepted by human resources management
19 professionals as the standard for workplace investigations. Indeed, it fell substantially short of a
20 fair, competent fact-finding investigation.
21

22 17. Coppedge was issued a written warning, charged with harassing other employees and
23 removed from his role as team lead. In my opinion, the unjustifiable charges of harassment and
24 the removal constituted an adverse employment action.

25 18. The story of what transpired that led up to disciplinary action against Coppedge by
26 JPL begins on March 2, 2009, when Chin became visibly upset and accused Coppedge of
27
28

1 pushing his religion by discussing ID. JPL has no express policy barring discussions about
2 religion and politics. Chin seemed to be focused on ID as a form of religious expression. But
3 other evidence in this case shows that Chin felt Coppedge had tried to convert him to
4 Coppedge's religion the prior Christmas when Coppedge left a religious DVD in Chin's mail slot
5 as a Christmas gift. Chin apparently had also received reports of Coppedge discussing
6 Proposition 8. But those matters were not brought up during Chin's outburst – only ID.
7 Coppedge sought to disabuse Chin of the impression that ID is a religious idea, but Chin would
8 have nothing of it. When Coppedge said he felt that Chin was creating a hostile work
9 environment, Chin dared him to report him.
10

11 19. At the outset, the pretense that Coppedge was engaged in religious activities by
12 handing out DVDs concerning ID is suspect. Nowhere in the deposition testimony or any of the
13 documents I have reviewed is there any interest shown by the HR investigator Jhertaune Huntley
14 (“Huntley”) in learning more about the subject matter of ID, its purported religious attributes or
15 whether what made it offensive to Chin. This is significant because Chin was ordering Coppedge
16 to stop talking about religion and politics, but was focused on ID. At deposition, Chin admitted
17 that he believed ID to be a religious matter and that he told Coppedge so directly. Chin therefore
18 was concerned about ID (the content of the message Coppedge was told to discontinue raising
19 with other employees), so it would have made sense for Huntley to attempt to learn something
20 about this perceived religious topic. If ID had something to do with religion, then Chin's efforts
21 to censure Coppedge might be interpreted to improperly tread upon Coppedge's legitimate right
22 of religious expression.
23
24

25 20. Content would seem to be an important factor here. Nothing about Chin's statements
26 that Coppedge was pushing religion through the topic of ID speak objectively to religious
27
28

1 proselytizing. Yet that was the nature of Chin's claim -- that Coppedge was proselytizing. In
2 sexual harassment cases, the use of particular language used by the offending employee may be
3 the basis for a finding of sexual harassment. That presents a content-based (as opposed to
4 merely a behavioral) concern. In cases of religious proselytizing, a threshold question is whether
5 the subject matter of the employee's contacts with other employees concerns religious advocacy.
6 By definition, one can't be proselytizing if one is not engaged in a discussion of religion. Thus,
7 Huntley should have been interested (or at minimum curious) about the nature of ID. She should
8 have inquired whether ID is a religious idea or doctrine.

10 21. Huntley was neither interested in determining what ID was or whether it had religious
11 substance. In fact, she testified repeatedly that she was not interested in ID, only Coppedge's
12 behavior. But this was disingenuous because Huntley seemed very concerned with the subject
13 matter of Proposition 8 when she discussed it with Weisenfelder and Edgington. In her
14 testimony, Huntley dances around the matter. The appearance is one of trying to avoid admitting
15 that she overlooked a relevant piece of the puzzle. If, as Coppedge tried to tell her, ID is a
16 scientific topic dealing with origin concepts consistent with the mission of JPL, Coppedge's
17 employer, and not a religious idea, then the next relevant question could be asked, particularly of
18 Chin: Why do you believe it to be a religious statement? Huntley's failure to ask Chin that
19 question allows the inference she did so in ignorance, neglect or hostility. If she failed to
20 examine the matter with Chin out of ignorance or neglect, then her investigation was flawed at
21 the outset, because she could not proceed on the basis of workable data. If out of hostility, then
22 the entire investigation was unfair.

25 22. Huntley testified that the only concern she had was whether an individual felt
26 "uncomfortable" when Coppedge approached them, regardless of whether the individual
27
28

1 expressed their discomfort to Coppedge. Her testimony in this regard shows she did not carry
2 out a fair and balance investigation but had prejudged the person accused. By accepting as true
3 the subjective statements given to her by employees with axes to grind, without assessing their
4 credibility or trustworthiness, Huntley stacked the deck against Coppedge. If it was merely the
5 burden of his accusers to state that by approaching them on matters involving his personal
6 interests Coppedge had made them feel "uncomfortable" and that his overtures were
7 "unwelcome," then nothing Coppedge could say could overcome such a burden. If no amount of
8 evidence was necessary to test whether the complaining employees had a reasonable basis for the
9 way they felt, then Coppedge was left defenseless.

11 23. Responding to Chin on March 2, Coppedge told him that Chin's behavior looked to
12 be consistent with a "hostile work environment." Chin dared Coppedge to report him. Chin must
13 have sensed, however, that his behavior was inappropriate because he quickly put calls out to
14 Human Resources as well as to a number of management personnel. Chin's stated purpose for
15 making the calls was to initiate an investigation into when he (Chin) had created a hostile work
16 environment by raising his voice and berating Coppedge. Ms. Huntley was assigned to
17 investigate the situation but incorrectly based her investigation on the premise that Coppedge
18 was the party that had created a hostile work environment and conducted her investigation on
19 that basis.

22 24. Huntley interviewed only five witnesses (Chin, Carmen Vetter, Margaret
23 Weisenfelder, Scott Edgington and Clark Burgess). Weisenfelder, Vetter and Edgington were
24 made known to Huntley through Chin. All but Burgess, Coppedge's direct supervisor, held
25 negative views toward Coppedge. Although Burgess indicated that he had purchased DVDs
26 from Coppedge and had discussed ID with him, he told Huntley that Coppedge had not made
27
28

1 him feel uncomfortable and that he was unaware of the fact that anyone had felt uncomfortable
2 by having Coppedge approach them concerning his personal interests. This should have made
3 Huntley question the motives of the other employees, or, at the very least, probe into their state
4 of mind sufficiently to learn whether their claimed feelings of discomfort were justified by an
5 objective standard. Instead, Huntley appears to have not even taken Burgess' positive statements
6 into consideration in her evaluation of Coppedge's perceived behavior.
7

8 25. We do not know what Chin told Huntley concerning his outburst. It is not in her
9 interview notes from her meeting with him nor in Chin's e-mail to management describing the
10 incident, so it is obvious that he did not explain any of the facts to defend against Coppedge's
11 assertion that he had created a hostile work environment. This is particularly troubling, because
12 Coppedge's recollections from the e-mail he sent Chin and which Chin forwarded to Huntley as
13 well as Huntley's interview notes with Coppedge reaffirm Coppedge's description of what
14 transpired between him and Chin, even going so far as to say that Chin had violated his civil
15 rights, a very strong allegation, which Huntley, herself a minority I am informed, would have
16 been expected to take seriously. However, Huntley was strangely uninterested in this charge.
17 When she was asked at her deposition whether she takes charges of a civil rights violation
18 seriously, she responded dispassionately that it "depends on the situation at hand." (Huntley
19 Depo, p.189, line 19 and 20). This is extraordinary not merely for its insensitiveness, but
20 because of the disdain she revealed for what Coppedge was telling her. Thus it appears Huntley
21 claimed she required facts to determine whether a civil rights claim was justified, but needed no
22 facts to decide whether a harassment claim was justified. Breaking it down further: Huntley did
23 not look for facts of a civil rights violation because *she herself did not take the allegation*
24 *seriously*. And she claimed she did not need additional facts to test the trustworthiness of the
25
26
27
28

1 individuals alleging that Coppedge harassed them. In short, Coppedge's defenses were not taken
2 seriously by Huntley at all. She accepted the claims that Coppedge had harassed the coworkers
3 without questioning their bald allegations, while at the same time rejecting Coppedge's claims of
4 a hostile work environment and his civil rights charge without any inquiry. There is no evident
5 reason why Huntley should trust the allegations against Coppedge but distrust Coppedge's
6 allegations.
7

8 26. Not only did Huntley ignore Coppedge's accusations of wrongful conduct by Chin
9 while accepting as true the allegations made against him, Huntley also failed to interview
10 witnesses potentially favorable to Coppedge. Huntley, after interviewing unfavorable witnesses,
11 also failed to return to Coppedge so that he could correct or contradict relevant statements
12 prejudicial to his case. Coppedge kept a log of everyone he had approached regarding his views
13 on ID. His purpose in keeping the log was to avoid returning to those who expressed no interest
14 in the topic of ID. Huntley again showed no interest and dismissed Coppedge's efforts to show
15 her the list of names. Huntley's indifference to all the evidence at her disposal is quite puzzling.
16 She was confronted with an unusual set of facts. This was not a case in which Coppedge
17 repeatedly hounded another employee, or used aggressive methods of approaching people.
18

19 27. JPL's Unlawful Harassment Policy states the relevant criteria for a finding of
20 harassment. "Harassment is the creation of a hostile or intimidating environment in which verbal
21 or physical conduct, because of its severity and/or persistence, is likely to interfere significantly
22 with an individual's work." Under this standard, Coppedge would first have had to "create" a
23 particular type of environment, either "hostile" or "intimidating." Next, his verbal (referring to
24 the use of words or language) or physical (nonverbal) conduct must have had to have been (1)
25 severe, and/or (2) persistent. The last part of this standard requires that the conduct would be
26
27
28

1 "likely" (more probable than not) to interfere (as opposed to merely interrupt) "significantly"
2 with an individual's work.

3 28. None of the criteria for harassment exists in any of the scenarios brought to Huntley's
4 attention. In the case of Vetter, he had merely asked her to consider changing "Holiday" to
5 "Christmas." Vetter was the person in charge of the employee parties and so she was the logical
6 person to approach on his request. The only evidence I have seen that shows Coppedge
7 approaching anyone on the subject is an e-mail to Chin with a commentary copied from the
8 Internet. Coppedge's approach appears rather harmless. He even states that the issue is "small
9 potatoes" for him. The e-mail does not have any of the characteristics one would associate with
10 "harassment." Vetter, however, on the basis of her deposition testimony, has a real insecurity
11 about her religious beliefs. She has more or less abandoned her faith, but she never once
12 revealed that fact to Coppedge, nor, for that matter, stated to him any reluctance or aversion to
13 discussing religion. As the administrative assistant to the program manager, she was in a
14 position to tell Coppedge firmly that the idea of reverting to the Christmas Party name for the
15 annual company event he suggested had been considered and rejected. She didn't, however.
16 Instead, she states that she reported the matter to Chin as harassment. This is truly puzzling,
17 since Chin testified that he does not deal with personnel matters. That was Burgess's domain.
18 Yet Vetter never discussed it with Burgess. These facts should have been explored by Huntley.
19 But Huntley did not apparently even ask Vetter about why she would have been upset by
20 Coppedge's request. And when Vetter told Huntley that (1) she believes Coppedge has an
21 "agenda," (2) that once Coppedge found out she was a Christian "she was harassed by him," (3)
22 that Coppedge is "inappropriate," and (4) that he doesn't know "the line he is crossing when he
23 brings religion in the workplace," Huntley accepts these conclusions at face value, never
24
25
26
27
28

1 following up to ask Vetter what Coppedge had done other than ask for a Christmas Party name
2 change. In short, Vetter's criticism of Coppedge appears to be a personal matter. Did Coppedge
3 create a hostile or intimidating environment in which verbal or physical conduct, because of its
4 severity and/or persistence, was likely to interfere significantly with an individual's work?
5 Huntley does not appear to have questioned Vetter regarding whether Coppedge said or did
6 anything that could have significantly interfered with Vetter's work. In fact, there is no evidence
7 in this case that I have seen tending to show that Coppedge had acted persistently, aggressively
8 or in any intimidating or hostile manner. The fact that Vetter felt intimidated is subjective. The
9 test is whether the average reasonable person would have been intimidated by one Christian
10 talking to another Christian about Christianity, or whether a request to name a social function its
11 traditionally recognized name is intimidating. I do not see how Vetter could have felt harassed
12 unless she harbored a deep resentment for Coppedge's Christian orthodoxy and convictions. In
13 fact, Vetter's complaint to Chin might itself be characterized as a form of religious
14 discrimination, since she appeared intolerant of his religious views.
15

16
17 29. Weisenfelder's statements and actions apparently ignited this case. She was the one
18 who went to Chin on March 2 to complain about Coppedge sharing his religious (ID) and
19 political (Proposition 8) interests. It was because of her complaint that Chin became upset. Chin,
20 however, was motivated also by his own religious animus. When Coppedge left a Christmas gift
21 in his mail slot – a DVD called "The Case for Christ" – Chin perceived that act not as one of
22 seasonal charity but of religious proselytizing. He told Huntley that Coppedge was trying to get
23 him to "believe in his religion during work hours." Accordingly, when Weisenfelder approached
24 him that morning, the pump had already been primed, so to speak. Chin already was frustrated, a
25 fact that he did not disavow. ("I raised my voice because I was getting frustrated because, you
26
27
28

1 know, I had asked Dave, 'Let's not go here. Let's not talk about politics. Let's not talk about
2 religion.' And yet he persisted.")

3 30. Chin's theory of persistent behavior appears to derive from what Vetter and
4 Weisenfelder had said to him. He testified that some 25 other people claimed they too found
5 Coppedge annoying with his religious and political interests (he did not say that they felt
6 harassed), but that claim does not appear to be validated by any evidence other than Chin's self-
7 serving statements. Nevertheless, it opens a window into Chin's state of mind. Had Chin
8 informed Coppedge that 25 people over the years had complained about Coppedge, and that
9 these complaints could lead to discipline, that might have been a professional approach to take
10 with Coppedge under the circumstances. But Chin's judgment appears to have been clouded by
11 his own personal animus and hostility toward Coppedge's religious views. Huntley should have
12 determined at this point that an investigation ought to include looking into whether Chin had
13 created a hostile or intimidating environment with his severe verbal and physical conduct, and
14 the threat of adverse employment action based on Coppedge's religious expression. But
15 Huntley's approach lacked that basic level of sophistication necessary for conducting a
16 reasonable investigation.

17 31. Weisenfelder's grievances too were highly suspect. What exactly were they? On an
18 earlier occasion, Coppedge had asked her to share her views on Proposition 8. She declined and
19 he backed away, asking only if there was anything he could say to change her mind. She
20 characterized that behavior as "persistent." But that behavior is not objectively persistent, and
21 Weisenfelder's characterization of it as such should have been rejected by Huntley. On the
22 March 2 occasion, Weisenfelder had voluntarily borrowed a DVD from Coppedge about ID. She
23 took it home and sped through it, finding it to be "heavy-handed" with religious content. I have
24
25
26
27
28

1 not seen the film and am going by what counsel has told me (that it contains no religious
2 message or content). Nevertheless, Weisenfelder testified that she was not offended by the
3 DVD. What she claims disturbed her was a yellow Post-It note on the DVD jacket with some
4 names on it and the words "try again" alongside one of the names. In her deposition transcript,
5 several pages of testimony reveal Weisenfelder trying in vain to avoid explaining what her fear
6 was. Eventually, she stated that the yellow note made her feel like Coppedge would try to come
7 back and approach her again with another DVD. She did not want him to talk to her again.
8
9 (Deposition at pages 158-161).

10 32. A few points should be noted regarding Weisenfelder's complaints. With regard to
11 the Proposition 8 encounter, Coppedge did not act persistently or severely. His behavior did not
12 create a hostile or intimidating environment that would significantly interfere with
13 Weisenfelder's work. He came and went. She did not even bother to report it initially. There is
14 no evidence that she could not continue to do whatever she was doing at the time. In fact, she
15 did precisely what Vetter should have done in regard to the Christmas Party matter – told
16 Coppedge she was not interested and did not want to discuss it further. The fact that
17 Weisenfelder did not want to discuss Proposition 8 does not render Coppedge's overture
18 actionable harassment. Nor does his follow-up question. Had he returned to her on a separate
19 occasion and sought to discuss the subject with her, he could then have been found to have acted
20 persistently, because she had already made her position clear and definite.
21
22

23 33. Regarding the DVD, Weisenfelder accepted the loan of it consensually. She need
24 only have returned it to him and told him not to offer her any more. As with her statements to
25 him regarding Proposition 8, she could have said, I don't think we're on the same page
26 ideologically, or words to that effect. Somehow, she could have conveyed to him that she felt
27
28

1 uncomfortable discussing ID. But Weisenfelder seemed to harbor a strong intolerance toward
2 what she perceived to be Coppedge's beliefs. There is evidence in this case that Coppedge's
3 religious views were widely known around JPL. In fact, Coppedge might have been a minor
4 celebrity had he chosen to reveal to co-workers his Creation Safari Headlines website and his
5 membership on the film company's board of directors. Weisenfelder's stern response to the
6 issues that Coppedge identified with demonstrates a hostility bordering on bigotry. Had
7 Coppedge been in favor of Proposition 8 and against ID, presumably she would not have felt
8 intimidated or harassed. It is the same when a racist feels threatened by another person's
9 ethnicity. If the other person were not a member of that ethnic group, there would be no tension
10 between them. But the tension is based on the racist's intolerance, not on the other person's
11 ethnicity. In this case, Vetter, Chin and Weisenfelder all blame Coppedge for their frustration
12 and discomfort when it is his religious identity, something he can do nothing about, that disturbs
13 them. It is interesting to me that Vetter and Weisenfelder are friends and were certified together
14 to teach a course in interpersonal communication. They clearly are kindred souls, a fact that
15 Huntley overlooked.

16
17
18 34. Edgington also was a case of intolerance toward Coppedge's viewpoint, which was
19 perceived, at least by Huntley and management to be religious in nature. Unlike Weisenfelder,
20 Edgington had consented to a discussion concerning Proposition 8 with Coppedge. Also unlike
21 Weisenfelder, Edgington did not disclose what his feelings were initially, telling Coppedge that
22 he was leaning a certain way. When Coppedge disclosed what he believed, Edgington
23 characterized Coppedge's views as "propaganda," a term he understood to have a derogatory
24 meaning. An argument soon followed and Edgington asked Coppedge to leave his office. The
25 first point to note is that the discussion initially was consensual. Although two people may
26
27
28

1 argue, there is nothing improper about an argument where both parties agree to participate.
2 There is a dispute as to whether Coppedge was asked to leave Edgington's office. However,
3 Coppedge did leave, and the following day he made a point of visiting Edgington to apologize
4 for his rudeness. This might have ended the matter. However, Vetter (who along with being
5 friends with Weisenfelder had her own problem with Coppedge dating back to the Christmas
6 incident five years earlier) had her office adjacent to Edgington's. Overhearing the argument,
7 she waited for Coppedge to leave before approaching Edgington about reporting Coppedge for
8 harassment to Chin. When Coppedge presented his apology to Edgington, Edgington did not let
9 on that he had already authorized Vetter to report Coppedge as having harassed him.
10

11 35. Vetter and Chin appear to be at the center of each of these scenarios, a fact never
12 explored nor recognized by Huntley. In Huntley's interview of Coppedge, he told her that he
13 had discussed Proposition 8 with another employee the same day he spoke to Edgington and that
14 the conversation had been friendly. Huntley did not feel this was important and did not attempt
15 to interview the other individual. Nor did she attempt to learn whether Edgington might have
16 been to blame for starting the argument by labeling Coppedge's comments propaganda. And
17 finally, after Huntley had conducted the interviews with Weisenfelder, Chin, Edgington and
18 Vetter, she failed to visit with Coppedge a second or final time to allow him an opportunity to
19 rebut their allegations against him. Coppedge was well able to respond to those charges during
20 his four days of deposition testimony. Huntley could have given him another hour of her time.
21 She met with Chin on more than one occasion. The idea of having Coppedge respond to his
22 accusers seemed lost on Huntley.
23

24 36. To sum up to this point, Huntley (1) failed to determine the threshold question as to
25 whether ID is religion in order to understand Chin's statements to Coppedge that "ID is religion"
26
27
28

1 and his order to stop "pushing" his religion; (2) failed to question the integrity of the accusations
2 leveled against Coppedge by his complaining coworkers; and (3) gave weight to subjective and
3 bare claims of feeling "uncomfortable" while giving no weight to the evidence showing that
4 Coppedge had not acted in any objectively improper manner; (4) ignored Coppedge's claims of a
5 hostile work environment, civil rights violations and harassment; (5) failed to interview
6 favorable witnesses who could have disrupted a perceived "pattern" of bad behavior; and (6)
7 failed to return to Coppedge to allow him to correct or contradict prejudicial statements made by
8 Weisenfelder Edgington, Vetter and Chin.
9

10 37. Since Ms. Huntley erroneously considered Chin the Complainant and Coppedge the
11 Respondent, she continuously violated the JPL Policy on Unlawful Harassment and Coppedge's
12 rights. The policy states that she must protect the rights of both the Complainant (Chin) and
13 Respondent (Coppedge) with the greatest degree of confidentiality. It also states that each
14 individual team member conducting the investigation will be trained. Huntley (the only team
15 member apparent) seems not to have been not trained, otherwise she would have correctly
16 ascertained that it was Coppedge who felt Chin had created a hostile work environment with his
17 angry words and excessive conduct during their exchange. The policy requires that the
18 complainant and the respondent be informed of the relevant procedures and have an opportunity
19 to comment on the suitability of the investigator. Further, the JPL's Nondiscrimination and Equal
20 Opportunity Policy and JPL's Unlawful Harassment Policy, which prohibits retaliation, state that
21 they are to be reviewed with both parties. They also state that the Complainant and Respondent
22 shall be given the opportunity to present their cases separately to the investigator and to suggest
23 others who might be interviewed. Although Coppedge sent Huntley several emails seeking
24 clarification of the process, he had no idea what was happening to him until he was called to a
25
26
27
28

1 meeting with Burgess and Klenk, counseled about his behavior, was given a written warning and
2 demoted.

3 38. The written warning contained statements that appear untrue based on my review.
4 Burgess stated "You failed to stop these activities when you were told they were unwelcome and
5 disruptive." He further stated that "coworkers found your requests to watch your DVD's that
6 express your personal views to be unwelcome." No one represented that to Coppedge at the time
7 of the exchange.
8

9 39. Ms. Huntley had apparently consulted with no one, analyzed her notes on the few
10 negative animus witnesses she interviewed and recommended to Burgess that he give Coppedge
11 a written warning. The JPL policy states that the investigator will summarize for the respondent
12 the evidence in support of the complaint to allow the respondent the opportunity to reply. Then
13 and only then, the policy states, the investigator will report the findings and recommend
14 solutions or sanctions and measures to prevent the occurrence of similar instances. Huntley
15 abrogated her responsibilities, rushed to judgment and violated the provisions of JPL's Policy on
16 the handling of investigations of unlawful harassment complaints. Burgess then compounded an
17 already unfair and discriminatory situation by demoting Coppedge and taking away his title of
18 Team Lead that he had held for 9 years.
19

20 40. Burgess tried to justify his action by informing Coppedge that he was remiss in that
21 he did not stop the activities when he was told they were unwelcome and disruptive. The
22 evidence seems otherwise. Coppedge was never told by the staff he approached that the
23 conversations were unwelcome or disruptive. Those words were later added by Huntley, Burgess
24 and Klenk. In the few instances where it became obvious the person was uninterested, Coppedge
25 ceased the conversation and did not reopen the subject.
26
27
28

1 41. There appears to be much more to review and comment on with respect to Huntley's
2 investigation, an investigation I can categorically describe as incompetent, unfair, inadequate and
3 inconsistent with JPL guidelines even without the benefit of additional review.

4 **IV. COPPEDGE'S TERMINATION WAS BUILT AROUND SEVERAL PRETEXTS.**

5 42. Apparently, Coppedge's attorney sent a courtesy copy of the complaint to JPL's
6 attorney on April 15, 2010. I have not seen the letter, but am told this by counsel. In April or
7 May of 2010 (after the lawsuit was filed and after JPL's attorneys received notice of it), a
8 meeting was held at JPL attended by JPL's in-house and outside counsel to discuss the lawsuit.
9 Two individuals who would assume the roles of Coppedge's supervisors in the Fall, Dianne
10 Connor and Richard Van Why, also attended the meeting. Their attendance raises the question
11 why their presence at a confidential meeting concerning this lawsuit was at all necessary. We
12 can only speculate because these witnesses were instructed not to divulge what was discussed at
13 the meeting. What we do know (through Van Why's testimony) is that the subject matter of the
14 meeting was confined to this lawsuit.
15

16 43. The attendance of Conner and Van Why at a meeting in the Spring 2010 exclusively
17 relating to this lawsuit becomes significant because these individuals were responsible for
18 selecting which systems administrators ("SA") on the Cassini Program would be laid off in
19 anticipated reductions. Conner had been informed in April or May, the same period of time in
20 which she and Van Why attended the lawsuit meeting, that she would be required to reduce the
21 SA team to 3.0 FTE (full-time equivalent) employees. She believed that would mean letting go
22 two SAs. The SA team at that time stood at 4.0 FTE (Coppedge, Nick Patel, Harvey Chien and
23 Bob Jobsky (see chart). Attached hereto and incorporated herein as Exhibit D is a true and
24 correct copy of a chart I requested from counsel illustrating who was employed during calendar
25
26
27
28

1 2010. This means that Conner understood in April/May that one SA would need to be
2 terminated when the layoffs went into effect. Conner and Van Why began working on the layoff
3 process in the summer.

4 44. In October, Conner hired two new SAs at a time when she was already involved in
5 the process of determining two reductions in the SA workforce (see chart). This raises a serious
6 question about timing. If 3.0 FTE were required in the new calendar year, why was she hiring
7 two new SAs in October, boosting the number of SAs to 6.0 FTE? One can fairly speculate that
8 Conner had "padded" the SA team with two members more to her liking so that when time came
9 to lay off employees, she would not be left having to retain Coppedge. Mr. Jobsky quit in
10 December, and I do not know when or if Conner first learned that he would be leaving the SA
11 team. However, with Jobsky gone on January 1, 2011, that left the staff at 4.0 FTE, requiring
12 only one SA to be laid off.
13
14

15 45. Apparently Chris Cordell worked in another "directorate" but was transferred to
16 Conner's office in October. At the time Van Why considered the list of SA names for possible
17 layoff, Cordell was not on the list because he was in another "directorate." Doing the math, had
18 Conner not hired Cordell and re-hired Oscar Castillo in October, that would have left Conner's
19 team at 3.0 FTE, precisely where it was required to be based on expected budgeting, without any
20 need to terminate anyone. By adding Castillo, the SA team stood at 4.0 FTE. But Van Why
21 included on the list an individual who was not part of Conner's SA team, Gary Wang. Van Why
22 explains that Wang was listed on the layoff criteria worksheet for consideration because Van
23 Why supervised him in another office. But if Wang was not a member of Conner's SA team and
24 Cordell was, why wasn't Wang excluded from consideration and Cordell included? The
25 explanation for putting Wang on the list is inconsistent with keeping Cordell off the list.
26
27
28

1 Following the logic applied to Cordell's name not being included in the list of potential layoffs,
2 Wang's name should not have been on it either. And if Wang's name had not been on it (and
3 Castillo had not been hired in October), the SA team would have stood at 3.0 FTE! No layoffs
4 would have been necessary. By "padding" the team with two additional people, Conner made it
5 possible to still terminate two SAs, but they would be two disfavored SAs, and to clear Cordell
6 from consideration. This was quite creative. And it was something that might have been
7 discussed at the lawsuit meeting behind closed doors with counsel, though that is strictly
8 conjecture. Nevertheless, one can draw a reasonable inference from the evidence for purposes of
9 showing pretext in a wrongful termination setting. It is therefore my opinion that the evidence
10 creates at least a triable issue as to whether Coppedge was terminated for reasons other than
11 budgetary concerns.
12

13 46. But that begs the question. Why would Coppedge have been singled out for layoff?
14 He was the most senior SA on the team, having been there since prior to the Saturn probe's
15 launch date, and he had been rewarded for nine of the 14 years he was there with the position of
16 Team Lead. As a full-time employee, his performance evaluations were steadily complimentary
17 each year. None of the "Employee Contribution and Assessment of Performance" ("ECAP")
18 performance evaluations for Coppedge for 2003/4, 2004/5, 2005/6, 2006/7, 2007/8 and 2008/9
19 were critical of his job performance. Only after the lawsuit was filed did Coppedge receive poor
20 performance assessment.
21

22 47. According to testimony I have reviewed, the only documented evidence of poor job
23 performance an employee would receive would be found in Coppedge's personnel file. My
24 review of that file contained Huntley's handwritten notes from her investigation. It also
25 contained the ECAPs. One can infer from these facts that the disciplining of Coppedge was
26
27
28

1 taken into account and that Coppedge's decision to file a lawsuit in April 2010 counted against
2 him. I have worked at General Dynamics, a defense firm, and have experience with work
3 environments similar to JPL. These companies are very concerned about their brands and their
4 reputations. There is no doubt that Burgess, a Defendant in the lawsuit, and Mitchell, both of
5 whom attended the April/May lawsuit meeting (and let's not forget that Vetter is Mitchell's
6 administrative assistant), would look with disfavor on the disrepute such a lawsuit might bring to
7 the world-renown space lab.
8

9 48. Burgess especially would have been perturbed by the lawsuit. He was scheduled to
10 retire October 1. And, too, he had already made the decision to remove Coppedge as his Team
11 Lead and give it to Nick Patel. These facts appear in various places but due to timing constraints
12 I cannot cite them at this time. It fell to Burgess to prepare the SAs' annual ECAPs, but Burgess
13 could invite comments from employees of his choosing. For 2010, after the lawsuit had been
14 filed, he strangely chose Conner and Patel to comment on Coppedge's job performance. Conner
15 was already paving the way to include Coppedge on the list of layoff casualties.
16

17 49. It is unclear what Patel's problem with Coppedge was. Patel and Coppedge had
18 worked side-by-side as SAs for several years. Coppedge had been Patel's "lead." That position
19 carried with it additional responsibility, mainly interfacing with other Cassini managers and
20 serving as the bridge between his office and the other units on the space program. Not once in
21 the nine years that Coppedge served as team lead did he criticize another SA in front of line
22 management. Nor did Coppedge micromanage the SAs by snooping to see if they were working
23 on business-related matters at all times.
24

25 50. But when Patel was elevated to the lead role, power seemed to corrupt him. He
26 accused Coppedge of typing personal matter on company time, a charge he could not prove. He
27
28

1 dragged Coppedge before Burgess, now a Defendant in this lawsuit, to make the unfounded
2 accusation. So when Burgess invited Patel to comment on Coppedge's job performance for the
3 2010 ECAP, Burgess could expect Patel to be critical...and he was. The critical comments in
4 Coppedge's ECAP could then serve as pretext for Coppedge's termination.

5
6 51. Finally, I have reviewed the layoff criteria worksheet attached hereto as Exh. E and
7 incorporate herein by reference. Burgess and Conner provided input to Van Why, who scored
8 the SAs to determine who would be selected for termination. My study of the testimony of
9 Conner and Van Why leads me to conclude that this was a purely subjective process in which
10 Burgess and Conner fed Van Why, who had not worked with Coppedge before, with critical
11 comments. Based on the input provided by Burgess, a Defendant at the time in this lawsuit, and
12 Conner, who attended attorney-client privileged meetings with JPL's internal and outside
13 counsel concerning this lawsuit at a time when she had no connection to it, Coppedge received a
14 rank of 5 (an "F" grade) in three categories and a rank of 4 (a "D" grade) in one category. No
15 other SA received a rank of 5 in multiple categories. After 14 years, nine of which he served as
16 team lead, Coppedge received the lowest possible ranking of 5 in "need," "skills" and
17 "performance" categories. He received the next lowest rank in "ability." And although he had
18 seniority over the other SAs evaluated, he received an average rank of 3 in "experience."
19 Strangely, he received a high rank of 2 ("B") for "conduct" even though he had been charged
20 with harassment and unprofessionalism, a fact known to Conner, Burgess and Van Why, who all
21 attended meetings with JPL counsel regarding this lawsuit beginning the prior Spring.

22
23
24 52. Based on these factors, I have concluded that there is sufficient evidence to infer that
25 Coppedge's termination was based upon pretext. To sum up, (1) the temporal proximity between
26 the April 2010 filing of the lawsuit and the Summer/Autumn ranking of SA to be laid off is
27
28

1 sufficiently close in time to raise a suspicion that Coppedge's termination was based on his
2 having challenged his employer's decision to discipline him in April 2009 through the filing of
3 this action; (2) the attendance in April/May 2010 of Coppedge's future supervisors, who would
4 be responsible for determining which SAs to lay off, at a confidential meeting with JPL
5 attorneys' solely to discuss this lawsuit looks suspicious and because of the attorney-client
6 confidentiality privilege leaves management with plausible deniability for refusing to divulge
7 what was discussed at that and subsequent meetings; (3) the "padding" of the SA team at a time
8 when reductions were being discussed and planned for, together with contradictory explanations
9 for who would be included on the layoff criteria worksheet for purposes of deciding layoff
10 casualties, raises a clear inference that favored personnel were added so that disfavored
11 personnel could be removed; (4) until this lawsuit was filed, Coppedge's personnel file contained
12 not a single documented record of poor job performance, but once the lawsuit was filed,
13 Coppedge's job performance was severely criticized; (5) Burgess and Patel engineered a
14 scenario that would ensure that Coppedge's performance review would contain criticism; (6) the
15 the mostly subjective, not data-driven, process for ranking employees left Coppedge with
16 preposterously inferior grades for "need," "skills" and "performance" after 14 years with Cassini.

17
18
19 53. I understand that there is quite a bit of deposition testimony and documentation in this
20 case, which I would like to review. Should additional information be made available to me, it
21 may become necessary to alter my opinions and conclusions. I reserve the right to amend my
22 opinions based on additional information received prior to my trial testimony.
23

24 54. I am prepared to testify on my findings and opinions.

25 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the
26 foregoing is true and correct.
27
28

1 Executed this 29th day of August, 2011, at Cool, California

2
3  829-11
4 LAWRENCE P. BALL

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

EXHIBIT A

116 West Santa Fe Ave., Suite A
Placentia, CA 92870

Phone 714-542-9525
FAX: 530-885-4394

SUMMARY OF QUALIFICATIONS:

Human Resources professional with over 40 years experience (22 years functional management including Director and Vice President positions and 15 years as a consultant to clients) in numerous industries. Author of articles on people practices and legal trends for trade publications and a business journal. Experience as an expert witness and internal investigator involving sexual harassment, age, race and sex discrimination, discipline and discharge cases.

SPECIFIC EXPERIENCE:

Sexual Harassment: Investigated, analyzed and resolved incidents of harassment, both while employed and for clients. Developed internal policies, procedures and practices addressing discrimination and harassment.

Discrimination Issues: Investigated and resolved informal and formal discrimination charges and responded to agencies. Coordinated resolution of cases with the Department of Fair Employment and Housing and the Equal Employment Opportunities Commission.

Corrective Action: Administered corrective action procedures including positive discipline. Counseled managers regarding the fair, appropriate and consistent application of workplace rules. Monitored and evaluated all termination actions

Employment Issues: Thoroughly familiar with accepted recruiting, selection and placement practices in various industries and the legal obligations regarding reductions in force. Direct responsibility, as well as through support staff, for the placement of all levels of Production, Technical, Professional, Management and Administrative employees.

Trier of Fact: Completed an 18 month Certified Arbitrator Development training program at UCLA sponsored by the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, the American Arbitration Association and other agencies. Served as an Arbitrator on workplace issues.

EMPLOYMENT:

Present	Human Resources Management Network On-Site Human Resources Management services for small to mid-sized companies (Project management and outsourced HR management). Expert Witness assignments and internal investigations.
1997 to 2000	STRATEGIC HR SERVICES Senior Vice President, Advisory Division, managing the activities of consulting staff performing all aspects of Human Resource Management on an outsourced basis for client companies.
1995 to 1997	HUMAN RESOURCES MANAGEMENT NETWORK People Management practices consultant, Internal Investigator, Expert Witness
1992-1995	ORANGE COUNTY TRANSPORTATION AUTHORITY Senior Projects Manager implementing people management systems for a large public employer.
1984-1992	EMPLOYERS GROUP (Formerly the Merchants and Manufacturers Association) Regional Manager serving as a technical workplace consultant to human resources and operations managers at 1000 member companies.
1981-1984	APPLEGATE STORE Owner/Manager of country general store in Oregon
1978-1981	STOODY COMPANY Vice President of Employee Relations
1975-1978	GOLDEN STATE FOODS Director of Employee Relations
1972-1975	ARMSTRONG NURSERIES Director of Administration
1967-1972	CLAREMONT COLLEGES Director of Personnel

1963-1967	GENERAL DYNAMICS-Pomona Division Senior Personnel Representative
1962-1963	ROY GILLIS AND ASSOCIATES Employment Search Recruiter
1961-1962	UNITED STATES AIR FORCE First Lieutenant, Recalled to duty in Berlin Crisis
1958-1961	HALLMARK CARDS Manager Managed two production processes and Final Inspection

EDUCATION:

Bachelor of Science, University of Kansas
 Work toward Masters in Business Economics, Claremont Graduate School
 Certified Arbitrator Development Program, University of California, Los Angeles

PUBLICATIONS:

Personnel Journal

Take Charge, Be an Intrapreneur

Orange County Business Journal

"Workplace" Column

Staff Cutbacks Involving Over-40 Employees
Workplace Nude Pinups-Sexual Harassment
Analyzing Jobs Can Cut Workers' Comp Costs
Employers Need to Know Time Off Rules
Hiring the Disabled Makes Dollars and Sense
Employers Can Be Responsible for Injuries Sustained at Play
Workplace Privacy Could be Your Next Lawsuit
Court Upholds Homosexual Rights on the Job
Independent Contractors Examined Closely by IRS
Managing Costs by Reviewing Your Pay System
Dealing with Stress and Trauma in the Workplace
Elder Care: Making it Company Policy

Orange County Business Journal

"Human Resources Guide"

How to Control Unemployment Insurance Costs
Employee Assistance Programs, a Must for the 90's
Productivity and Market Performance Linked to HR Practices
Don't Get Caught with Your Posters Down
Courting and Joking at Work May Become Harassment
Part Time HR Manager, An Idea Whose Time Has Come

Money Radio, AM 1620

Weekly Commentator

Workplace issues

Employer's Alert

Employer's Obligations Under New USERRA

CLIENT ENGAGEMENTS:

Payne and Fears
R. Craig Scott and Associates
Accurate Instrument and Repair
Pacific Theatres Corporation
Moulton Niguel Water

Irvine, CA
Newport Beach, CA
Orange, CA
Los Angeles, CA
Aliso Viejo

Dan Fears
Craig Scott
Lowell Smith
Ira Levin
Carol Sanders

REFERENCES:

Barnes, Crosby, FitzGerald & Zeman
Gerald Unis and Associates
Nossaman, Guthner, Knox & Elliott
Paul, Hastings, Janofsky and Walker
Rutan and Tucker
Allen, Matkins, Leck, Gamble and Mallory
Murtaugh, Miller, Meyer and Nelson
Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher
Gibson, Dunn and Crutcher

Irvine, CA
San Clemente, CA
Irvine, CA
Costa Mesa, CA
Costa Mesa, CA
Irvine, CA
Costa Mesa, CA
Irvine, CA
Irvine, CA

William Crosby
Gerald Unis
Greg Sanders
Howard Hay
Jim Morris
Dwight Armstrong
Jim Murphy
Bill Claster
Ken Ristau

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS:

Association of Professional Consultants
Forensic Consultants Association

Costa Mesa, CA
Costa Mesa, CA

Juli Bartels
Norma Fox

EXHIBIT B

Case Listing

Case Name	Law Firm	Issue	Attorney
Achondo v. T.M. Cobb	Payne & Fears	Sexual Harassment	Mark Sacks/Dan Fears
Giocondo v. TRM Mfging	Ricks & Anderson	Wrongful Termination	Cecil Ricks
Daum v. Mental Health Systems	Law Offices of Susan Moore	Religious Discrimination	Susan Moore
Bisi v. Imperial Irrigation District	Sutherland & Gerber	Disability Discrimination	Lowell Sutherland
Mason v. Lanterman Hospital	Law Offices of Diane Cray	Sexual Harassment	Diane Cray
Edmonds v. Ornda	Cotkin & Collins	Sexual Harassment	Phil Collins
Anderson v. Natl. Revenue Corp.	Law Offices of Robert D. Coviello	Sexual Harassment	Robert Coviello
Dayeh v. Mission Amb. Surgi-center	Barnes, Crosby, FitzGerald & Zeman	Disability Discrimination	William Crosby
Anne Rex v. ACT Networks	Brobeck, Phelger, Harrison LLP	Gender Harassment	Gabrielle Wirth
Moreno v. Salvatore Rotella	Best, Best & Krieger LLP	Harassment & Retaliation	Patrick HWF Pearce
Keller & Gadde v. CSUN	Law Offices of Lawrence J. Hanna	Disability Discrimination	Lawrence J. Hanna
J.C. Washington v. City of Colton	Best, Best & Krieger LLP	Racial Discrimination/ Retaliation	Patrick HWF Pearce
Ornelas v. Arnold Palmer Golf Mgt. Co.	Law Offices of John Kiwan	Racial Discrimination/ Wrongful Termination	Patrick O'Keefe
Sinkula v. Farmers Insurance Exchange	Sedgwick, Detert, Moran & Arnold	Wrongful Termination, Gender Discrimination	Alan Freisleben
Wisted v. Bicycle Club	Sedgwick, Detert, Moran & Arnold	Wrongful Termination, Breach of Contract	Yvette Cano
Stewart v. Unihealth	Law Offices of Victor George	Sexual Harassment	Victor George
Bemiller v. Unihealth	Law Offices of David Holt	Sexual Harassment	David Holt
Wilson v. 24 Hour Fitness	Law Offices of David Holt	Wrongful Termination/ FMLA Violation	David Holt
Smith v. Pool	Thomas and Price	Racial Discrimination/ Wrongful Termination	Michael Price/Paul Ayers
Damico v. Nations Healthcare	Harrigan, Ruff	Racial Discrimination	Frank Tobin
Stacey Detels v. Farmers Insurance	Sedgwick, Detert, Moran & Arnold	Disability Discrimination	Yvette Cano/Alan Freisleben
Ramirez v. Thomas Bros. Maps	Barnes, Crosby, FitzGerald & Zeman	FMLA/Disability Discrimination	William Crosby
Bukhaya v. Kaiser Laboratories	Thelen, Reid & Priest	National Origin, Sex and Disability Discrimination	Cheryl Schreck

EX B

Graham v. Auto Club of Southern Calif.	Murtaugh, Miller, Meyer & Nelson	Sexual Harassment, Wrongful Discharge, Disability Discrim., FMLA Violation	Michael Murtaugh
Lee Bon v Argentina Airlines	Gutierrez, Preciado & House	Age Discrimination, Wrongful Term, Breach of Contract	Peter Kim
Debra Brown v. Warner Brothers Studios.	Barnes, Crosby, Fitzgerald & Zeman	Discrimination and Harassment	William Crosby
Baez v. AirTouch Cellular	Law Offices of Victor George	Sexual Harassment	Victor George
Sage v. San Diego Zoological Society	Law Offices of Donald Moses	Age and Disability Harassment	Donald Moses
Cervantes v Aon Corp/Sherwood Ins.	Barnes, Crosby, FitzGerald & Zeman	Wrongful Termination	Wm Crosby
Sessions v Beckman Coulter, Inc.	Payne and Fears	Wrongful Discharge	Andrew Jaramillo
Willie Marshal v. County of Riverside	Kinkle, Rodiger & Spriggs	Wrongful Discharge, Racial Discrimination	
Heather Flanders v. Salt Lake City Corp.	Dewsnup, King & Olson	Sexual and Age Discrimination	Bruce Disenhouse
Gorrell v. Insituform Technologies, Inc.	Hewitt & Prout	Wrongful Discharge, Whistleblower	Alan Mortensen
Laurence Sanders v. Insituform Tech.	Hewitt & Prout	Marital Status Discrimination	Erica Arouesty
Michael Leatherman v. Insituform Tech	Hewitt & Prout	Reverse Discrimination	Henry Truskowski
Siccama v. Comant Industries	Payne & Fears	Age Discrimination	Henry Truskowski
Georgiev v. The Bicycle Club	Peterson, Pitcher, Chow & Freisleben	Violation of FMLA	James Payne
Jaimes v. Teamsters	Hewitt and Prout	Wrongful Discharge, Sexual Harassment	Lily Chow
Maesee v. Calendar	Roberts & Associates	Sexual Discrimination	Stacey Raphael
Beauchamp v. Kabuki Sushi	Scott Galien & Assoc.	Sexual Harassment/Wrongful Discharge	Cliff Roberts
David Jones, et.al. v. Family Dollar Stores	Perkins, Johnson & Settle	Racial Discrimination, Hostile Environment	Ted Cox
Saldana v L. A. County Office of Education	Bolden & Martin	Wrongful Discharge & Violation of FMLA	Florence Johnson
Steele v. Inland Eye and Tissue Band	Thompson & Colgate	Wrongful Hiring/Retention	Areva Martin
James Marley v. Masina	Walton & Associates	Racial Discrimination	Kurt Yeager
Williams v County of Riverside	Kinkle, Rodiger & Spriggs	Disability Discrimination/FMLA Violation	Justin E.D. Daily
Linda Shannon v. U.S. Postal Service	Law Offices of Ollie Manago	FMLA Violation	Bruce Disenhouse
Karol Vladovich v. Abrams Communications	Borton, Petrini & Conron, LLP	Sexual Discrimination & Harassment	Ollie Manago
Thornton v. Gartner Group	Bolden & Martin	Racial Discrimination	Michael F. Long
Williams v. United Rentals	Qualls & Workman	Sexual Harassment	Areva Martin
Fajardo v. Walter's Auto Sales	Hewitt & Prout	Disability Discrimination	Robin Workman
Enke Enterprises v. Search West, Inc.	Wilson Law Firm	Constructive Discharge Breach of Contract, Employment	Susan Rosenblat Dennis Wilson

Rivera v. Ag Formulators	Law Offices of Dean B. Gordon	Sexual Harassment/Wrongful Discharge	Dean Gordon
Buy.com v. Scott Blum	Law Offices of David Salvin	Sexual Harassment, Battery, Wrongful Termination	David Salvin
Seever v. Copley Press	Shepherd Mullin	Wrongful Termination, Violation of ADA	Tara Wilcox
Muller v. DMJM&N	Krieger & Krieger	Age Discrimination	Jeff Neiderman
Fajardo v Walter's Auto Sales, et.al.	Hewitt and Prout	Wrongful Termination, Disability Discrimination	Susan Rosenblatt
Everett v. Chargers Football Co.	Pillsbury Winthrop	Wage Hour, Exempt v Non-exempt	George Howard
Westlake Plaza Realty v Leyden	Silver & Arsh	Wrongful Termination, Breach of Contract	Jeff Frasier
AC Phillips v Boeing Aircraft	Law Offices of Rachelle Evans Jackson	Wrongful Termination, Age Discrimination, Race Discrimination	Rachelle Jackson
Morelli v Pioneer House	Law Offices of Richard K. Werner	Wrongful Termination	Richard K. Werner
Sumner v. Wamco	Barnes, Crosby, Fitzgerald & Zeman	Wrongful Termination, Failure to provide Standard of Care re: Anti-Discrimination, Anti-Harassment Law	Bill Crosby
Tsamoudakis v. City of Garden Grove	Barnes, Crosby, Fitzgerald & Zeman	Disability Discrimination	Bill Crosby
Addison v Nishihara	Bolen & Martin	FEHA Housing Discrimination	Chike Onyia
Edwards v Hurricane Bar and Grill	Law Offices of John Kraemer	Sex Discrimination, Sex Harassment	John Kremer
Mathews v Sunrise Colony	O'Brien & Nelson	Sexual Harassment, Failure to Promote	April A. O'Brien
Myers v Kaiser	Thielen, Reed & Priest	Disability, Sex & Race Discrimination, Wrongful Termination	Hardy Murphy
Tarzi v. Fountain Valley Hospital	Law Offices of Donald Huffstader	Hostile Work Environment, Constructive Discharge	Donald Huffstader
Santoro v Macy's	Barr & Mudford	Wrongful Termination due to Breach of Contract	Dugan Barr
Matta v Valley Yellow Pages, ,	Hinkle, Hachimowicz, Pointer & Mayron	Disability Discrimination	Jerry Emanuel

Adams et.al. v. Merced City School Distr.	Richter and Smith	Sexual Harassment/Retaliation	William Smith
Maldavo v Robert Half International	Radoslovich Law Corp,	Breach of Contract, Negligent Referral, Negligent Misrepresentation	Frank Radoslovich
Scott Arwood v D.J.'s Glass Plus	Honaker Law Offices	Wrongful Hiring and Retention	Richard Honaker
Busolo v. Caesar's Palace	O'Brien & Nelson	FMLA, Wrongful Discharge	Sharon O'Brient
Hernandez v. Roundtable Pizza	Lionel, Sawyer & Collins	Disability Discrimination, Employability	Leslie Hart
Johnson et al v. Walgreens	Alverson, Taylor, Nortensen, Nelson & Sanders	Racial Discrimination	Nathan Reinmiller
Gathright v. Oak Grove School	Law Offices of Kyle Scott	Wrongful Hire and Retention	Kyle Scott
Randolf v. Mahdy Ahmed & First Interstate Security	Law Offices of Eugene Shoe	Sexual Harassment/Constructive Discharge	Arnold Levine
Vargas v. NMB (USA), Inc.	Littler Mendelson	Sexual Harassment, Retaliation, FMLA Violation	Martha Keon
Briggs v. San Diego Housing Commission	Christensen, Schwerdtfeger & Spath	ADA Violation, Constructive Discharge	Sean Schwerdtfeger
Haluck, Litton v. Ricoh Elec, Inc.	Littler, Mendelson	National Origin, Race Discrimination	Ken Rose/Mindy Mattingly
Morales v. Home Depot	Damiani Law Group	Employment Discrimination, Wrongful Discharge	Lisa Damiani
Park v Choil Enterprises	Hollins & Schechter	Wrongful Discharge, Discrimination & Retaliation	Kathleen Carter
Choil v. Rose Cain	Hollins & Schechter	Interference with Economic Advantage, Defamation	Kathleen Carter
Rose Cain v. Choil Enterprises	Hollins & Schechter	Wrongful Discharge, Retaliation	Kathleen Carter
Leach v Imhoff	Rosen and Associates	Independent Contractor Status	John Wallace
Don Del Rio v. Carey Limo	Haney, Buchanan & Patterson	Independent Contractor Status	George Romain
Kathy Green v. Air Force Village West	Carney & Delaney	Wrongful Discharge	Richard Roth
Oglesby-Lugo v. Antelope Valley Union High School District	Sylvester, Oppenheim & Linde	Disability Discrimination	Alan Varner
Jo A. Preston v. City of North Las Vegas	Kolias Law Offices	ADA Violation, Age, Gender Discrimination, Retaliation	Marina Kolias
Chand et. al. v Target Corp.	Paul, Hastings, Janofsky & Walker	FMLA Violation, Exempt/Non-Exempt Determination	Jeff Wohl

Johnson v. Palm Management	Law Offices of Hugh Duff Robertson	Wrongful Termination, Sexual Discrimination, Failure to Promote	Hugh Robertson
Garcia v Choon Suk Ro Elmwood Insurance	Gray and Prouty Cozen, O'Connor	Wrongful Hire, Retention Wrongful Hire/Retention, Misrepresentation	Jill Klein Peter Lynch
Darling v Coca Cola	Atkins & Evans	Disability Discrimination, Wrongful Discharge	Cynthia Sands
De Leon v. TW Metals	Law Offices of Doug Spoors	Discrimination and Harassment	Doug Spoors
Sanchez v. City of Los Angeles	Law Offices of Michael Light	Retaliation	Michael Leight
Taylor/Napoles v. California Pizza, LLC	Fisher and Phillips	Racial Discrimination, Harassment, Retaliation	Steve Miller
Glow v. UPRC, et al.	Ganong & Wyatt, LLP	Wrongful Retention	Phil Ganong
Adrienne Terrill v CFL, Inc. et al; #RIC 425263	Chamblee & Ryan	Sexual Harassment	James Eckels
Adrienne Terrill v. Central Freight Lines, Inc. et al, #RIC 428089	Chamblee & Ryan	Wrongful Hire	James Eckels
Tanya Milan v. City of Holtville	Plourd and Breeze	Wrongful Discharge-Failure to Provide Reasonable Accommodation	John Breeze
Crabtree v. Visaye	Chigoyenette, Grossberg & Clouse	Nation of Origin Discrimination, CFRA Violation	Richard Clouse Michael Lisko
Chanlee v. First Mutual Mortgage	Teuton, Loeyw & Parker	Discrimination, Retaliation, Constructive Dismissal	Charles Courteny
Ross v. Director's Guild of America	Latham & Watkins		
Maria D. v. Comcast	Lewis, Brisbois, Bisgaard & Smith	Wrongful Hire/Retention, Inadequate Investigation	Paul Clauss
Aflak v. Pro Unlimited	Qualls & Workman	Exempt/Non-Exempt Classification, Wrongful Termination, FMLA Violation	Robin Workman
Tzresniowski v. Signature Flight Support	Hal P. Gazaway, P.C.	Wrongful Termination	Hal P. Gazaway
Henderson/Davis v. LadyFootLocker	Law Offices of Florence Johnson	Sexual Harassment, Wrongful Discharge	Florence Johnson
Gonzales v. Autozone	Madrid Law Firm	Wrongful Hiring/Retention	Eduardo Madrid
Angel/Licona v. Rapid Transfer	White & Oliver	Wrongful Discharge	Larry Ward
Gonzales v. Plastic Dress up Co.	Rager Law Firm	Age Discrimination, Sex Discrimination	Jeff Rager

Shelley v CRST Expedited	Lyndberg and Watkins	Disability Discrimination	Judy Gold
Stacy Crissmore V. CCA of Tennessee, LLC.	Gleason & Favarote	Sexual Harassment, Discrimination	Richard Chen
Rebecca McWhorter v. CCA of Tennessee, LLC.	Gleason & Favarote	Wrongful Constructive Discharge, Discrimination	Paul Gleason
Koci v. Hilton Hotel	Girardi & Keese	Wrongful Discharge, Disability Discrimination	Keith Griffin
Boehme v. Symond Abina	The Walston Legal Group	Slander	Julie Zhalkovsky
Fernandez v. Niagra Bottling Co.	Kring and Chung	Disability Discrimination/Wrongful Discharge	Laura Hess/Greg Brown
Pietrusiewicz v Ashland	Bonetati, Sasaki, Kincaid & Kincaid	Disability Discrimination/Failure to Accommodate	Marilyn Bonetati
Yeakel v. Farmers Insurance	Tharpe and Howell	Wrongful Termination, Whistle Blower	David Binder
Wolf v. Target Corp	Lendrum Law Firm	Wrongful Discharge, Disability Discrimination	Jeff Lendrum
Pleasants v. Lowes	Erickson, Arbuthnot, Kilduff, Day & Lindstrom	Wrongful Hire of Independent Contractor	Jodie Steinberg
Curtis v. Golden Rain	Kinkle, Rodiger & Spriggs	Defamation, Slander	Dave Lenhardt
Haynes v. Plycon Transportation Group	Law Offices of David Bates	Wrongful Discharge	David Bates
Buccheri v. LegalMatch.com	The Revelation Law Firm	Sexual Harassment, Retaliation	Melanie Popper
Anderson v. Longs Drugs	Mashney Law Firm	Defamation and Violation of Privacy	Gerald Block
Michel Morgan v. City of Oceanside	Law Offices of Laura Farris	Disability Discrimination, Failure to Reasonably Accommodate, Wrongful Termination	Laura Farris
Mathews v. Alpha Tech Spine	Justin Prato, Atty at Law	Sexual Harassment and Retaliation,	Justin Prato
Scott Fitzpatrick v. Bradshaw Intl.	Farmer and Ridley	Wrongful Term/Wage Hour	Rebecca Mocciano
Chandna v. Lynwood Unified School District	Leal and Trejo, LLP	Failure to Accommodate, Race & National Origin Discrimination	David Trejo
Pham v. Samano	The Reeves Law Group	Negligent Hire/Train/Investigate	Derek Pakis

Ryan v. Southwest Diagnostics	Doyle, Berman & Murday	Sexual Harassment/Gender Discrimination, Employment discrimination, Retaliation,	Heather Fazio
Pasinger v. Starbucks	Hollins, Schechter	Race, Religious Discrimination, Wrongful Discharge	Christy Arnold
Vinogradov v. Montana State University	Waddel & Magan	Gender Discrimination, Equal Pay	E. Casey Magan
White v. United Health Care Services	Brendan White	Labor Code Violations, Wrongful Discharge	Brendan White
Hoffman Richter v. Costco	Damiani & Assoc	Sexual Harassment, Inadequate Investigation	Lisa Damiani
Alice Lin v. Wang, Hartmann & Gibbs	Khiterer Law Office	Employability	Vladimir Khiterer
Kalene Peoples v. Pabst Brewing	Mason & Mason, LLP	Wrongful Retention, Sexual Harassment, Assault	Reginald Mason
Victoria Cruz v. Sequoia School	Dale, Braden & Hinchcliffe,	Wrongful Termination, Long Term Employee Leave Expired	Stacie Johnson, Leah Gasendo
Smith v. Sun State Components of Nevada	Lee Hernandez, Kelsey Brooks Garofola & Blake	Wrongful Retention	Maria Maskall
Deckert v. FedEx Freight West	Law Office of Mary-Alice Coleman	Wrongful Term, Race Discrimination, Inadequate Investigation	Jim Ashworth
Moster v. Encore Capital Group	Procopio, Cory, Hargreaves & Savitch	Defamation, Breach of Contract	Eunice Lau
Allison v. Apple Tree Home Care	Trullinger & Wenk	Wrongful Hire, Retention	Chuck Trullinger
Sunada v. CCSD	Nelson Law	Disability	Sharon Nelson
Piro v. Pacific Honda	Flynn & Flynn	Harassment/Discrimination	
Mark Gee v. Ken Bankston v. American Power Converters	Ricks & Anderson	Sexual Harassment	Linda Flynn
Quinteros v. Snelling Staffing	Geary, Shea & O'Donnell	Disparate Impact Age Discrimination	Cecil Ricks
Pohrman v. Westair Gases and Equipment, Inc.	Higgs, Fletcher & Mack	Breach of Standard of Care in Hiring	Matthew Good
		Disability Discrimination	Loren Freestone

Blue v. GRM	Law Offices of Cecil Ricks	Wrongful Termination, Violation Cecil Ricks of CFRA
Dickerson v. California Waste Solutions, Inc	Law Offices of Wallace Doolittle	Sexual Harassment, Racial Discrimination
Sweet v. ALB Industries	Treon & Shook	Defamation, Libel, Negligent Termination
Wiles v. County of Kings	Weakley, Arendt & McGuire LLP	Harassment/Hostile Intimidating & Offensive Workplace, Constructive Discharge, Age Discrimination
Johnson v. Land Title	Doyle, Berman, Murdy PC	Negligent Hiring, Negligent Retention, Negligent Supervision, Negligent Training
Gomez v Kenyon Construction, Inc.	Corporate Legal Division	Disability Discrimination, Constructive Discharge
Owsley v. J.B. Hunt	Tharpe & Howell	Wrongful Term, Failure to properly drug test
Frates v Liberty Elementary School	Weakley, Arendt & McGuire LLP	Discrimination, Sexual Harassment, Retaliation
Troy White et al. v. Memphis Metropolitan Transportation	Johnson & Brown	Race Discrimination and Harassment
Thorson Specialty Insurance Services v. The Hampshire Group LLC	Artiano & Associates	Standards of Recruiting
McBurnie v. City of Prescott Arizona	City of Prescott	Wrongful Discharge (Layoff)
Mitchell v. Martin Sprocket and Gear	Law Offices of Mary Alice Coleman	Racial Discrimination, Wrongful Discharge
Lemeck v. SAPPI LTD	Barnes Crosby	Wrongful Discharge, Violation of Labor Code
Rich Futia v. Romano Family	Williams, Panelli, Cullen	Disability Discrimination, ADA Accessibility
Papazian v. Chino Valley USD	Thompson & Colgate	Discrimination, Retaliation, Cancer Diagnosis
Lebsack v. Goff	Yoka & Smith	Negligent Hiring and Retention
Gerondale v. Memorial Care Hospital	Law Office of Cecil Ricks	Wrongful Discharge

Arvizu v. County of Kern	Office of County Counsel, Kern County	Reasonableness of Vision Standard	Scott Fontes
Elizabeth Hughey v. Clarus Group LLC	Fisher and Phillips	Sexual Harassment, Negligent Hire, Negligent Retention	Steve Miller
Govan v. Security National Funeral Homes	Lewis Brisbois, Bisgaard & Smith LLP	Wrongful Demotion, Racial Discrimination, Religious Discrimination	Karen Karr, Esq.
Belardes v. County of Los Angeles	Law Offices of William Balderrama	Whistle Blower, Wrongful Discharge	Michael Carmichael
Bowen v. State of California, Department of Justice	Law Offices of Mary Alice Coleman	Racial Discrimination, Wrongful Discharge	James Ashworth
Zapata v. City of San Diego	Haight, Brown and Bonesteel, LLC	Wrongful Discharge, Sexual Orientation Discrimination	Chandra Moore
Alonzo v. Tuesday Morning	Law Offices of Sandra Castro	FMLA/CFRA RTW, failure to Accommodate, Failure to engage in interactive discussion	Kristen Brown
Lordes v. City of Houston Alaska	Lazarus Law Office	Wrongful Termination	Dennis Lazarus

MATERIALS REVIEWED IN THE PREPARATION OF MY DECLARATION

1. Separate Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Defendant California Institute of Technology's Motion for Summary Judgment or in the Alternative, Summary Adjudication of Issues
2. Memorandum of Points and Authorities by Defendant California Institute of Technology in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment, or, in the Alternative, Summary Adjudication of Issues
3. Coppedge ECAP's for 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 & 2010
4. Personnel File Documents
5. Huntley's hand written notes of the interviews
6. Procedures for the Investigating and Resolving Unlawful Harassment Complaints at JPL
7. Additional Disputed and Undisputed Material Facts
8. A chart titled Cassini SA Workforce 2010
9. A chart titled Discreet Layoff Ranking Criteria Worksheet
10. A Chart titled Employee Progression History Report-Coppedge
11. Written Warning from Clark Burgess to David Coppedge
12. Various depositions.

EXHIBIT C

MATERIALS REVIEWED IN THE PREPARATION OF MY DECLARATION

1. Separate Statement of Undisputed Material Facts in Support of Defendant California Institute of Technology's Motion for Summary Judgment or in the Alternative, Summary Adjudication of Issues
2. Memorandum of Points and Authorities by Defendant California Institute of Technology in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment, or, in the Alternative, Summary Adjudication of Issues
3. Coppedge ECAP's for 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009 & 2010
4. Personnel File Documents
5. Huntley's hand written notes of the interviews
6. Procedures for the Investigating and Resolving Unlawful Harassment Complaints at JPL
7. Additional Disputed and Undisputed Material Facts
8. A chart titled Cassini SA Workforce 2010
9. A chart titled Discreet Layoff Ranking Criteria Worksheet
10. A Chart titled Employee Progression History Report-Coppedge
11. Written Warning from Clark Burgess to David Coppedge
12. Various depositions.

ERC

EXHIBIT D

11/18/01

Cassini SA Workforce 2010

	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb
Cordell														
Castillo														
Jobsky														
Chien														layoff
Patel														
Coppedge														layoff
FTE	5	5	5	4	4	4	4	4	4	6	6	6	5	3

72 D

EXHIBIT E

Discreet Layoff Ranking Criteria Worksheet

Steps

1. Assign a weighted value (W) to each layoff criterion using a scale of 1-5. Use the same value for all employees.
2. In the Name column, list all employees within the section who are performing the same or similar duties (generally this means those working in the same/similar discipline(s)).
3. Describe how the ranking pool was determined. What specific criteria were used to determine which employees were placed in the pool:
(for example, "ranking includes Senior Section Engineers in the CO-100 discipline from the lower 1/3 of the Section ranking")
4. Within each criterion column (Need, Skills, etc.), using a scale of 1-N, rank (R) employees in numerical order (highest ranked employee = 1).
5. For each layoff criterion, multiply the individual ranking (R) by the weighted value (W) and put the score in the appropriate columns (A-H).
6. To get the total score for an employee, add columns A through H and place the sum in the Total column.
7. Typically, the employee(s) with the highest overall ranking score will be subject to layoff.
8. List the name(s) of the employee(s) subject to layoff.

Layoff Criteria:

NEED - Criticality of skills required to meet present Laboratory commitments and/or anticipated business directions.

SKILLS - Individual applies the knowledge, behaviors, and skills required to execute or perform in a satisfactory manner the tasks and work associated with current position or other positions as anticipated in the future.

ABILITY - Employee's ability to contribute to work assignments based on proficiency, versatility, knowledge and experience.

PERFORMANCE - Current level of contribution in four specific categories: a) Work product including quality, timeliness, quantity of work and adherence to parameters such as budget, b) Interpersonal effectiveness, c) ownership of performance, d) commitment to improvement.

CONDUCT - Adherence to JPL policy and compliance with standards of conduct, for example, property, accountability, business ethics, timekeeping practice, personnel instructions and safety.

RELIABILITY - Responsible, trustworthy, a good attendance record, punctual and dependable.

EDUCATION AND/OR TRAINING - Formal education level and extent of specialized instruction and practice.

EXPERIENCE - Job related experience that enhances the ability to perform present or anticipated assignments.

Paper copies of this document may not be current and should not be relied on for official purposes.
The current version is in the JPL Rules Information System at <http://rules/>

0000000242

1 PROOF OF SERVICE

2 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
3 CITY OF LOS ANGELES AND COUNTY OF LOS) ss:
4 ANGELES)

5 I am employed in the City of Los Angeles and County of Los Angeles, State
6 of California. I am over the age of 18, and not a party to the within action. My business
address is as follows: 515 So. Flower Street, 25th Floor, Los Angeles, CA 90071.

7 On November 30, 2011, I served the foregoing document(s) described as:

8 **DEFENDANT CALIFORNIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY'S NOTICE OF**
9 **MOTION AND MOTION *IN LIMINE* #2 ("DML 2") FOR AN ORDER EXCLUDING**
10 **TESTIMONY, EVIDENCE, ARGUMENT AND COMMENT REGARDING THE**
11 **CONTENT OF DVDS COPPEDGE DISTRIBUTED TO CO-WORKERS AND FILMS**
12 **REGARDING ALLEGED HOSTILITY PROPONENTS OF INTELLIGENT DESIGN**
13 **HAVE EXPERIENCED; MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN**
14 **SUPPORT THEREOF; DECLARATION OF CAMERON W. FOX IN SUPPORT**
15 **THEREOF; [PROPOSED] ORDER**

16 on the interested parties as follows:

17 William J. Becker, Jr., Esq.
18 THE BECKER LAW FIRM
19 11500 Olympic Blvd, Suite 400
20 Los Angeles, CA 90064

Attorney for Plaintiff
DAVID COPPEDGE

21 Email: bbeckerlaw@gmail.com



23 **VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL:**

24 By personally emailing the aforementioned document in PDF format to the email address
25 designated for the above listed counsel.




27 **VIA U.S. MAIL:**

28 By placing a true and correct copy thereof in a sealed envelope(s) as addressed above. I
am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing of correspondence
for mailing. Under that practice such sealed envelope(s) would be deposited with the U.S.
postal service on November 30, 2011, with postage thereon fully prepaid, at Los Angeles,
California.

29 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California
30 that the above is true and correct and was executed on November 30, 2011, at Los
31 Angeles, California.

32 Irma Gamino
33 Type or Print Name

34 
35 Signature