

ORIGINAL

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

KAMALA D. HARRIS  
Attorney General of California  
ALLAN S. ONO, State Bar No. 130763  
Deputy Attorney General  
ERIC M. KATZ, State Bar No. 204011  
Deputy Attorney General  
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702  
Los Angeles, CA 90013  
Telephone: (213) 897-2604  
Fax: (213) 897-2802  
E-mail: allan.ono@doj.ca.gov

*Attorneys for Defendants California Science Center  
and Jeffrey Rudolph in his individual and official  
capacity as President and CEO of the California  
Science Center*

[EXEMPT FROM FILING FEES -  
GOV. CODE § 6103]

**FILED**  
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

MAR 25 2011

John A. \_\_\_\_\_, Clerk  
By GLORIBETTA ROBINSON, Deputy

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

BC 423687

**AMERICAN FREEDOM ALLIANCE, a  
nonprofit corporation,**  
  
Plaintiff,  
  
v.  
  
**CALIFORNIA SCIENCE CENTER, a legal  
entity of the State of California;  
CALIFORNIA SCIENCE CENTER  
FOUNDATION, a nonprofit corporation;  
JEFFREY RUDOLPH, an Individual, and  
DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,**  
  
Defendants.

**DEFENDANTS CALIFORNIA SCIENCE  
CENTER AND JEFFREY RUDOLPH IN  
HIS INDIVIDUAL AND OFFICIAL  
CAPACITY AS PRESIDENT AND CEO  
OF THE CALIFORNIA SCIENCE  
CENTER'S MEMORANDUM OF  
POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN  
SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT, OR IN THE  
ALTERNATIVE, SUMMARY  
ADJUDICATION ON PLAINTIFF'S  
THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT**

[Notice of Motion and Motion; Separate  
Statement of Undisputed Material Facts;  
Appendix of Non-California Authorities;  
Declaration of C. Tateishi; Declaration of  
Allan S. Ono; Declaration of Jeffrey  
Rudolph; and [Proposed] Order filed  
concurrently herewith]

Date: June 9, 2011  
Time: 8:45 a.m.  
Dept: 14  
Judge: The Honorable Terry A. Green  
Trial Date: July 25, 2011  
Action Filed: October 14, 2009

11/28/11

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

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

	Page
INTRODUCTION .....	1
STATEMENT OF FACTS .....	2
I.    The Center .....	2
II.   The Relationship Between the Center and the Foundation.....	2
III.  The AFA Contract and its Cancellation.....	2
LEGAL STANDARD.....	4
ARGUMENT.....	4
I.    AFA’s Claim for Breach of Contract Against the Center Fails .....	4
A.    AFA’s Failure to Present its Claim for Money Damages Pursuant to the Government Claims Act Bars its Claim.....	4
B.    The Center Cannot be Liable for Breach of Contract Because it is Not a Party to the Event Contract .....	5
C.    The Foundation is Not the Center’s Agent .....	6
II.   AFA’s Constitutional Claims Against the Center Defendants Lack Merit.....	7
A.    The Center Defendants Did Not Engage in the Actions AFA Claims Were Unconstitutional .....	7
1.    AFA has not and cannot produce evidence that the Center Defendants intentionally discriminated against AFA .....	8
C.    AFA’s Federal Claims Against the Center Defendants Fail .....	11
1.    The Center enjoys Eleventh Amendment immunity as an “arm of the state” .....	11
2.    The Center is not a “person” under 42 U.S.C. § 1983 .....	14
D.    AFA’s Federal Claims Against Rudolph Fail .....	15
1.    No relief is available against Rudolph in his official capacity.....	15
a.    Damages are not available against Rudolph in his official capacity.....	15
b.    Injunctive relief is not available against Rudolph in his official capacity .....	15
2.    No relief is available against Rudolph in his individual capacity .....	16
a.    AFA is not entitled to damages against Rudolph in his individual capacity as he possesses qualified immunity.....	16
b.    AFA can seek an injunction governing the Center’s actions only against Rudolph in his official capacity.....	17
3.    Even if AFA prevails on its Constitutional claims, it is not entitled to money damages as claimed.....	18

03/25/11

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**  
(continued)

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

**Page**

	III. Because There is No Evidence of a Constitutional Violation, AFA's Cause of Action For Declaratory Relief is Moot.....	18
	IV. AFA Cannot Seek Punitive Damages Against the Center .....	18
	CONCLUSION.....	19

11/22/08

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

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  
29

**Page**

**STATE CASES**

*Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co.*  
(2001) 25 Cal.4th 826 ..... 4

*City of Stockton v. Superior Court (Civic Partners Stockton, LLC)*  
(2007) 42 Cal.4th 730 ..... 4, 5

*Degrassi v. Cook*  
(2002) 29 Cal.4th 333 ..... 18

*Edelstein v. City and County of San Francisco*  
(2002) 29 Cal.4th 164 ..... 9

*Haley v. Casa Del Rey Homeowners Ass'n*  
(2007) 153 Cal.App.4th 863 ..... 15

*J.L. v. Children's Institute, Inc.*  
(2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 388 ..... 6

*Katzberg v. Regents of the University of California*  
(2002) 29 Cal.4th 300 ..... 18

*Kaye v. Board of Trustees of the San Diego Country Public Law Library*  
(2009) 179 Cal.App.4th 48 ..... 9

*Kirchmann v. Lake Elsinore Unified School Dist.*  
(2000) 83 Cal.App.4th 1098 ..... 12

*MHC Financing Ltd. Partnership Two v. City of Santee*  
(2010) 182 Cal.App.4th 1169 ..... 18

*People v. Teresinski*  
(1982) 30 Cal.3d 822 ..... 8

*State of California v. Superior Court (Bodde)*  
(2004) 32 Cal.4th 1234 ..... 5, 12

**FEDERAL CASES**

*Bank of Lake Tahoe v. Bank of America*  
(9th Cir. 2003) 318 F.3d 914..... 14, 15

*Bernheim v. Litt*  
(2d Cir. 1996) 79 F.3d 318..... 9

11/02/08

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
(continued)

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  
29  
30

**Page**

<i>Brian v. Hunter</i> (1991) 502 U.S. 224 .....	16
<i>Cain v. Tigard-Tualatin School Dist.</i> (D. Or. 2003) 262 F.Supp.2d 1120 .....	9
<i>Carmen v. San Francisco Unified School Dist.</i> (N.D. Cal 1997) 982 F.Supp. 1396 .....	15, 17
<i>Conn v. Gabbert</i> (1999) 526 U.S. 286 .....	16
<i>Davis v. Scherer</i> (1984) 468 U.S. 183 .....	16
<i>Durning v. Citibank, N.A.</i> (9th Cir. 1991) 950 F.2d 1419.....	12
<i>Ex Parte Young</i> (1908) 209 U.S. 123 .....	15
<i>Federal Maritime Com'n v. South Carolina State Ports Authority</i> (2002) 535 U.S. 743 .....	12
<i>Foster v. Arcata Assoc. Inc.</i> (9th Cir. 1985) 772 F.2d 1453.....	8
<i>Hafer v. Melo</i> (1991) 502 U.S. 21 .....	15
<i>Harlow v. Fitzgerald</i> (1982) 457 U.S. 800 .....	16
<i>Hess v. Port Authority Trans-Hudson Corp.</i> (1994) 513 U.S. 30 .....	12
<i>ITSI TV Productions, Inc. v. Agricultural Assns.</i> (9th Cir. 1993) 3 F.3d 1289.....	13, 14
<i>Karam v. City of Burbank</i> (2003) 352 F.3d 1188 .....	10
<i>Keniston v. Roberts</i> (9th Cir. 1983) 717 F.2d 1295.....	8

11/22/11

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
(continued)

	<u>Page</u>
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	
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	

03/25/11

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
(continued)

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  
29  
30

**Page**

<i>Vukadinovich v. Bartels</i> (7th Cir. 1988) 853 F.2d 1387.....	9
<i>Watkins v. Bowden</i> (11th Cir. 1997) 105 F.3d 1344.....	9
<i>Welch v. Texas Dept. of Highways and Public Transp.</i> (1987) 483 U.S. 468.....	12
<i>Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police</i> (1989) 491 U.S. 58.....	14, 15
<b>STATE STATUTES</b>	
Civ. Code,	
§ 1558.....	6
§ 2300.....	6
§ 3294.....	19
Code Civ. Proc.,	
§ 437c.....	4
Food & Agr. Code,	
§§ 3801 et seq. ....	2
§ 3953.....	2
§§ 3953, 3959, 3962, 4101.....	13
§ 3954.....	13
§ 3955.....	5
§§ 4102, 4103, 4104.....	2
§ 4106, subd. (e).....	13
Gov. Code,	
§ 905.....	4
§ 945.4.....	5

11/22/88

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**  
**(continued)**

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

**Page**

§ 818..... 19

**CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION**

California Constitution..... 8, 18

California Constitution, Article 1, §§ 2, 3, and 4..... 9, 18

**FEDERAL CONSTITUTION AND STATUTES**

United States Constitution ..... 11, 18

    First Amendment..... 8, 9

    Eleventh Amendment..... passim

    Fourteenth Amendment..... 14

42 U.S.C. § 1983 ..... 14, 15

03/25/11

11/11/11



1  
2 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

3 **INTRODUCTION**

4 Plaintiff, American Freedom Alliance ("AFA"), contends that it contracted for the use of  
5 the IMAX facility located on the grounds of the California Science Center for a private event  
6 featuring two films intended to stimulate scientific debate between opposing views on evolution  
7 and intelligent design ("Event"). AFA now alleges that defendants breached their contractual  
8 commitment for use of the venue in willful violation of its civil rights. But AFA's reflexive  
9 distrust stemming from what it views as a pervasive bias against intelligent design cannot, by  
10 itself, support its claims for Constitutional violations. Plaintiff has no factual support for any of  
11 these claims and as set forth below, defendants California Science Center ("Center") and Jeffrey  
12 Rudolph, in his individual and official capacity as President and CEO of the Center ("Rudolph",  
13 and collectively with the Center, "Center Defendants"), are entitled to judgment as a matter of  
14 law for at least the following reasons:

15 1. The Center Defendants cannot have breached the alleged Event contract because  
16 they were not parties to an Event contract with AFA, did not engage AFA in any contract  
17 negotiations, or even have the ability to contract with AFA (or any other private party) for the  
18 rental of the IMAX facility;

19 2. AFA has not filed a statutorily required claim for damages against the Center with  
20 the California Victim's Compensation and Government Claims Board and the time for doing so  
21 has long passed;

22 3. Even were the Center Defendants somehow in breach of an Event contract with  
23 AFA, they nevertheless possess Eleventh Amendment immunity from lawsuits which assert  
24 alleged federal civil rights violations;

25 4. Even were the Center Defendants somehow in breach of an Event contract with  
26 AFA, there is no evidence that the Center Defendants intended to discriminate against AFA; and,

27 5. Even if the Center Defendants somehow intended to discriminate against AFA,  
28 there is no possible threat of future injury to AFA by the Center necessary to support injunctive

11/22/00

27  
28  
11

1 relief because the Center Defendants lack the ability to contract with private parties for the use of  
2 the IMAX facilities (i.e., the Center Defendants will never have the future opportunity to contract  
3 with AFA).

## 4 STATEMENT OF FACTS

### 5 I. THE CENTER

6 The Center, also known as the is the Sixth District Agricultural Association, was created by  
7 the California Legislature pursuant to the Food and Agriculture Code, Division 3, Part 3. (Sep.  
8 Stmt. 1; Food & Agr. Code, §§ 3801 et seq.) The Center is “a state institution” organized within  
9 “the State and Consumer Services Agency and is deemed a tax-exempt organization as an  
10 instrumentality of this state in accordance with Section 23706 of the Revenue and Taxation  
11 Code.” (Sep. Stmt. 2; see also Food & Agr. Code, § 3953.) In its recognized capacity as a State  
12 institution, the Legislature has, among other things, specifically authorized the Center to establish  
13 a space-age museum, and to create an independent California African-American History Museum.  
14 (Food & Agr. Code, §§ 4102, 4103, 4104.) Today, the Center is the West Coast’s largest  
15 interactive science center and museum.

### 16 II. THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE CENTER AND THE FOUNDATION

17 Defendant California Science Center Foundation (“Foundation”) is a non-profit section  
18 501(c)(3) organization that raises funds to support exhibits and educational programs featured at  
19 the Center. (Sep. Stmt. 4.) The Foundation also leases the Exposition Park IMAX theater from  
20 the Center pursuant to a 25 year lease agreement. (Sep. Stmt. 5.) The Foundation and its  
21 employees are solely responsible for operations at the IMAX and have the exclusive authority to  
22 contract with third parties for private events held at the venue. (Sep. Stmts. 7, 8, 9.)

### 23 III. THE AFA CONTRACT AND ITS CANCELLATION

24 On or about September 24, 2009, AFA approached Foundation employees to ascertain the  
25 availability of the IMAX facility for a proposed October 25, 2009 private fund raising event  
26 entitled “We Are Born of Stars IMAX Screening” (“Event”). (Sep. Stmt. 11.)

27 The Event was to consist of the screening of two films. The first film entitled “We Are  
28 Born of Stars (3D)” purported to express a positive view of evolutionary theory. (Third Amended

1 Complaint ("TAC") ¶ 10.) By contrast, the second film, "Darwin's Dilemma: The Mystery of the  
2 Cambrian Fossil Record," purported to challenge the theory of Darwinian evolution. (TAC ¶ 11.)  
3 Because it was a private event, the Foundation was not particularly concerned about the Event's  
4 content and, over the next few days, the Foundation and AFA came to agree upon terms for the  
5 Event. (Sep. Stmt. 44.) Neither the Center nor its employees were ever involved in any Event  
6 contract negotiations on behalf of the Center or Foundation with AFA. (Sep. Stmt. 12.)

7 The contract included standard terms and conditions governing the use of promotional  
8 materials. (Sep. Stmt. 40.) That provision, which AFA admits it understood, provided as follows:

9 **PROMOTIONAL MATERIALS:** It is required that the Event Services Office  
10 approve, for technical and factual accuracy, all promotional materials mentioning  
11 the California Science Center produced for your event (including invitations,  
12 programs, press releases, etc.) prior to printing or broadcast. Please allow  
13 sufficient time for this approval. (Sep. Stmts. 40, 43.)

14 On October 5, 2009, the Foundation learned of press releases that had been issued relating  
15 to the Event. (Sep. Stmt. 45.) The Foundation believed these press releases misappropriated the  
16 Center's name and reputation by implying that the Center, as a Smithsonian-affiliated Institution,  
17 was the entity premiering the Event's films. One press releases stated, "The debate over Darwin  
18 will come to California on October 25, when the Smithsonian Institution's west coast affiliate  
19 premieres 'Darwin's Dilemma: The Mystery of the Cambrian Fossil Record,' a new intelligent  
20 design film which challenges Darwinian evolution." (Sep. Stmt. 46.) Because none of the press  
21 releases were ever submitted to the Foundation's Event Services Office for approval, the  
22 Foundation believed that the press releases violated the Promotional Materials provisions of the  
23 Event contract. (Sep. Stmts. 47, 50.) In order to stem what he believed were misleading publicity  
24 pieces, on October 6, 2009, Rudolph, acting in his capacity as President of the Foundation,  
25 decided to cancel the AFA Event contract. (Sep. Stmts. 48, 49.) This was solely his decision in  
26 his Foundation capacity; Rudolph did not consult with any Center employees. (Sep. Stmt. 18.)  
27 The cancellation was communicated to AFA on October 6, 2009, and Plaintiff filed suit eight (8)  
28 days later claiming that defendants had somehow schemed to violate its civil rights. What may at  
most have then been a straight forward contract dispute was quickly transformed into a civil  
rights-styled lawsuit with, as set forth below, no facts to support it.



1 of a claim. (Gov. Code, § 945.4.) “[F]ailure to timely present a claim for money or damages to a  
2 public entity bars a plaintiff from filing a lawsuit against that entity.” (*State of California v.*  
3 *Superior Court (Bodde)* (2004) 32 Cal.4th 1234, 1239.) Filing a civil complaint in superior court  
4 does not satisfy a claimant’s claim presentment obligation. (*City of Stockton v. Superior Court,*  
5 *supra*, 42 Cal.4th at 746 [“The legislature’s intent to require the presentation of claims before suit  
6 is filed could not be clearer. (§ 945.4.)”].) The claim filing procedures and limitations  
7 specifically apply to district agricultural associations, such as the Center. (Food & Agr. Code,  
8 § 3955.)

9 AFA’s Complaint does not contain an allegation that it presented a claim pursuant to the  
10 Government Claims Act. (Sep. Stmt. 23.) Indeed, as of February 17, 2011, AFA has not  
11 presented a claim against the Center to the California Victim’s Compensation and Government  
12 Claims Board. (Sep. Stmt. 24.) “The period for asserting contract claims is one year.” (*City of*  
13 *Stockton v. Superior Court, supra*, 42 Cal.4th at p. 746, n. 13 [citing Gov. Code, § 911.2].)  
14 Therefore, the last day on which AFA could have submitted a claim for the alleged breach of  
15 contract – which allegedly occurred on October 6, 2009 – was October 5, 2010. Because AFA  
16 has not complied with the Government Claims Act, and time for doing so has long passed, its  
17 First Cause of Action seeking contract damages is barred.

18 **B. The Center Cannot be Liable for Breach of Contract Because it is Not a**  
19 **Party to the Event Contract**

20 Even if AFA’s breach of contract claim were not barred for failure to comply with the  
21 Government Claims Act, it is also barred for the independent reason that the Center cannot be  
22 liable for the alleged breach of a contract to which it is a stranger: the Center is not a party to the  
23 Event contract, was not involved in negotiating the Event contract, and was not involved in the  
24 cancelation of the Event contract.

25 AFA claims that the Center is a party to the Event contract. (TAC ¶ 8.) That contention is  
26 demonstrably false. The Event contract does not identify the Center as a contracting party. (Sep.  
27 Stmt. 12.) The Event contract was not executed by the Center, but instead was the product of  
28 negotiations exclusively between the Foundation and AFA. (Sep. Stmt. 12.) “It is essential to the

1 validity of a contract, not only that the parties should exist, but that is should be possible to  
2 identify them.” (Civ. Code, § 1558.) Because the Event contract neither identifies the Center as a  
3 contracting party, nor was it executed by the Center, the Center is not a direct party to the contract.

4 **C. The Foundation is Not the Center’s Agent**

5 AFA may attempt to argue that the Foundation executed the Event contract as an agent on  
6 behalf of the Center. (See, e.g., TAC ¶ 7 [“each of the Defendants . . . are the agents . . . of each  
7 other . . .”].) But the Foundation is not the Center’s agent and such boilerplate contentions are  
8 baseless.

9 In February 1995, the Center and the Foundation entered into a 25-year lease for the  
10 IMAX facility. (Sep. Stmt. 5.) The lease specifically disclaims the creation of an agency or  
11 partnership relationship. (Sep. Stmt. 6; IMAX Lease ¶ 13A [“This Amended and Restated Lease  
12 shall not be construed as constituting Foundation as agent or partner of Museum . . .”].)<sup>1</sup> Thus,  
13 while the IMAX Lease requires the Foundation to conduct its operations in accordance with both  
14 State and Federal laws, the Center neither has the ability to contract with third parties for rental of  
15 the IMAX nor has authority over the Foundation’s contractual dealings with third parties seeking  
16 to rent the IMAX for private events. (Sep. Stmts. 16, 7, 8, 9; Tateishi Decl. ¶ 5.) Consistent  
17 therewith, the IMAX Lease even expressly prohibits the Center from dictating what films will be  
18 shown (such as the films AFA intended to show). (Sep. Stmt. 5.)

19 Nor can AFA present evidence that an implied ostensible agency relationship exists. (Civ.  
20 Code, § 2300.) “Liability of the principal for the acts of an ostensible agent rests on the  
21 [equitable] doctrine of ‘estoppel,’ the essential elements of which are [1] representations made by  
22 the principal, [2] justifiable reliance by a third party, and [3] a change of position from such  
23 reliance resulting in injury.” (*J.L. v. Children’s Institute, Inc.* (2009) 177 Cal.App.4th 388, 404.)  
24 It is AFA’s burden to establish the existence of an ostensible agency relationship between the  
25 Center and the Foundation. Even assuming AFA could satisfy the first two of these elements  
26 (which it cannot), AFA would still be unable to establish that it suffered injury due to some

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

1 misplaced reliance on the Foundation's contracting authority. Not only did the Foundation have  
2 authority to contract with AFA for its after-hours private Event at the IMAX, it had the *exclusive*  
3 authority to do so. (Sep. Stmt. 8.) AFA wanted to negotiate with the party that could put them  
4 into the IMAX and that is precisely what occurred. (Sep. Stmt. 13.)

5 Nor does an ostensible agency relationship even make sense. If Plaintiff contends that the  
6 Center was the principal and the Foundation was the Center's agent, at a minimum, the Center  
7 would need to possess the ability to enter into a contract directly with AFA. But the undisputed  
8 evidence is that only the Foundation had that ability (pursuant to its 25-year lease of the IMAX  
9 facility). If the Center did not have the ability to itself rent the IMAX facility to AFA, no one,  
10 including the Foundation, could have been the Center's agent for that purpose.

11 The undisputed facts preclude a finding of agency, implied or otherwise, as a matter of law.

12 **II. AFA'S CONSTITUTIONAL CLAIMS AGAINST THE CENTER DEFENDANTS LACK**  
13 **MERIT**

14 AFA's Second, Third, Fourth, and Eighth Causes of Action are each based on alleged  
15 violations of the United States and California Constitutions. All these causes of action fail.

16 **A. The Center Defendants Did Not Engage in the Actions AFA Claims Were**  
17 **Unconstitutional**

18 AFA's lawsuit is based on an erroneous contention that the cancellation of the AFA  
19 contract violated its constitutional rights. The case fails as to the Center for, among other reasons,  
20 the simple fact that neither the Center nor any of its employees were involved in the contracting  
21 or cancellation of the AFA Event. Only the Foundation, and not the Center, had the legal right  
22 and authority to book private events at the IMAX Theater. (Sep. Stmts. 8, 9.) Only Foundation  
23 employees, and not Center employees, were involved in the negotiation of the AFA Event  
24 contract. (Sep. Stmt. 38.) Only Rudolph, as President of the Foundation, made the decision to  
25 cancel the AFA Event contract. (Sep. Stmt. 48, 49.) No Center employees were involved in the  
26 decision to cancel the AFA Event contract. (Sep. Stmt. 18.) In simple terms, whatever AFA  
27 contends was done unlawfully or unconstitutionally, it was not done by the Center. AFA's bare  
28 speculation flies in the face of the facts, is not evidence and is legally insufficient to support its  
supposed civil rights claims. (*Keniston v. Roberts* (9th Cir. 1983) 717 F.2d 1295, 1300 [vague

1 and conclusory allegations are insufficient to support civil rights claims or to withstand summary  
2 judgment].)

3 **1. AFA has not and cannot produce evidence that the Center**  
4 **Defendants intentionally discriminated against AFA**

5 Even assuming that the Foundation's decision to cancel the Event were somehow  
6 attributable to the Center Defendants, AFA still cannot prove that the Foundation's decision to  
7 cancel the Event contract was the result of a discriminatory motive. Rudolph's deposition  
8 testimony is clear—he alone, as President of the Foundation, made the decision to cancel the  
9 Event after determining that “the press statements put out were in violation of [the Foundation's]  
10 policies and procedures.” (Sep. Stmts. 46, 50.) AFA has no evidence to refute Rudolph's  
11 testimony. Rather, its unequivocal refusal to accept any other explanation for the cancellation is  
12 based solely upon unsupported speculation and conjecture. (Sep. Stmt. 60.) But AFA's  
13 subjective belief and bald assertion of discriminatory intent are inadequate. (*Foster v. Arcata*  
14 *Assoc. Inc.* (9th Cir. 1985) 772 F.2d 1453, 1459, cert denied, (1986) 475 U.S. 1048, overruled on  
15 other grounds by *Kennedy v. Allied Mutual Ins. Co.* (9th Cir. 1991) 952 F.2d 262.) This is  
16 because vague and conclusory allegations are legally insufficient to support civil rights claims or  
17 to withstand summary judgment. (*Keniston v. Roberts, supra*, 717 F.2d at 1300.). As such, AFA  
18 must support its First Amendment claims with actual evidence demonstrating that deterrence of  
19 its First Amendment rights “was a substantial or motivating factor in [the Foundation's] conduct.”  
20 (*Sloman v. Tadlock* (9th Cir. 1994) 21 F.3d 1462 [applying intent-based, retaliatory discharge  
21 framework to claim that police officers' actions were intended “to prevent [plaintiff] from  
22 expressing his political views”].) In other words, AFA must show that defendants “intended to  
23 interfere with [its] First Amendment rights.” (*Mendocino Environmental Center v. Mendocino*  
24 *County* (9th Cir. 1999) 192 F.3d 1283, 1300.)

25 The same standard applies to AFA's claims under the California Constitution. When  
26 interpreting similar provisions of the California Constitution, “[d]ecisions of the United States  
27 Supreme Court . . . ought to be followed unless persuasive reasons are presented for taking a  
28 different course.” (*People v. Teresinski* (1982) 30 Cal.3d 822, 836.) Thus, “California courts



1 have routinely followed Supreme Court precedents in addressing public employee free speech  
2 matters.” (*Kaye v. Board of Trustees of the San Diego Country Public Law Library* (2009) 179  
3 Cal.App.4th 48, 57 [citing examples].) Because Article 1, §§ 2, 3, and 4 of the California  
4 Constitution are similar to the federal Constitution, the same federal standard applies to those  
5 claims absent a persuasive reason otherwise. (*Edelstein v. City and County of San Francisco*  
6 (2002) 29 Cal.4th 164, 179 [“Generally, when we interpret a provision of the California  
7 Constitution that is similar to a provision of the federal Constitution, we will not depart from the  
8 United States Supreme Court’s construction of the similar federal provision unless we are given  
9 cogent reasons to do so”].)

10 Similarly, AFA cannot establish its equal protection claim. AFA baldly alleges that the  
11 Defendants “intentionally treat[] Plaintiff differently than other similarly-situated organizations  
12 based on the viewpoint of its expression.” (TAC ¶ 67.) But, a number of federal courts have held  
13 that an equal protection claim cannot be brought where, as here, it is premised on the same facts  
14 as a First Amendment claim. (See, e.g., *Kirby v. City of Elizabeth City* (4th Cir. 2004) 388 F.3d  
15 440, 447; *Watkins v. Bowden* (11th Cir. 1997) 105 F.3d 1344, 1354; *Bernheim v. Litt* (2d Cir.  
16 1996) 79 F.3d 318, 323; *Thompson v. City of Starkville* (5th Cir. 1990) 901 F.2d 456, 468;  
17 *Vukadinovich v. Bartels* (7th Cir. 1988) 853 F.2d 1387, 1391–92.) For those courts willing to  
18 consider equal protection claims based on First Amendment violations, those claims are generally  
19 evaluated under the “class-of-one” methodology. (See, e.g., *Neveu v. City of Fresno* (E.D. Cal.  
20 2005) 392 F.Supp.2d 1159 [applying “class-of-one” methodology to equal protection claim that  
21 plaintiff was treated differently “for having exercised his rights to free speech”]; *Cain v. Tigard-  
22 Tualatin School Dist.* (D. Or. 2003) 262 F.Supp.2d 1120, 1130–31 [dismissing claim based on  
23 First Amendment retaliation].) Thus, AFA’s claim fails if, as here, there is a rational basis for the  
24 cancellation (e.g. the dissemination of unapproved press releases suggesting Smithsonian and  
25 Science Center sponsorship of the Event). But even if the decision to cancel was irrational, AFA  
26 still cannot prove intentional discrimination. (*Village of Willowbrook v. Olech* (2000) 528 U.S.  
27 562, 564 [establishing the “class-of-one” analysis and noting the requirement that plaintiff be  
28 “intentionally treated differently”]; *Village of Arlington Heights v. Metropolitan Housing*

1 *Development Corp.* (1977) 429 U.S. 252, 265 [conclusory allegations by themselves do not  
2 establish an equal protection violation without proof of invidious discriminatory intent].)

3 Thus, each of AFA's civil rights claims requires proof that the cancellation of the Event  
4 was the result of a discriminatory motive. Proof of improper motive cannot be the result of mere  
5 speculation. (See *Karam v. City of Burbank* (2003) 352 F.3d 1188, 1194.) But, in their  
6 depositions, AFA's own witnesses failed to identify any evidence of improper motive, except for  
7 the singular act of the cancellation itself. (Sep. Stmt. 60.) Nevertheless, AFA in its various  
8 complaints has alleged that defendants "have instituted a policy whereby the advancement,  
9 promotion or discussion of intelligent design is prohibited." (TAC ¶ 41.) However, AFA has  
10 developed no evidence to support this claim. In its interrogatory responses, AFA suggests that  
11 documents and testimony from Chris Sion (Foundation Vice President of Food and Event  
12 Services) and documents obtained from the Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County  
13 demonstrate the existence of such a policy, noting that the "unanimity of position suggests a  
14 policy." (Sep. Stmt. 47.1)

15 A closer examination of this "evidence" demonstrates it is either misconstrued or mere  
16 speculation. AFA has previously relied on e-mails from Sion as purported evidence of  
17 discriminatory intent. But this Court has previously found that those e-mails "don't show  
18 discriminatory intent." (Ono Decl. Ex. 1 [July 19, 2010 Hearing Transcript] at 6:20-23.)  
19 Moreover, Sion, and other Foundation witness, testified that Rudolph ultimately made the  
20 decision to cancel the Event. (Sep. Stmt. 48.) Further, Sion—and every other Foundation  
21 witness—denied the existence of any policy addressing the content of private events. (Sep. Stmt.  
22 51.) Even the e mail from the Natural History Museum AFA relies on was not received by  
23 anyone at the Foundation until after the Event was cancelled. (Sep. Stmt. 52.) In fact, the actual  
24 evidence demonstrates that AFA's speculation regarding a discriminatory policy is incorrect.  
25 AFA's own witnesses testified that the Foundation Defendants were aware of the Event's subject  
26 matter before any agreement was reached and before they became aware of the unapproved press  
27 releases. (Sep. Stmt. 11.) Rudolph testified that he "had a general understanding" as to the nature  
28 of the Event based on an October 1, 2009 e-mail from Sion. (Sep. Stmt. 53.) Indeed, AFA

1 witness Joe Peterson testified that Sion was supportive of having a “conservative” event. (Sep.  
2 Stmt. 54.) AFA’s witnesses also testified that the Foundation employees, particularly Sion, were  
3 aggressively trying to get the contract finalized. (Sep. Stmt. 55.) The Foundation even agreed to  
4 modify its standard payment terms in an effort to assist AFA. (Sep. Stmt. 56.) Tellingly,  
5 Foundation employee recommendations to not cancel the Event in response to the inaccurate  
6 press releases (which were ultimately rejected by Rudolph in his official capacity as Foundation  
7 President) supports the conclusion that the Foundation has no policy to prohibit discussions of  
8 intelligent design at private events. (Sep. Stmt. 57.)

9 Finally, the testimony of the Foundation’s witnesses demonstrate that—consistent with  
10 the reasons given at the time—the Event was cancelled because AFA had violated the  
11 Promotional Materials provision of the Event Policies & Procedures. All of the Foundation  
12 witnesses testified that the inaccurate press releases were the reason for the cancellation. (Sep.  
13 Stmt. 58.) Rudolph did not consider the subject matter of the Event when making the decision to  
14 cancel (Sep. Stmt. 50), a statement that is confirmed by the fact that Foundation CFO Cynthia  
15 Pygin testified that the subject matter of the Event never was discussed in her conversations with  
16 Rudolph prior to the cancellation. (Sep. Stmt. 59.) Indeed, Rudolph’s concerns that the press  
17 releases violated the agreement and were misleading—implying sponsorship by the Center and  
18 the Smithsonian when it was only a private event —were the motivating factor for his decision to  
19 cancel. (Sep. Stmts. 46, 47,49, 50.)

20 Because there is no evidence of intentional discrimination, AFA cannot prevail on its  
21 alleged state and federal constitutional claims as a matter of law.

22 **B. AFA’s Federal Claims Against the Center Defendants Fail**

23 Even assuming that AFA could somehow establish that the Foundation discriminated  
24 against AFA and that the Center was responsible for it, the Center, as an arm of the state, is  
25 immune from lawsuits based on alleged violations of federal law.

26 ///  
27 ///  
28 ///

11/22/08  
11

1                   **1. The Center enjoys Eleventh Amendment immunity as an “arm of the**  
2                   **state”**

3                   The Eleventh Amendment to the United States Constitution provides that “[t]he Judicial  
4 power of the United States shall not be construed to extend to any suit in law or equity,  
5 commenced or prosecuted against one of the United States by Citizens of another State, or by  
6 Citizens or Subjects of any Foreign State.” (U.S. Const., XI Amendment.) The “preeminent  
7 purpose of state sovereign immunity is to accord States the dignity that is consistent with their  
8 status as sovereign entities.” (*Federal Maritime Com’n v. South Carolina State Ports Authority*  
9 (2002) 535 U.S. 743, 760.) The Eleventh Amendment immunity applies not only when the State  
10 itself is named in an action, but also to “actions against state agents and state instrumentalities.”  
11 (*Regents of the University of California v. Doe* (1997) 519 U.S. 425, 429.) It has been interpreted  
12 to preclude lawsuits filed in *federal court* by citizens of their own state (*Welch v. Texas Dept. of*  
13 *Highways and Public Transp.* (1987) 483 U.S. 468, 472-473), as well as to preclude lawsuits filed  
14 in *state court* based on a federal statute. (*Kirchmann v. Lake Elsinore Unified School Dist.* (2000)  
15 83 Cal.App.4th 1098, 1103 [“if an entity enjoys Eleventh Amendment immunity, it is also  
16 immune from suit under section 1983, even in state court”].) While state entities are protected by  
17 the Eleventh Amendment, local cities and counties are not. (*Monell v. Department of Social*  
18 *Services of City of New York* (1978) 436 U.S. 658.)

19                   Whether a governmental entity like the Center is protected by the Eleventh Amendment  
20 depends on whether it “is to be treated as an arm of the State partaking of the State's Eleventh  
21 Amendment immunity, or is instead to be treated as a municipal corporation or other political  
22 subdivision to which the Eleventh Amendment does not extend.” (*Mt. Healthy City School Dist.*  
23 *Bd. of Educ. v. Doyle* (1977) 429 U.S. 274, 280.) Courts have looked to the following factors to  
24 make that determination:

25                   [1] whether a money judgment would be satisfied out of state funds, [2] whether  
26 the entity performs central governmental functions, [3] whether the entity may sue  
27 or be sued, [4] whether the entity has power to take property in its own name or  
28 only the name of the state, and [5] the corporate status of the entity. To determine  
these factors, the court looks to the way state law treats the entity.

(*Mitchell v. Los Angeles Community College Dist.* (9th Cir. 1988) 861 F.2d 198, 201.)

1            “[V]ulnerability of the State’s purse [is] the most salient factor in Eleventh Amendment  
2 determinations.” (*Hess v. Port Authority Trans-Hudson Corp.* (1994) 513 U.S. 30, 48; *Durning v.*  
3 *Citibank, N.A.* (9th Cir. 1991) 950 F.2d 1419, 1423-1424 [whether a money judgment would be  
4 satisfied out of state funds is “the most important factor”].) In this case, if the Center were  
5 subject to a money judgment, that judgment would be satisfied by money drawn from the State’s  
6 General Fund. (Sep. Stmt. 30.)<sup>2</sup> Indeed, almost 90% of the Center’s spending is drawn from the  
7 State’s General Fund. (Sep. Stmt. 28.) The remainder of the Center’s spending is based on work  
8 for which it will be reimbursed by a third-party,<sup>3</sup> or spending authorized by the Legislature from a  
9 state special fund known as the Exposition Park Improvement Fund. (Sep. Stmt. 29.) The  
10 Exposition Park Improvement Fund would not be available to fund a judgment in this case, as  
11 expenditures from that fund “may only be used, upon appropriation from the Legislature, for  
12 improvements to Exposition Park, . . . .” (Food & Agr. Code, § 4106, subd. (e).)

13            A finding that the state’s purse is at risk should end the “arm-of-the-state” inquiry. But  
14 even a review of the remaining, less significant factors support the conclusion that the Center is  
15 an arm of the State for Eleventh Amendment purposes. Tellingly, the State has control over the  
16 Center’s litigation. While the Center may be sued, it cannot sue without obtaining the approval of  
17 the Department of Food and Agriculture. (Food & Agr. Code, § 3954.) Likewise, the Center  
18 takes money in the name of the State. Money donations to the Center are not held directly by the  
19 Center, but are sent to the Legislature controlled Exposition Park Improvement Fund, and can  
20 only be appropriated back to the Center by the Legislature. (Sep. Stmt. 31; Tateishi Decl. ¶ 7.)

21            Finally, corporate status seals the analysis. The Legislature created the Center, housed it  
22 within the State’s State and Consumer Services Agency, determined that it is “an instrumentality  
23 this state”, decreed that it is a “state institution”, proclaimed that its directors are “state officers”,  
24

25            <sup>2</sup> The fact that the Center may have contractual indemnity rights from a third party is  
26 irrelevant to an arm of state analysis. (*Regents of the University of California v. Doe* (1997) 519 U.S. 425,  
431 [“The Eleventh Amendment protects the State from the risk of adverse judgments even though the  
State may be indemnified by a third party”].)

27            <sup>3</sup> For example, the Center is authorized to incur postage expenses for the Foundation up to a  
28 certain limit, so long as the Foundation reimburses the Center for the actual cost.  
29

1 and provide state control by requiring that its directors be appointed by the Governor. (Food &  
2 Agr. Code, §§ 3953, 3959, 3962, 4101.)

3 AFA has previously cited *ITSI TV Productions v. Agricultural Assns.*, for the proposition  
4 that at least one obscure district agricultural association could not establish that it was an arm of  
5 the state based upon the particular facts of that case. (*ITSI TV Productions, Inc. v. Agricultural*  
6 *Assns.* (9th Cir. 1993) 3 F.3d 1289.) The *ITSI TV* court recognized that the “most important  
7 factor” in determining whether a different agricultural association was protected by the Eleventh  
8 Amendment was “whether a money judgment would be satisfied out of state funds.” (*Id.*, at p.  
9 1292.) After determining that all of that particular agricultural association’s funds were received  
10 from sources other than the State’s General Fund, the Court concluded that it was not protected  
11 by the Eleventh Amendment. (*Id.*, at pp. 1292-1293.) That is clearly not the case here as almost  
12 90% of the Center’s budget comes out of the State’s General Fund. (Sep. Stmt. 28.) As such, the  
13 Center is an arm of the state for purposes of the Eleventh Amendment, and immune from AFA’s  
14 Second, Third and Fourth Causes of Action premised on violations of federal law.

15 **2. The Center is not a “person” under 42 U.S.C. § 1983**

16 While the Fourteenth Amendment allows Congress to enact certain statutes that abrogate a  
17 state’s sovereign immunity, the United States Supreme Court has unambiguously held that  
18 Congress did not abrogate the states’ sovereign immunity when it enacted 42 U.S.C. § 1983.  
19 (*Will v. Michigan Dept. of State Police* (1989) 491 U.S. 58, 64 [“a state is not a person within the  
20 meaning of § 1983”].) The court’s ruling was based on the fact that only “persons” are subject to  
21 § 1983, and Congress did not intend for states to be included within the definition of persons. (*Id.*,  
22 p. 65.) Because the Center is an arm of the state and therefore not a person for purposes of  
23 § 1983, AFA’s Second and Third Causes of Action, expressly based on 42 U.S.C. § 1983, are  
24 therefore prohibited as a matter of law. (*Id.*) AFA’s Fourth Cause of Action, premised on an  
25 alleged violation of the equal protection clause found in the federal Constitution’s Fourteenth  
26 Amendment, is similarly barred for the same reasons, as courts have held that a violation of the  
27 equal protection clause can only be prosecuted through a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. (*Bank of Lake*  
28 *Tahoe v. Bank of America* (9th Cir. 2003) 318 F.3d 914, 917 [claim for equal protection violation

1 "must utilize 42 U.S.C. § 1983"], citing *Azul-Pacifico, Inc. v. City of Los Angeles* (9th Cir. 1992)  
2 973 F.2d 704, 705.)

3 **C. AFA's Federal Claims Against Rudolph Fail**

4 "Plaintiff is limited to injunctive and declaratory relief against the individual defendants in  
5 their official capacities, and damages against the individual defendants in their personal  
6 capacities." (*Carmen v. San Francisco Unified School Dist.* (N.D. Cal 1997) 982 F.Supp. 1396,  
7 1407.)

8 **1. No relief is available against Rudolph in his official capacity**

9 **a. Damages are not available against Rudolph in his official  
10 capacity**

11 The Supreme Court has held that "[s]tate officers sued for damages in their official capacity  
12 are not 'persons' for purposes of [a § 1983] suit because they assume the identity of the  
13 government that employs them." (*Hafer v. Melo* (1991) 502 U.S. 21, 27.) Inasmuch as the  
14 Center is a State entity, Rudolph, in his official capacity as President and CEO of the Center, also  
15 enjoys the same immunity. (*Will v. Michigan, supra*, 491 U.S. at 71.) Therefore, AFA's claim  
16 for damages against Rudolph in his official capacity is barred just as AFA's claims are barred  
17 against the Center.

18 **b. Injunctive relief is not available against Rudolph in his official  
19 capacity**

20 While the State's Eleventh Amendment immunity bars all manner of claims against the  
21 Center, it does not prevent a plaintiff from seeking prospective injunctive relief against a state  
22 officer acting in his official capacity. (*Ex Parte Young* (1908) 209 U.S. 123; *Pennhurst State Sch.  
23 & Hosp. v. Halderman* (1984) 465 U.S. 89.) To obtain an injunction, however, the plaintiff must  
24 prove that it faces a significant threat of a future injury. (*Haley v. Casa Del Rey Homeowners  
25 Ass'n* (2007) 153 Cal.App.4th 863, 873 ["Injunctive relief is available to prevent future harm, not  
26 to address past harm"]; *Bank of Lake Tahoe v. Bank of America* (9th Cir. 2003) 318 F.3d 914,  
27 918.)

28 AFA ostensibly seeks an injunction prohibiting Rudolph, in his official Center capacity,  
from refusing to allow AFA access to hold private events, including events concerning intelligent

1 design. (Sep. Stmt. 67.) But Rudolph, in his Center capacity, has no control over private event  
2 bookings at the IMAX. (Sep. Stmts. 62, 63, 68.) He has no ability to rent the IMAX to AFA or  
3 any other third party for a private event now or in the future. (Sep. Stmt. 63, 68.) The IMAX  
4 Lease even expressly prohibits the Center from requiring the Foundation to show any particular  
5 film. (Sep. Stmt. 61.)

6 Because Rudolph, in his official Center capacity, has no control over which private events  
7 the Foundation may prospectively book with private entities like AFA, AFA does not face a  
8 threat of future harm from him in his Center capacity. In other words, AFA cannot obtain an  
9 injunction against Rudolph in his official Center capacity because Rudolph, in that capacity, is  
10 incapable of having future private event-related dealings with AFA.

11 **2. No relief is available against Rudolph in his individual capacity**

12 **a. AFA is not entitled to damages against Rudolph in his**  
13 **individual capacity as he possesses qualified immunity**

14 The doctrine of qualified immunity protects public officials from personal liability when  
15 performing discretionary functions. (*Harlow v. Fitzgerald* (1982) 457 U.S. 800, 818.) In order to  
16 overcome a public official's qualified immunity, a plaintiff is required to show that the official (i)  
17 violated clearly established statutory or constitutional rights, (ii) of which a reasonable person  
18 would have known. (*Conn v. Gabbert* (1999) 526 U.S. 286, 290; *Pearson v. Callahan* (2009) 555  
19 U.S. 223; 109 S.Ct 818 [Doctrine of qualified immunity protects a government official from  
20 personal liability when such official reasonably believes his conduct complies with the law.];  
21 *Davis v. Scherer* (1984) 468 U.S. 183, 197 [The plaintiff shoulders the burden of proving that the  
22 rights he claims are "clearly established"].) "The protection of qualified immunity applies  
23 regardless of whether the government official's error is a mistake of law, a mistake of fact, or a  
24 mistake based on mixed questions of law and fact." (*Pearson, supra*, 109 S.Ct. at p. 815.) Thus,  
25 the qualified immunity standard gives ample room for mistaken judgments by protecting all but  
26 the plainly incompetent or those who knowingly violate the law. (*Brian v. Hunter* (1991) 502  
27 U.S. 224, 229; *Davis, supra*. 468 U.S. at p. 197 ["[Qualified immunity] safeguards all but the  
28 plainly incompetent or those who knowingly violate the law....[I]f officers of reasonable



1 competence could disagree on [whether a chosen course of action is constitutional], immunity  
2 should be recognized.”]; *Harlow, supra*, 457 U.S. at pp. 816-17 [Bare allegations of malice  
3 should not suffice to subject government officials” to the burdens of trial or extended discovery].)  
4 Indeed, this accommodation for reasonable error exists “because officials should not err always  
5 on the side of caution because they fear being sued.” (*Hunter, supra*, 502 U.S. at p. 229.)

6 For the reasons discussed above, Rudolph, in his individual (or any other) capacity, did  
7 not violate AFA’s constitutional rights.<sup>4</sup> But assuming arguendo that AFA somehow established  
8 a constitutional violation by Rudolph, a reasonable official in Rudolph’s position could  
9 nevertheless have believed that it was within his discretion to cancel the Event contract under the  
10 circumstances presented.

11 Whether a reasonable official *under these facts* could have believed that it was not  
12 unconstitutional to cancel the Event contract is a question of law the court can determine on  
13 summary judgment. (*Knox v. Southwest Airlines* (9th Cir. 1997) 124 F.3d 1103, 1107 [For  
14 qualified immunity inquiry, reasonableness of defendant’s actions are not a question of fact, they  
15 are a question of law].) Here, Rudolph’s uncontroverted testimony was that he canceled the  
16 Event contract without regard to the content of AFA’s Event. (Sep. Stmts. 69, 70.) Rudolph  
17 further testified that he believed that AFA violated the terms of the Event contract, and that  
18 violation of the contract gave the Foundation the right to cancel. (Sep. Stmts. 70, 73.) Upon  
19 these facts, even were Rudolph’s decision to cancel ultimately wrong and in breach of the Event  
20 contract, a reasonable official in Rudolph’s position could easily have believed that cancellation of  
21 the Event contract under the circumstances was constitutional. As such, Rudolph is afforded  
22 qualified immunity for that decision and plaintiff’s claims asserted against him in his individual  
23 capacity and barred as a matter of law.

24 ///

25 ///

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>4</sup> Rudolph canceled the Event contract in his official capacity as Foundation President.  
28 (Sep. Stmt. 49.) The qualified immunity argument is made arguendo to address the Third Amended  
Complaint’s unfounded, scatter-gun, allegation of wrongdoing in Rudolph’s individual capacity.

1                                   **b. AFA can seek an injunction governing the Center's actions only**  
2                                   **against Rudolph in his official capacity**

3                                   AFA cannot obtain an injunction against Rudolph in his personal capacity, as the  
4                                   injunction seeks to regulate his activities as it relates to duties in his official capacity. (*Carmen v.*  
5                                   *San Francisco Unified School Dist.* (N.D. Cal 1997) 982 F.Supp. 1396, 1407 ["Plaintiff is limited  
6                                   to injunctive and declaratory relief against the individual defendants in their official  
7                                   capacities..."].)

8                                   **3. Even if AFA prevails on its Constitutional claims, it is not entitled to**  
9                                   **money damages as claimed**

10                                  AFA's operative Third Amended Complaint seeks money damages for the alleged violation  
11                                  of the California Constitution. However, AFA cannot satisfy the necessary damages element of  
12                                  its cause of action, as no money damages are available even if there was a violation of the  
13                                  California Constitution. The Supreme Court expressly held that a plaintiff cannot obtain money  
14                                  damages even if it proves a violation of Article I, section 2 (speech). (*Degrassi v. Cook* (2002) 29  
15                                  Cal.4th 333, 342.) A court of appeal recently expressly held that a plaintiff cannot obtain money  
16                                  damages even if it proves a violation of Article I, section 3 (association). (*MHC Financing Ltd.*  
17                                  *Partnership Two v. City of Santee* (2010) 182 Cal.App.4th 1169, 1184.) While the Center is  
18                                  aware of no case law directly discussing the availability of money damages for a violation of  
19                                  Article I, section 4 (religion), the same result should follow the courts' holdings that no money  
20                                  damages are available for violations of Article I, § 2 (speech) and § 3 (association.) (See  
21                                  *Katzberg v. Regents of the University of California* (2002) 29 Cal.4th 300.)

22                                  **III. BECAUSE THERE IS NO EVIDENCE OF A CONSTITUTIONAL VIOLATION, AFA'S**  
23                                  **CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF IS MOOT**

24                                  AFA requests judicial declarations that "the cancellation of the EVENT and breach of the  
25                                  contract violated the United States Constitution and the California Constitution" and that "the  
26                                  Defendants engaged in content and viewpoint discrimination by preventing Plaintiff from  
27                                  addressing the topic of intelligent design in a public forum." (TAC ¶¶ 111, 112.) As discussed  
28                                  above, AFA cannot prove violations of the United States Constitution or the California

1 Constitution. Thus, the request for declaratory relief is moot, and summary adjudication should  
2 be granted.

3 **IV. AFA CANNOT SEEK PUNITIVE DAMAGES AGAINST THE CENTER**

4 Paragraph 4 of AFA's prayer for relief seeks "punitive and exemplary damages on the  
5 Fourth Cause of Action for Fraud." (Sep. Stmt. 82.) This prayer for punitive damages should be  
6 deemed moot as the court has already sustained the Center's demurrer to AFA's fraud cause of  
7 action.

8 To the extent that any claim for punitive damages against the Center as to any remaining  
9 cause of action can be deemed adequately pled, which it is not, such a prayer is barred as a matter  
10 of law. Government Code section 818 expressly states, "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of  
11 law, a public entity is not liable for damages awarded under Section 3294 of the Civil Code or  
12 other damages imposed primarily for the sake of example and by way of punishing the  
13 defendant." (Gov. Code, § 818.) Therefore, AFA may not seek punitive damages against the  
14 Center for any reason.

15 **CONCLUSION**

16 For all the foregoing reasons, the California Science Center and Jeffrey Rudolph, in his  
17 individual and official capacity as President and CEO of the California Science Center,  
18 respectfully request that the court enter summary judgment or, in the alternative, summary  
19 adjudication, in their favor and against AFA.

20 Dated: March 23, 2011

Respectfully Submitted,

21 KAMALA D. HARRIS  
22 Attorney General of California

23 

24 ALLAN S. ONO  
25 Deputy Attorney General  
26 *Attorneys for Defendants*  
27 *California Science Center and Jeffrey*  
28 *Rudolph in his individual and official*  
*capacity as President and CEO of the*  
*California Science Center*

03/23/11

27  
28  
11

**DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY MESSENGER**

Case Name: **American Freedom Alliance v. California Science Center, et al.**

No.: **BC 423687**

I declare:

I am employed in the Office of the Attorney General, which is the office of a member of the California State Bar at which member's direction this service is made. I am 18 years of age or older and not a party to this matter; my business address is: 300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702, Los Angeles, CA 90013.

**On March 25, 2011, I caused the attached DEFENDANTS CALIFORNIA SCIENCE CENTER AND JEFFREY RUDOLPH IN HIS INDIVIDUAL AND OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS PRESIDENT AND CEO OF THE CALIFORNIA SCIENCE CENTER'S MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF THEIR MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT, OR IN THE ALTERNATIVE, SUMMARY ADJUDICATION ON PLAINTIFF'S THIRD AMENDED COMPLAINT to be personally served by Ace Messenger Service by placing a true copy thereof for delivery to the following person(s) at the address(es) as follows:**

William J. Becker, Jr., Esq.  
The Becker Law Firm  
11500 Olympic Boulevard, Suite 400  
Los Angeles, CA 90064

James L. Zelenay Jr., Esq.  
Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher LLP  
333 South Grand Avenue  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3197

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on March 25, 2011, at Los Angeles, California.

Olivia Padilla  
Declarant



Signature