

JONI J. JONES (7562)
KYLE J. KAISER (13924)
Assistant Utah Attorneys General
OFFICE OF THE UTAH ATTORNEY GENERAL
160 East 300 South, Sixth Floor
P.O. Box 140856
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-0856
Telephone: (801) 366-0100
Facsimile: (801) 366-0101
E-mail: jonijones@utah.gov
kkaiser@utah.gov

Attorneys for State Defendants

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
IN AND FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH, CENTRAL DIVISION

JONELL EVANS, STACIA IRELAND,
MARINA GOMBERG, ELLENOR
HEYBORNE, MATTHEW BARRAZA,
TONY MILNER, DONALD JOHNSON,
and CARL FRITZ SHULTZ,

Plaintiffs,

v.

STATE OF UTAH, GOVERNOR GARY
HERBERT, in his official capacity; and
ATTORNEY SEAN REYES, in his official
capacity,

Defendants.

**NOTICE OF REMOVAL OF A CIVIL
ACTION FROM STATE COURT TO
FEDERAL COURT**


Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441(b) and 1446, Defendants, State of Utah, Gary Herbert and Sean Reyes, (hereinafter "Defendants") by and through counsel, Joni J. Jones and Kyle J. Kaiser, Assistant Utah Attorneys General, hereby gives NOTICE OF REMOVAL of the civil action pending against Defendants in the Third Judicial District, West Jordan Department, in and for Salt Lake County, State of Utah, entitled *Evans v. State of Utah, et al.*, Case No. 140400673, to this Court. The grounds for removal are:

1. This action was commenced by the filing of a Complaint in the Third Judicial District Court, West Jordan Department, in and for Salt Lake County, State of Utah on January 21, 2014.
2. Defendants received a copy of the Complaint on or about January 22, 2014.
3. Plaintiff's Complaint contains causes of action against Defendants for alleged violations of federal civil rights under 42 U.S.C. §1983.
4. Based on Plaintiff's allegations of violations of civil rights, this Court has original jurisdiction of the above-entitled action pursuant 28 U.S.C. §1331, and this action may be removed to this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1441.
5. Removal of this action is timely. Fewer than thirty days have elapsed since the Defendants received a copy of the Complaint. The Complaint was the pleading from which it was first ascertained that the case is removable. *See* 28 U.S.C. §1446(b).
6. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1446 (a), a copy of all process and pleadings that have been received by Defendants are attached hereto as Exhibit A.

WHEREFORE, Defendants submit this Notice that the above-entitled matter is hereby removed from the Third Judicial District Court, West Jordan Department, in and for Salt Lake County, State of Utah, in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1446.

DATED this 28 day of January, 2014.

OFFICE OF THE UTAH ATTORNEY GENERAL



JONI J. JONES
KYLE J. KAISER
Assistant Utah Attorneys General
Attorney for Defendants

**EXHIBIT A-
COMPLAINT TIER II
THREE SUMMONSES WITH
PROOF OF SERVICE**

Erik Strindberg (Bar No. 4154)
Lauren I. Scholnick (Bar No. 7776)
Kathryn Harstad (Bar No. 11012)
Rachel E. Otto (Bar No. 12191)
STRINDBERG & SCHOLNICK, LLC
675 East 2100 South, Ste. 350
Salt Lake City, UT 84106
Telephone: (801) 359-4169
Facsimile: (801) 359-4313
erik@utahjobjustice.com
lauren@utahjobjustice.com
kass@utahjobjustice.com
rachel@utahjobjustice.com

John Mejia (Bar No. 13965)
Leah M. Farrell (Bar No. 13696)
ACLU of Utah
355 North 300 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84103
Telephone: (801) 521-9862
Facsimile:
jmejia@acluutah.org
lfarrell@acluutah.org

Joshua A. Block*
ACLU LGBT Project
125 Broad Street, Floor 18
New York, New York, 10004
Telephone: (212) 549-2593
Facsimile: (212) 549-2650
jblock@aclu.org

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**Pro hac vice motion to follow*

**IN THE THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, STATE OF UTAH
SALT LAKE COUNTY, WEST JORDAN DEPARTMENT**

**JONELL EVANS, STACIA IRELAND,
MARINA GOMBERG, ELENOR
HEYBORNE, MATTHEW BARRAZA,
TONY MILNER, DONALD JOHNSON,
and CARL FRITZ SHULTZ,**

Plaintiffs,

vs.

**STATE OF UTAH, GOVERNOR GARY
HERBERT, in his official capacity; and
ATTORNEY SEAN REYES, in his official
capacity,**

Defendants.

COMPLAINT

TIER 2

Case No.

Judge

Plaintiffs JoNell Evans, Stacia Ireland, Marina Gomberg, Elenor Heyborne, Matthew Barraza, Tony Milner, Donald Johnson and Carl Fritz Shultz (collectively referred to as the

“Plaintiffs”) by and through their undersigned attorneys, hereby file this Complaint against the State of Utah, Governor Gary Herbert (“Governor Herbert”) and Attorney General Sean Reyes (“Attorney General Reyes”) (Defendants will collectively be referred to as “Defendants” or “State of Utah”):

NATURE OF THE CLAIMS

1. Plaintiffs are four same-sex couples who were legally married in Utah between December 20, 2013, and January 6, 2014, the period from the day a federal district court in *Kitchen v. Herbert* enjoined Utah from enforcing its statutory and constitutional bans on allowing same-sex couples to marry to the day that injunction was stayed pending appeal. The moment Plaintiffs solemnized their marriages in accordance with Utah law, they immediately obtained vested rights in the validity and recognition of their marriages under Utah law. Those vested rights are protected by the Due Process Clauses of the Utah and United States Constitutions and must be recognized regardless of the ultimate outcome of the *Kitchen* litigation.

2. In violation of those constitutional protections, the State of Utah has unilaterally decided to place recognition of these valid marriages “on hold.” By retroactively stripping Plaintiffs’ marriages of legal recognition, the State of Utah has put these couples and their families in legal limbo and prevented legally married same-sex couples from accessing critical protections for themselves and their children.

3. Plaintiffs seek to have the Court declare that their valid marriages must be given immediate and ongoing recognition by the State of Utah and grant all injunctive relief necessary to ensure that recognition.

BACKGROUND FACTS

4. In 1977, the Utah Legislature amended Section 30-1-2 of the Utah Code to “prohibit[] and declare[] void” marriages “between persons of the same sex” (the “Marriage Limitation Statute”).

5. In 2004, the Utah Legislature added Section 30-1-1.4 to the Utah Code, which reads “the policy of this state [is] to recognize as marriage only the legal union of a man and a woman,” and “this state will not recognize, enforce, or give legal effect to any law creating any legal status, rights, benefits, or duties [to same sex-couples] that are substantially equivalent to those provided under Utah law to a man and woman because they are married” (the “Marriage Recognition Statute”).

6. Also in 2004 the Utah Legislature passed a “Joint Resolution of Marriage” proposing to amend the Utah Constitution by adding Article I, Section 29, to read: “(1) Marriage consists of only the legal union between a man and a woman. (2) No other domestic union, however denominated, may be recognized as a marriage or given the same or substantially equivalent legal effect.”

7. This proposed amendment, known as “Amendment 3,” was on the ballot in the November 2, 2004 general election. Amendment 3 passed and became effective on January 1, 2005.

8. On March 25, 2013, three same-sex couples living in Utah filed a lawsuit in the Federal District Court for the District of Utah against Governor Gary Herbert, then-Utah Attorney General John Swallow, and Salt Lake County Clerk Sherrie Swensen, all acting in their

official capacities. *See Kitchen v. Herbert*, 2:13-cv-217 RJS (D. Utah) (referred to herein as *Kitchen*).

9. The plaintiffs in *Kitchen* asserted that Amendment 3 and the Marriage Limitation and Recognition Statutes violated the Equal Protection and Due Process Clauses of the U.S. Constitution. The plaintiffs sought declaratory relief that Amendment 3 and the Marriage Limitation and Recognition Statutes are unconstitutional under the Constitution. The parties filed cross-motions for summary judgment.

10. On December 20, 2013, the U.S. District Court in *Kitchen* denied the defendants' motion for summary judgment, granted plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment, and issued a permanent injunction barring Utah officials from enforcing Amendment 3 and the Marriage Limitation and Recognition Statutes. (Attached as Ex. A).

11. The Memorandum Decision and Order by the *Kitchen* court concluded as follows:

The court hereby declares that Amendment 3 is unconstitutional because it denies the Plaintiffs their rights to due process and equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution. The court hereby enjoins the State from enforcing Sections 30-1-2 and 30-1-4.1 of the Utah Code and Article I, § 29 of the Utah Constitution to the extent these laws prohibit a person from marrying another person of the same sex.

12. The county clerks for Salt Lake County and Washington County began to issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples that same day, in accordance with the *Kitchen* court's injunction. Many same-sex couples promptly obtained marriage licenses and solemnized their marriages that same day.

13. Governor Herbert and the acting Utah Attorney General then filed motions with the U.S. District Court and with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit to stay the district court's order, pending appeal.

14. On December 22, 2013, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit denied Governor Herbert and the acting Utah Attorney General's motion for a stay without prejudice for failing to "meet the requirements of the Federal or local appellate rules."

15. On December 23, 2013, Governor Herbert and the acting Utah Attorney General filed a second motion to stay the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit. The Tenth Circuit denied the second motion the same day.

16. On December 23, 2013, the U.S. District Court also denied defendants' motion for a stay of the December 20 injunction. The District Court stated in its written Order denying the motion that "The court's Order [of December 20] specifically mentioned Sections 30-1-2 and 30-1-4.1 of the Utah Code and Article I, § 29 of the Utah Constitution. The court's Order also applies to any other Utah laws that prohibit same-sex couples from marrying."

17. On December 23, 2013, following the U.S. District Court's denial of a stay, Governor Herbert and the acting Utah Attorney General filed a third motion with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit to stay the district court's order.

18. As of December 23, 2013, officials in seven counties in Utah had either closed their offices or were publicly refusing to issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples, while officials in the other 22 counties publicly stated that they would. (*See [Utah counties split on issuing same-sex marriage licenses](http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/news/57302939-78/counties-county-couples-issuing.html.csp), Salt Lake Trib., Dec. 23, 2013, accessible at <http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/news/57302939-78/counties-county-couples-issuing.html.csp>.)*

19. On December 24, 2013, Governor Herbert's office sent an email to his cabinet with the following directive: "Where no conflicting laws exist you should conduct business in compliance with the federal judge's ruling until such time that the current district court decision is addressed by the 10th Circuit Court." (Attached as Ex. B.)

20. Also on December 24, 2013, a spokesman for the Utah Attorney General's Office publicly stated that county clerks who did not issue licenses could be held in contempt of the court and the law. (See Denying same-sex marriage licenses illegal, says A.G. office, Salt Lake Trib., Dec. 24, 2013, accessible at <http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/news/57306295-78/county-sex-marriage-office.html.csp>.)

21. Later that day, also on December 24, 2013, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit for the third time denied Governor Herbert and the acting Utah Attorney General's motion for a stay.

22. By December 26, 2013, officials in 28 of Utah's 29 counties stated that they would issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples. (See Same-sex couples shatter marriage records in Utah, Salt Lake Trib., Dec. 26, 2013, accessible at <http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/mobile/57310957-68/marriages-sex-county-total.html.csp>.)

23. An official in Piute County, the one county that was not making public statements on December 26, 2013 about whether it would issue licenses, later stated that the county had decided to issue same-sex licenses on December 24, 2013, but had received no applications. (Utah issues hundreds of marriage licenses to gay couples, Associated Press, Dec. 28, 2013, accessible at <http://www.krextv.com/story/utah-issues-hundreds-of-marriage-licenses-to-gay-couples-20131228>.)

24. Governor Herbert and Attorney General Reyes waited until December 31, 2013 to file a request for a stay of the district court's order with the U.S. Supreme Court.

25. Between December 20, 2013 and January 6, 2014, it is estimated that over 1,300 same sex couples were issued Utah marriage licenses. (Same-sex couples denied Utah marriage licenses in court order's wake, Salt Lake Trib., Jan. 6, 2014, accessible at <http://www.sltrib.com/sltrib/news/57357867-78/county-marriage-couple-sex.html.csp>.)

26. While there are no reported counts of how many of those granted licenses solemnized their marriages before January 6, 2014, on information and belief, over 1,000 same-sex couples solemnized their marriages before that date. It is reported that all but seven counties in Utah issued at least one marriage license to a same-sex couple during that period. (*Id.*)

27. On January 6, 2014, the United States Supreme Court ruled on Governor Herbert and Attorney General Reyes's motion in *Kitchen* and issued the following Order:

“The application for stay presented to Justice Sotomayor and by her referred to the Court is granted. The permanent injunction issued by the United States District Court for the District of Utah, case No. 2:13-cv-217, on December 20, 2013, is stayed pending final disposition of the appeal by the United States Court of Appeals for the Tenth Circuit.”

28. The Supreme Court's Order staying the *Kitchen* court's decision did not address the legal status of the marriages that same-sex couples entered into in Utah between December 20, 2013, and January 6, 2014.

29. That same day, January 6, 2014, Attorney General Reyes issued a statement that reads in part, “Utah's Office of Attorney General is carefully evaluating the legal status of the marriages that were performed since the District Court's decision and will not rush to a decision that impacts Utah citizens so personally.” (Attached as Ex. C.)

30. On January 8, 2014, Governor Herbert's chief of staff issued an email to the Governor's cabinet members instructing them to refuse to grant recognition to same-sex couples married pursuant to Utah marriage licenses (the "Directive"). (Attached as Ex. D.)

31. The Directive begins by stating that soon after the December 20, 2013 injunction, "this office sent an email to each of you soon after the district court decision, directing compliance" with that order. (*Id.*)

32. The Directive explained that the Supreme Court had stayed the *Kitchen* order and stated that "[b]ased on counsel from the Attorney General's Office regarding the Supreme Court decision, state recognition of same-sex marital status is ON HOLD until further notice." (*Id.*)

33. The Directive then stated that its recipients should "understand this position is not intended to comment on the legal status of those same-sex marriages – that is for the courts to decide. The intent of this communication is to direct state agency compliance with current laws that prohibit the state from recognizing same-sex marriages." (*Id.*)

34. The Directive went on to give the following instruction to state agencies:

Wherever individuals are in the process of availing themselves of state services related to same-sex marital status, that process is on hold and will stay exactly in that position until a final court decision is issued. For example, if a same-sex married couple previously changed their names on new drivers licenses, those licenses should not be revoked. If a same-sex couple seeks to change their names on drivers licenses now, the law does not allow the state agency to recognize the marriage therefore the new drivers licenses cannot be issued. (*Id.*)

35. On January 9, 2014, Attorney General Reyes issued a letter to county attorneys and county clerks which states that he seeks to provide "legal clarification about whether or not to mail or otherwise provide marriage certificates to persons of the same sex whose marriage

ceremonies took place between December 20, 2013 and January 6, 2014, prior to the issuance of the stay by the U.S. Supreme Court.” (Attached as Ex. E.)

36. Attorney General Reyes continued that “[a]lthough the State of Utah cannot currently legally recognize marriages other than those between a man and a woman, marriages between persons of the same sex were recognized in the state of Utah between the dates of December 20, 2013 until the stay on January 6, 2014. *Based on our analysis of Utah law, the marriages were recognized at the time the ceremony was completed.*” (*Id.*, emphasis added.)

37. Attorney General Reyes further indicated that the State of Utah would not challenge the validity of those marriages for the purposes of recognition by the federal government or other states, nonetheless “the validity of the marriages in question must ultimately be decided by the legal appeals process presently working its way through the courts.” (*Id.*)

38. Attorney General Reyes also explained that “the act of completing and providing a marriage certificate for all couples whose marriage was performed prior to the morning of January 6, 2014, is administrative and consistent with Utah law” and “would allow, for instance, same-sex couples who solemnized their marriage prior to the stay to have proper documentation in states that recognize same-sex marriage.” (*Id.*)

39. On January 15, 2014, the Utah State Tax Commission issued a notice stating that same-sex couples “may file a joint return if they [were] married as of the close of the tax year” for 2013 because “[a]s of December 31, 2013, the Supreme Court had not yet issued its stay of the District Court’s injunction.” (Attached as Ex. F.)

40. The notice further states: “This notice is limited to the 2013 tax year. Filing information for future years will be provided as court rulings and other information become available.” (*Id.*)

PLAINTIFFS

Marina Gomberg and Elenor Heyborne

41. Plaintiffs Marina Gomberg and Elenor Heyborne were both born and raised in Utah. Ms. Gomberg was raised in a Jewish family in Ogden, and Ms. Heyborne comes from an LDS family in Salt Lake City.

42. Ms. Gomberg and Ms. Heyborne met nine years ago through mutual friends, and have been in a committed relationship ever since.

43. Ms. Gomberg and Ms. Heyborne both work in communications and Ms. Heyborne is a State employee.

44. Ms. Gomberg and Ms. Heyborne had a commitment ceremony in May 2009 but the State did not recognize their union or afford them any of the rights of married couples.

45. For the last couple of years they have been contemplating having a baby, but they are worried about protecting their family because the State will only allow one of them to be a legal parent to any children they have together. They had hoped being legally married would resolve this concern.

46. Within an hour of learning of the *Kitchen* decision, Ms. Gomberg and Ms. Heyborne rushed to the Salt Lake County building to obtain their marriage license and solemnized their marriage that same day. They were thrilled that their State was finally going to sanction their union and recognize their marriage.

47. Although they have supportive and loving family and friends, once they were legally married, Ms. Gomberg and Ms. Heyborne realized how anxious they had been in what the State considered a second-class relationship. The disadvantageous tax status, lack of guaranteed hospital visitation, and inability to both be legal guardians of their future children had created an enormous emotional weight, which was lifted by their legal marriage.

48. The State's refusal to continue to recognize their marriage raises again all their concerns and anxiety.

49. Despite the fact that Ms. Gomberg and Ms. Heyborne feel disregarded and insulted by the State, it rankles them when people suggest they move elsewhere. They are committed to their community in Utah – they have jobs, family, and friends here. They are hoping to raise a family in the State they grew up in and continue to love.

Matthew Barraza and Tony Milner

50. Plaintiffs Matthew Barraza and Tony Milner have been in a committed and loving relationship for nearly 11 years.

51. Mr. Barraza is an attorney and Mr. Milner is the executive director of a non-profit organization serving homeless families.

52. Mr. Barraza and Mr. Milner are lifelong Utahns. Mr. Milner was born and raised in an LDS family in West Jordan. Mr. Barraza, one of six siblings, was born in California but his family, who are also LDS, moved to Ogden when he was one year old.

53. In 2007, Mr. Barraza and Mr. Milner held a religious commitment ceremony officiated by their pastor, Erin Gilmore of Holladay United Church of Christ, and have since referred to themselves as husbands and married. But this commitment was not recognized by the

State of Utah.

54. Mr. Barraza and Mr. Milner had been contemplating starting a family when, in 2009, a struggling couple they knew who were expecting a baby approached them and asked if they would consider adopting the child. Mr. Barraza and Mr. Milner were overjoyed by the prospect of welcoming a child into their family. They attended all of the birth mother's prenatal appointments with her and attended the birth, where Mr. Milner got to cut their son's umbilical cord.

55. Their son, "J.," is now four years old. Although Mr. Barraza and Mr. Milner have raised J. from birth, only one of them was able to adopt J. and establish legal parentage under Utah law. Mr. Barraza is the adoptive parent, which means that Mr. Milner is treated as a legal stranger to their son, and if something were to happen to Mr. Barraza, J. could potentially be placed in foster care.

56. In 2010, Mr. Barraza and Mr. Milner traveled to Washington, D.C., to get married. Although they were legally married in D.C., Amendment 3 prevented them from having their marriage recognized in Utah.

57. Even though that marriage was not recognized by the State, they chose to remain in Utah where they have tremendous family and community support. They want to continue to live, work and raise their son here.

58. When they heard that Amendment 3 was ruled unconstitutional, Mr. Barraza and Mr. Milner were thrilled to finally have all of the legal protections that come with marriage. Most importantly, their marriage would allow Mr. Milner to establish legal parentage with J. through a second-parent adoption. They wanted to give J. the security of having two legal

parents, and they wanted the peace of mind knowing that if something were to happen to Mr. Barraza, J. would have another legally recognized parent who could care and provide for him.

59. On December 20, 2013, Mr. Barraza and Mr. Milner obtained a Utah marriage license and were married by Pastor Tom Nordberg of Holladay United Church of Christ that same day.

60. Immediately after Christmas, on December 26, 2013, Mr. Barraza and Mr. Milner initiated proceedings in the court for Mr. Milner to adopt their son. They received a hearing date of January 10, 2014.

61. On January 9, 2014, however, the court contacted Mr. Barraza and Mr. Milner and informed them that because of the stay in *Kitchen*, and because of Governor Herbert's and Attorney General Reyes's announcements to State agencies to not recognize same-sex marriages, the court had decided that it should provide notice of the adoption proceedings to the Attorney General's office so that the Attorney General could intervene.

62. Faced with the potential that the State could attempt to thwart J.'s adoption, Mr. Barraza and Mr. Milner requested that the court continue the hearing to January 31, 2014.

63. At this point, Mr. Barraza and Mr. Milner will have to put the proceedings completely on hold until they are sure that Mr. Milner can adopt J. without State interference.

64. The State's refusal to recognize their legal marriage has again destroyed the peace of mind they would have received by providing J. two legal parents.

JoNell Evans and Stacia Ireland

65. Plaintiffs JoNell Evans, 61 years old, and Stacia Ireland, 60 years old, have been in a committed relationship for 13 years.

66. Ms. Ireland taught math to junior high and high school students for 30 years before semi-retiring. She now works part-time at a community college helping students with disabilities.

67. Ms. Evans is an artist and a human resources director for a non-profit organization.

68. Ms. Evans and Ms. Ireland have lived in Utah their entire adult lives. Their home is located on property in West Valley City that has been in Ms. Evans's family for generations. Much of their family lives in the same neighborhood.

69. In 2007, Ms. Evans and Ms. Ireland affirmed their commitment with a religious marriage ceremony at the Unitarian Church in Salt Lake City. But their commitment was not recognized by the State of Utah.

70. In 2008, Ms. Evans and Ms. Ireland had wills and medical powers of attorney drawn up. They knew other same-sex couples who had been treated as legal strangers by hospitals, and they wanted to ensure this would not happen to them, should either of them be hospitalized.

71. In 2010, Ms. Ireland suffered a heart attack. Before they left for the hospital, Ms. Evans scrambled to locate a copy of Ms. Ireland's power of attorney. With documents in hand, the hospital tolerated Ms. Evans's insistence that she stay by Ms. Ireland's side during her treatment, but the hospital did not treat Ms. Evans like it would a spouse. As Ms. Evans describes it, "It felt like I wasn't even in the room."

72. On December 20, 2013, Ms. Evans learned of the *Kitchen* decision. She rushed to the Salt Lake County building and called Ms. Ireland to meet her there. After standing in line for

a few hours, the couple received their marriage license, and Salt Lake City Mayor Ralph Becker solemnized their marriage. They were surrounded by other couples and friends, all there to celebrate the right of same-sex couples to finally marry. The only downside to the whirlwind wedding was that their families could not make it there to witness their ceremony.

73. On January 1, 2014, Ms. Evans again had to rush Ms. Ireland to the emergency room because Ms. Ireland was experiencing severe chest pains. Prior to their visit, Ms. Ireland had informed the hospital that she had married Ms. Evans and during their stay in the hospital, Ms. Evans was afforded all the courtesies and rights given to the married spouse of a patient. For example, the hospital allowed Ms. Evans to sign paperwork for Ms. Ireland and consulted with her on all aspects of Ms. Ireland's treatment.

74. On the day after Governor Herbert directed State agencies to no longer recognize the marriages of same-sex couples in Utah, Ms. Ireland had to return to the hospital for a follow-up procedure. Once again, they had to face uncertainty and anxiety that the hospital would treat Ms. Evans like a non-entity instead of a spouse.

75. Ms. Evans and Ms. Ireland now worry that during any future emergency hospital visits, and even during routine care, they will no longer be afforded the same protections as other married couples.

Donald Johnson and Carl Fritz Shultz

76. Plaintiffs Donald Johnson and Carl Fritz Shultz met in 1992, and have been "best friends and partners" for over 21 years.

77. Mr. Johnson was born and raised in Utah, attended the University of Utah, and has taught special education high school juniors and seniors in the same school district for 37

years.

78. Mr. Shultz was raised in southern Idaho and attended Idaho State University. He came to Utah to begin his career in retail sales.

79. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Shultz started dating around Labor Day in 1992. After having to spend Thanksgiving apart that year, they both realized that they wanted to spend their lives together. When Mr. Shultz returned from his family trip, Mr. Johnson proposed to him. They have celebrated the Sunday after Thanksgiving as their anniversary ever since.

80. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Shultz have been a vital and important part of their close-knit neighborhood for many years. They describe themselves as the “neighbors who lend a hand” when it is needed. They love taking care of their neighbors’ dogs, and keeping an eye on neighbors’ houses when they go on vacation. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Shultz are always pitching in to shovel neighbors’ walks and mow lawns.

81. On the Saturday morning after the *Kitchen* decision, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Schultz were sitting at breakfast when Mr. Shultz reached over the table, took Mr. Johnson’s hand, and suggested they get married.

82. Mr. Johnson and Mr. Shultz had been considering going to California to marry, but were elated to be able to marry in their home state.

83. On December 22, 2013, Mr. Johnson got up at midnight, put on a suit, and went to stand in line at the Salt Lake County building at 2 a.m. Mr. Shultz joined him at 6 a.m. They finally got their marriage license at around 10 a.m. on December 23, 2013, and solemnized their marriage immediately.

84. For Mr. Johnson, being able to stand in front of his classroom of high school

juniors and seniors and tell them that he had married his partner of 21 years over the holidays and that “yes, indeed, [he] was a gay man” meant he no longer had to hide who he is and made him immensely proud and happy. When he told them, Mr. Johnson’s students burst into applause for him.

85. Now that the State of Utah has refused to continue to recognize same-sex marriages, Mr. Johnson and Mr. Shultz feel that they have again been relegated to second-class citizenship in their own state.

86. Mr. Johnson is 61 years old, and Mr. Shultz is 58 years old. Mr. Johnson researched insurance coverage for himself and Mr. Shultz and discovered that they could have access to savings of approximately \$8,000 per year on health insurance that they will lose without State recognition of their marriage.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
(Deprivation of Plaintiffs’ Property and Liberty Interests without Due Process in Violation of the Utah Constitution)

87. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the allegations set forth above.

88. After the December 20, 2013 *Kitchen* ruling, Plaintiffs and other same-sex couples were legally permitted to marry in the State of Utah.

89. To perfect that legal right, Plaintiffs completed each step required by the state of Utah under Utah Code Title 30 Chapter 1: They acquired valid marriage licenses from a county clerk and solemnized their marriages before an authorized person who then returned the license and marriage certificate to the county clerk. Upon information and belief, the county clerk then filed and preserved the license and certificate.

90. The validity of those marriages was contemporaneously recognized by the State of Utah as evidenced by an email from Governor Herbert's office to his cabinet dated December 24, 2013, in which his office directed them to comply "with the federal judge's ruling until such time that the current district court decision is addressed by the 10th Circuit Court." The State of Utah's contemporaneous recognition of these marriages is further evidenced by a statement made by the Attorney General's Office that same day warning county officials that denying same sex couples marriage licenses could constitute contempt of the court and the law.

91. The validity of those marriages, including Plaintiff's marriages at the time they were solemnized, was further recognized by the State of Utah in another email from Governor Herbert's office to his cabinet dated January 8, 2014, in which his office stated, in part, "[a]fter the district court decision was issued on Friday, December 20th, some same-sex couples availed themselves of the opportunity to marry and to the status granted by the state to married persons. This office sent an email to each of you soon after the district court decision, directing compliance."

92. The validity of those marriages, including Plaintiffs' marriages, was also recognized and acknowledged the next day when Attorney General Reyes directed the county clerks to provide a marriage certificate to all couples whose marriage was performed between December 20, 2013, and January 6, 2014.

93. Further recognition of those marriages, including Plaintiffs' marriages, occurred on January 15, 2013, when the Utah State Tax Commission issued a notice that same-sex couples could file as married for the 2013 tax year if they were married as of December 31, 2013.

94. By properly availing themselves of their legal right to marry and completing the necessary steps to solemnize their marriages, Plaintiffs – like any legally married different-sex couples – acquired certain property and liberty interests under Utah law attendant upon and arising from their marriages.

95. Those interests are fundamental and encompass a panoply of rights. These interests have been described by the U.S. Supreme Court, in discussing the liberty interest protected by the U.S. Constitution, as the right to establish a home, raise children, and enjoy those privileges long recognized at common law as essential to the orderly pursuit of happiness by free persons. *Meyer v. Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390, 399 (1923).

96. Plaintiffs’ vested rights in the recognition of their marriages do not depend on the ultimate outcome of the *Kitchen* litigation in federal court. Whether or not the U.S. District Court’s decision in *Kitchen* is ultimately affirmed, Plaintiffs obtained vested rights in the validity and recognition of their marriages once those marriages were solemnized in accordance with Utah law.

97. Article I, Section 7 of the Utah Constitution guarantees that “[n]o person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property, without due process of law.” Because those liberty and property interests and rights vested once the Plaintiffs were married, they are subject to the protections of Article 1, Section 7 and thereafter, the State of Utah could not interfere with those rights, or otherwise interfere in the Plaintiffs’ marriages.

98. Nonetheless, on January 7, 2014, Governor Herbert, on advice of Attorney General Reyes, directed his Cabinet to place “on hold” recognition of same-sex marriages,

including those of Plaintiffs, who had already completed the legal requirements required by the State of Utah and therefore were validly married under then-existing law.

99. By taking this action, and retroactively stripping Plaintiffs' marriages of legal recognition, the State of Utah acted without legal authority and deprived Plaintiffs, and all other same-sex couples who had been legally married, of those liberty and property rights and interests protected by Article 1, Section 7 of the Utah Constitution.

100. By placing recognition of their marriages "on hold," the State of Utah has placed the legal status of all same-sex married couples, including Plaintiffs and their families and children, in legal limbo and created uncertainty as to their rights and status in virtually all areas of their lives. For example, they may be unable to obtain health insurance for their spouses and children, may not be able to make medical decisions about their spouses and family members if the need arises, may not complete stepparent adoptions to protect the legal status of their families, and if the biological parent of their child or children dies, may not be able to retain custody of their children, who may be placed into foster care.

101. This uncertainty leaves Plaintiffs in a constant state of insecurity and uncertainty that is emotionally devastating. And because their marriages are valid and must be recognized regardless of the outcome of the *Kitchen* appeal, and because the Directive is indefinite in nature, this state of insecurity may last for years.

102. The State of Utah's actions also imposed immediate dignitary harm on married same-sex couples and their families, including Plaintiffs, by creating second-class marriages in Utah that do not enjoy the rights and privileges of different-sex marriages. Like the law struck down in *United States v. Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. 2675 (2013), the State of Utah's decision to place

same-sex couples' marriages "on hold" "deprive[s] some couples married under the laws of their State, but not other couples, of both rights and responsibilities." *Id.* at 2694. "By this dynamic [the Governor's Directive] undermines both the public and private significance of state-sanctioned same-sex marriages; for it tells those couples, and all the world, that their otherwise valid marriages are unworthy of [Utah's] recognition. This places same-sex couples in an unstable position of being in a second-tier marriage. . . .And it humiliates [the] children now being raised by same-sex couples." *Id.*

103. As a result, Plaintiffs have been injured and are entitled to declaratory, injunctive, and equitable relief as set forth in the Prayer for Relief.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
(Deprivation of Plaintiffs' Property and Liberty Interests Protected by
The United States Constitution in Violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Against Defendants
Governor Herbert and Attorney General Reyes)

104. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by references the paragraphs set forth above.

105. After the December 20, 2013, ruling Plaintiffs were legally permitted to marry in Utah.

106. To perfect that legal right, Plaintiffs completed each step required by the State of Utah under Utah Code Title 30 Chapter 1: They acquired valid marriage licenses from a county clerk; solemnized their marriages before an authorized person who then returned the license and marriage certificate to the county clerk; and, upon information and belief, the county clerk then filed and preserved the license and certificate.

107. The validity of those marriages, including Plaintiffs' marriages, was recognized by the State of Utah as evidenced by an email from Governor Herbert's office to his cabinet

dated December 24, 2013, in which his office directed them to comply “with the federal judge’s ruling until such time that the current district court decision is addressed by the 10th Circuit Court.” It was further evidenced by a statement made by the Utah Attorney General’s Office that same day that warned county clerks denying same sex couples marriage licenses could constitute contempt of the court and the law.

108. The validity of those marriages, including Plaintiffs’ marriages, at the time they were solemnized, was further recognized by the State in another email from Governor Herbert’s office to his cabinet dated January 8, 2014, in which his office stated, in part, “[a]fter the district court decision was issued on Friday, December 20th, some same-sex couples availed themselves of the opportunity to marry and to the status granted by the state to married persons. This office sent an email to each of you soon after the district court decision, directing compliance.”

109. Further recognition of the validity of those marriages, including Plaintiffs’ marriages, also occurred the next day when Attorney General Reyes directed the county clerks to provide a marriage certificate to all couples whose marriage was performed between December 20, 2013, and January 6, 2014.

110. Further recognition of those marriages, including Plaintiffs’ marriages, occurred on January 15, 2013, when the Utah State Tax Commission issued a notice that same-sex couples could file as married for the 2013 tax year if they were married as of December 31, 2013.

111. By properly availing themselves of their legal right to marry and completing the necessary steps to solemnize their marriages, Plaintiffs – like any legally married different-sex couples – acquired certain property and liberty interests under Utah law attendant upon and arising from their marriages.

112. Those interests are fundamental and encompass a panoply of rights. These have been described by the U.S. Supreme Court, in discussing the liberty interest protected by the U.S. Constitution, as the right to establish a home, raise children, and enjoy those privileges long recognized at common law as essential to the orderly pursuit of happiness by free persons. *Meyer v. Nebraska*, 262 U.S. 390, 399 (1923).

113. Plaintiffs' vested rights in the recognition of their marriages do not depend on the ultimate outcome of the *Kitchen* litigation in federal court. Whether or not the U.S. District Court's decision in *Kitchen* is ultimately affirmed, Plaintiffs obtained vested rights in the validity and recognition of their marriages once those marriages were solemnized in accordance with Utah law.

114. The due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution provides that no "State [shall] deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law." U.S. Const. Amend XIV, § 1.

115. Nonetheless, on January 7, 2014, Governor Herbert, on advice of Attorney General Reyes, directed his Cabinet place "on hold" recognition of same-sex marriages, including those of Plaintiffs and not to afford them any of the protections that the State will continue to afford to different-sex couples who were married during the same period.

116. By taking this action, and retroactively stripping Plaintiffs' marriages of legal recognition, the State of Utah acted without legal authority and deprived Plaintiffs, who had been legally married, of those liberty and property rights and interests protected by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

117. By placing recognition of their marriages “on hold,” the State of Utah has placed the legal status of Plaintiffs’ families, including their children, in legal limbo and created uncertainty as to their rights and status in virtually all areas of their lives. For example, they may be unable to obtain health insurance for their spouses and children, will not be able to make medical decisions about their spouses and family members if the need arises, may not complete stepparent adoptions to protect their families, and if the biological parent of their child or children dies, may not be able to retain custody of their children, who may be placed into foster care.

118. This uncertainty leaves Plaintiffs in a constant state of insecurity and uncertainty which is emotionally devastating, and which is likely to significantly and negatively impact them, their spouses, and their children in a multitude of ways. And because these marriages are valid and must be recognized regardless of the outcome of the *Kitchen* appeal, and because the Directive is indefinite in nature, this state of insecurity may last for years.

119. The State of Utah’s actions also imposed immediate dignitary harm on married same sex couples and their families by creating second-class marriages that do not enjoy the rights and privileges of different-sex marriages. Like the law struck down in *United States v. Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. 2675 (2013), Utah’s decision to place same-sex couples’ marriages “on hold” “deprive[s] some couples married under the laws of their State, but not other couples, of both rights and responsibilities.” *Id.* at 2694. “By this dynamic [the Governor’s Directive] undermines both the public and private significance of state-sanctioned same-sex marriages; for it tells those couples, and all the world, that their otherwise valid marriages are unworthy of

[Utah's] recognition. This places same-sex couples in an unstable position of being in a second-tier marriage. . . .And it humiliates [the] children now being raised by same-sex couples.” *Id.*

120. At all times, the Defendants were acting under color of state law when committing the complained of acts. In addition, the Governor is the final policy making authority for the State of Utah and exercised that authority in violating Plaintiffs’ constitutional rights.

121. As a result, Plaintiffs have been injured and are entitled to declaratory, equitable, and injunctive relief pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. Plaintiffs are also entitled to recover their attorney’s fees and costs incurred in bringing this action pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1988.

THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION
(Relief under Rule 65B)

122. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the paragraphs set forth above.

123. Rule 65B of the Utah Rules of Civil Procedure allows a person to seek extraordinary relief from acts involving the wrongful use of public authority, or when a governmental official has failed to perform an act required by law, “where no other plain, speedy and adequate relief is available.”

124. More specifically, under subpart (c)(2)(A) of Rule 65B, relief may be granted when a government employee engages in the wrongful use of his public authority. This includes “where a person usurps, intrudes into, or unlawfully holds or *exercises* a public office . . .” (emphasis added).

125. Appropriate relief may also be granted under subpart (d)(2): “(B) where an inferior court, administrative agency, corporation, or persons has failed to perform an act required by law as a duty of office, trust or station”

126. As set forth above, each of Plaintiff couples obtained marriage licenses as required by, and in conformance with, Utah Code Ann. § 30-1-7. Thereafter, each Plaintiff couple had their marriages solemnized within 30 days in front of a person authorized by statute to solemnize their marriage, and otherwise fully complied with, Utah Code Ann. § 30-1-6.

127. Each of Plaintiffs’ marriages was complete and valid and they were thereafter entitled to all of the rights, benefits and privileges afforded to married couples, as well as being subject to all obligations and responsibilities attendant upon married couples.

128. The validity of those marriages was recognized by the State of Utah as evidenced by an email from the Governor to his cabinet dated December 24, 2013; in another email dated January 8, 2014; when the Attorney General directed the county clerks to provide marriage certificates to Plaintiffs and other same-sex couples; and when the Utah State Tax Commission issued a notice that same-sex couples could file as married for the 2013 tax year if they were married as of December 31, 2013.

129. Notwithstanding that Plaintiffs have fully complied with the requirement of Utah Code Ann. § 30-1-1, *et seq.*, and are now validly married under the laws of Utah, the State of Utah now refuses to “recognize” those marriages, or provide Plaintiffs with any of the protections and responsibilities attendant upon and to all other valid marriages.

130. By placing recognition of their marriages “on hold,” the State of Utah has placed the legal status of Plaintiffs’ families, including their children, in legal limbo, which creates

uncertainty as to their rights and status in virtually all areas of their lives. For example, they may be unable to obtain health insurance for their spouses and children, will not be able to make medical decisions about their spouses and family members if the need arises, and if the biological parent of their child or children dies, may not be able to retain custody of their children, who may be placed into foster care.

131. This uncertainty leaves Plaintiffs in a constant state of insecurity and uncertainty which is emotionally devastating, and which is likely to significantly and negatively impact them, their spouses, and their children in a multitude of ways. And because these valid marriages must be recognized regardless of the outcome of the *Kitchen* appeal, and because the Directive is indefinite in nature, this state of insecurity may last for years.

132. By taking this action, and retroactively stripping plaintiffs' marriages of legal recognition, the State of Utah acted without legal authority, arbitrarily and capriciously, and deprived Plaintiffs, and all other same-sex couples who had been legally married, of those liberty and property rights and interests protected by Article 1, Section 7 of the Utah Constitution and the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

133. Plaintiffs and their families have been injured by the illegal conduct of the Defendants, and will continue to be injured until the State of Utah recognizes their marriages. Plaintiffs are accordingly entitled to the relief detailed in the Prayer for Relief.

134. Plaintiffs have no other plain, speedy, and adequate remedy available as to the issues raised in this Complaint because Plaintiffs' vested rights in the recognition of their marriages do not depend on the ultimate outcome of the *Kitchen* litigation in federal court. Whether or not the U.S. District Court's decision in *Kitchen* is ultimately affirmed, Plaintiffs

obtained vested rights in the validity and recognition of their marriages once those marriages were solemnized in accordance with Utah law.

135. Plaintiffs request that if this Court cannot resolve this matter based on the pleadings that it issue an order requiring the parties to appear at an expedited hearing on the merits as provided for under Rule 65B(d)(3).

FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION
(Declaratory Judgment)

136. Plaintiffs reallege and incorporate by reference the paragraphs set forth above.

137. Pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 78B-6-401(1) this Court has the authority to issue a declaratory judgment that determines the “rights, status and other legal relations within its respective jurisdiction.” Further, that declaration may be either affirmative or negative in form and effect. Utah Code Ann. § 78B-6-401(2).

138. A person whose rights, status, and legal relations are affected by a statute may also request that “the district court to determine any question of construction or validity arising under that . . . statute” and “obtain a declaration of rights, status or other legal relations.” Utah Code Ann. § 78B-6-401(2).

139. Importantly, the Utah Legislature has mandated that the declaratory judgment act must be liberally construed. Utah Code Ann. § 78B-6-412 reads as follows:

This chapter is to be remedial. Its purpose is to settle and afford relief from uncertainty and insecurity with respect to rights, status, and other legal relations; and is to be liberally construed and administered.

140. As set forth above, Plaintiffs fully complied with the requirements of Utah law regarding marriage, and therefore have valid marriages according to Utah law. In addition, the State of Utah recognized those marriages as valid at the time they were performed.

141. Notwithstanding the validity of those marriages and the prior recognition given to them by the State of Utah, the State of Utah has now unilaterally declared that it will no longer recognize those marriages or afford Plaintiffs the protections and responsibilities that it legally affords to all other married couples.

142. By placing recognition of their marriages “on hold,” the State of Utah has placed the legal status of Plaintiffs’ families, including their children, in legal limbo, which creates uncertainty as to their rights and status in virtually all areas of their lives. For example, they may be unable to obtain health insurance for their spouses and children, will not be able to make medical decisions about their spouses and family members if the need arises, and if the biological parent of their child or children dies, may not be able to retain custody of their children, who may be placed into foster care.

143. This uncertainty leaves Plaintiffs in a constant state of insecurity and uncertainty which is emotionally devastating, and which is likely to significantly and negatively impact them, their spouses, and their children in a multitude of ways. And because these valid marriages must be recognized regardless of the outcome of the *Kitchen* appeal, and because the Directive is indefinite in nature, this state of insecurity may last for years.

144. By taking this action, and retroactively stripping plaintiffs’ marriages of legal recognition, the State of Utah acted without legal authority, arbitrarily and capriciously, and deprived Plaintiffs and all other same-sex couples who had been legally married of those liberty

and property rights and interests protected by Article 1, Section 7 of the Utah Constitution and the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.

145. Plaintiffs seek a declaration from the Court that because their marriages are valid under Utah Code Ann. § 30-1-1, *et seq.*, and have been previously recognized by the State of Utah, that:

- a. The State of Utah must continue to recognize the marriages by all same-sex couples entered into pursuant to Utah marriage licenses issued between December 20, 2013, and January 6, 2014, including Plaintiffs' marriages, and afford those couples and their families with all of the protections and responsibilities given to married couples under Utah law.
- b. The State must withdraw its Directive not to recognize the marriages by all same-sex couples entered into pursuant to Utah marriage licenses issued between December 20, 2013, and January 6, 2014, including Plaintiffs' marriages, and must in all respects treat and recognize them as married.
- c. The reimplemention of Amendment 3, the Marriage Limitation Statute, the Marriage Recognition Statute, and any other statute preventing same-sex couples from marrying does not retroactively strip recognition from the same-sex marriages entered into pursuant to Utah marriage licenses issued between December 20, 2013 and January 6, 2014, or otherwise impair the protections and responsibilities that such marriages are subject to under Utah law.

146. Plaintiffs also request that the court award them the costs they incurred in bringing this action, pursuant to Utah Code Ann. § 78B-6-411.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Wherefore, Plaintiffs pray for the following relief:

- A. A declaratory judgment stating that because the marriages by same-sex couples entered into pursuant to Utah marriage licenses issued between December 20, 2013, and January 6, 2014, including Plaintiffs' marriages, are valid under U.C.A. §30-1-1, et seq., and have been previously recognized by the State of Utah, that the State of Utah must continue to recognize those marriages, and afford those couples, including Plaintiffs, and their families with all of the protections and responsibilities given to all married couples under Utah law.
- B. An injunction ordering the State of Utah to withdraw any of its officials' instructions, such as the Directive, not to recognize the marriages by same-sex couples entered into pursuant to Utah marriage licenses issued between December 20, 2013, and January 6, 2014, including Plaintiffs' marriages, and must in all respects treat them as married.
- C. A declaratory judgment stating that the reimplemention of Amendment 3, the Marriage Limitation Statute, the Marriage Recognition Statute, and any other statute preventing same sex couples from marrying does not retroactively strip recognition from the marriages by same-sex couples entered into pursuant to Utah marriage licenses issued between December 20, 2013 and January 6, 2014, including Plaintiffs'

marriages, or otherwise impair the protections and responsibilities that such marriages are subject to under Utah law.

- D. An order pursuant to Rule 65B of the Utah Rules of Civil Procedure directing State officials as follows: to immediately recognize the marriages by same-sex couples entered into pursuant to Utah marriage licenses issued between December 20, 2013, and January 6, 2014, including Plaintiffs' marriages, as valid marriages; to afford all such couples, including Plaintiffs, and their families with all of the protections and responsibilities given to all married couples under Utah law; and to cease making representations that the federal appellate courts will decide whether their current refusals are lawful in the *Kitchen* suit.
- E. Attorneys' fees and costs related to the litigation of this action.
- F. Any other relief the court deems just and proper.

DATED this 21st day of January, 2014.

STRINDBERG & SCHOLNICK, LLC

/s/ Erik Strindberg

Erik Strindberg
Lauren Scholnick
Kathryn Harstad
Rachel Otto

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF UTAH
CENTRAL DIVISION

DEREK KITCHEN, MOUDI SBEITY,
KAREN ARCHER, KATE CALL, LAURIE
WOOD, and KODY PARTRIDGE,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

GARY R. HERBERT, JOHN SWALLOW,
and SHERRIE SWENSEN,

Defendants.

MEMORANDUM DECISION
AND ORDER

Case No. 2:13-cv-217

The Plaintiffs in this lawsuit are three gay and lesbian couples who wish to marry, but are currently unable to do so because the Utah Constitution prohibits same-sex marriage. The Plaintiffs argue that this prohibition infringes their rights to due process and equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution. The State of Utah defends its laws and maintains that a state has the right to define marriage according to the judgment of its citizens. Both parties have submitted motions for summary judgment.

The court agrees with Utah that regulation of marriage has traditionally been the province of the states, and remains so today. But any regulation adopted by a state, whether related to marriage or any other interest, must comply with the Constitution of the United States. The issue the court must address in this case is therefore not who should define marriage, but the narrow question of whether Utah's current definition of marriage is permissible under the Constitution.

Few questions are as politically charged in the current climate. This observation is especially true where, as here, the state electorate has taken democratic action to participate in a popular referendum on this issue. It is only under exceptional circumstances that a court interferes with such action. But the legal issues presented in this lawsuit do not depend on whether Utah's laws were the result of its legislature or a referendum, or whether the laws passed by the widest or smallest of margins. The question presented here depends instead on the Constitution itself, and on the interpretation of that document contained in binding precedent from the Supreme Court and the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Applying the law as it is required to do, the court holds that Utah's prohibition on same-sex marriage conflicts with the United States Constitution's guarantees of equal protection and due process under the law. The State's current laws deny its gay and lesbian citizens their fundamental right to marry and, in so doing, demean the dignity of these same-sex couples for no rational reason. Accordingly, the court finds that these laws are unconstitutional.

BACKGROUND

I. The Plaintiffs

The three couples in this lawsuit either desire to be married in Utah or are already legally married elsewhere and wish to have their marriage recognized in Utah. The court summarizes below the relevant facts from the affidavits that the couples filed in support of their Motion for Summary Judgment.

A. Derek Kitchen and Moudi Sbeity

Derek Kitchen is a twenty-five-year-old man who was raised in Utah and obtained a B.A. in political science from the University of Utah. Moudi Sbeity is also twenty-five years old and

was born in Houston, Texas. He grew up in Lebanon, but left that country in 2006 during the war between Lebanon and Israel. Moudi came to Logan, Utah, where he received a B.S. in economics from Utah State University. He is currently enrolled in a Master's program in economics at the University of Utah.

Derek testifies that he knew he was gay from a young age, but that he did not come out publicly to his friends and family for several years while he struggled to define his identity. Moudi also knew he was gay when he was young and came out to his mother when he was sixteen. Moudi's mother took him to a psychiatrist because she thought he was confused, but the psychiatrist told her that there was nothing wrong with Moudi. After that visit, Moudi's mother found it easier to accept Moudi's identity, and Moudi began telling his other friends and family members. Moudi testifies that he was careful about whom he told because he was concerned that he might expose his mother to ridicule.

Derek and Moudi met each other in 2009 and fell in love shortly after meeting. After dating for eighteen months, the two moved in together in Salt Lake City. Derek and Moudi run a business called "Laziz" that they jointly started. Laziz produces and sells Middle Eastern spreads such as hummus, muhammara, and toum to Utah businesses like Harmon's and the Avenues Bistro. Having maintained a committed relationship for over four years, Derek and Moudi desire to marry each other. They were denied a marriage license from the Salt Lake County Clerk's office in March 2013.

B. Karen Archer and Kate Call

Karen Archer was born in Maryland in 1946, but spent most of her life in Boulder, Colorado. She received a B.A. and an M.D. from the University of Texas, after which she

completed her residency in OB/GYN at the Pennsylvania State University. She worked as a doctor until 2001, when she retired after developing two serious illnesses. Karen experienced a number of hardships due to her sexual identity. Karen came out to her parents when she was twenty-six years old, but her parents believed that her sexual orientation was an abnormality and never accepted this aspect of Karen's identity. Karen was one of thirteen women in a medical school class of 350, and she recalls that her male classmates often referred to the female students as "dykes." Karen also testifies that she was once present at a gay bar when it was raided by the police, who assaulted the bar patrons with their batons.

Kate Call is sixty years old and spent her earliest years in Wisconsin and Mexico, where her parents were mission presidents for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. When she was eight years old, Kate moved to Provo, Utah, where her father worked as a professor at Brigham Young University. Kate received her B.A. from BYU in 1974. While she was in college, she dated several men and was even engaged twice. Although she hoped that she would begin to feel a more intimate connection if she committed herself to marriage, she broke off both engagements because she never developed any physical attraction to her fiancés. Kate began to realize that she was a lesbian, a feeling that continued to develop while she was serving a mission in Argentina. She wrote a letter sharing these feelings to her mission president, who, without Kate's consent, faxed Kate's message to church authorities and her parents. Kate's family was sad and puzzled at first, but ultimately told her that they loved her unconditionally.

During her professional life, Kate owned a number of businesses. In 2000, she bought a sheep ranch in San Juan County and moved there with D., her partner at the time. Kate worked seasonally for the National Park Service and D. found a job at the Youth Detention facility in

Blanding. But when rumors surfaced that D. was a lesbian, D.'s boss told her that she needed to move away from Kate's ranch if she wished to keep her job. While Kate was helping D. move, someone from D.'s work saw Kate's vehicle at D.'s new trailer. That person reported the sighting to D.'s boss, and D. was fired. Several weeks later, Kate's supervisor also told her that her services were no longer needed. Kate never found out why she was let go, but she surmises that her supervisor may have been pressured by D.'s boss, who was one of her supervisor's mentors. Kate and D. moved back to the Wasatch Front, and Kate was eventually forced to sell the ranch. Kate testifies that she and D. split up as a result of the difficult challenges they had faced, and Kate eventually moved to Moab.

Karen and Kate met online through a dating website and were immediately attracted to each other when they first met in person. Karen moved from Colorado to Utah, and the couple now lives in Wallsburg. The two are both concerned about how they will support each other in the event that one of them passes away, a consideration that is especially urgent in light of Karen's illness. Karen has had difficult experiences with the legal aspects of protecting a same-sex union in the past. Before meeting Kate, Karen had two partners who passed away while she was with them. While partnered to a woman named Diana, Karen had to pay an attorney approximately one thousand dollars to draw up a large number of legal documents to guarantee certain rights: emergency contacts, visitation rights, power of attorney for medical and financial decisions, medical directives, living wills, insurance beneficiaries, and last wills and testaments. Despite these documents, Karen was unable to receive Diana's military pension when Diana died in 2005.

Karen and Kate have drawn up similar legal papers, but they are concerned that these

papers may be subject to challenges because they are not legally recognized as a couple in Utah. In an attempt to protect themselves further, Karen and Kate flew to Iowa to be wed in a city courthouse. Because of the cost of the plane tickets, the couple was not able to have friends and family attend, and the pair had their suitcases by their side when they said, "I do." Kate testifies that the pragmatism of their Iowa wedding was born out of the necessity of providing whatever security they could for their relationship. Under current law, Utah does not recognize their marriage performed in Iowa.

C. Laurie Wood and Kody Partridge

Laurie Wood has lived in Utah since she was three years old. She grew up in American Fork, received a B.A. from the University of Utah, and received her Master's degree from BYU. She spent over eleven years teaching in the public school system in Utah County and is now employed by Utah Valley University. She teaches undergraduate courses as an Associate Professor of English in the English and Literature Department, and also works as the Concurrent Enrollment Coordinator supervising high school instructors who teach as UVU adjuncts in high schools across Utah County. She has served on the Board of Directors for the American Civil Liberties Union for fifteen years and co-founded the non-profit Women's Redrock Music Festival in 2006. Laurie was not open about her sexual identity while she was a public school teacher because she believed she would be fired if she said anything. She came out when she was hired at UVU. While she dated men in high school and college, she never felt comfortable or authentic in her relationships until she began dating women.

Kody Partridge is forty-seven years old and moved to Utah from Montana in 1984 to attend BYU. She received her B.A. in Spanish and humanities and later obtained a Master's

degree in English. She earned a teaching certificate in 1998 and began teaching at Butler Middle School in Salt Lake County. She realized that she was a lesbian while she was in college, and her family eventually came to accept her identity. She did not feel she could be open about her identity at work because of the worry that her job would be at risk. While she was teaching at Butler, Kody recalls that the story of Wendy Weaver was often in the news. Ms. Weaver was a teacher and coach at a Utah public school who was fired because she was a lesbian. Kody also became aware that the pension she was building in Utah Retirement Systems as a result of her teaching career could not be inherited by a life partner. Given these concerns, Kody applied and was accepted for a position in the English department at Rowland Hall-St. Mark's, a private school that provides benefits for the same-sex partners of its faculty members. Kody volunteers with the Utah AIDS Foundation and has traveled with her students to New Orleans four times after Hurricane Katrina to help build homes with Habitat for Humanity.

Laurie and Kody met and fell in love in 2010. Besides the fact that they are both English teachers, the two share an interest in books and gardening and have the same long-term goals for their committed relationship. They wish to marry, but were denied a marriage license from the Salt Lake County Clerk's office in March 2013.

II. History of Amendment 3

The Utah laws that are at issue in this lawsuit include two statutory prohibitions on same-sex unions and an amendment to the Utah Constitution. The court discusses the history of these laws in the context of the ongoing national debate surrounding same-sex marriage.

In 1977, the Utah legislature amended Section 30-1-2 of the Utah Code to state that marriages "between persons of the same sex" were "prohibited and declared void." In 2004, the

Utah legislature passed Section 30-1-4.1 of the Utah Code, which provides:

- (1) (a) It is the policy of this state to recognize as marriage only the legal union of a man and a woman as provided in this chapter.
- (b) Except for the relationship of marriage between a man and a woman recognized pursuant to this chapter, this state will not recognize, enforce, or give legal effect to any law creating any legal status, rights, benefits, or duties that are substantially equivalent to those provided under Utah law to a man and woman because they are married.

In the 2004 General Session, the Utah legislature also passed a Joint Resolution on Marriage, which directed the Lieutenant Governor to submit the following proposed amendment to the Utah Constitution to the voters of Utah:

- (1) Marriage consists only of the legal union between a man and a woman.
- (2) No other domestic union, however denominated, may be recognized as a marriage or given the same or substantially equivalent legal effect.

Laws 2004, H.J.R. 25 § 1. The proposed amendment, which became known as Amendment 3, was placed on the ballot for the general election on November 2, 2004. Amendment 3 passed with the support of approximately 66% of the voters. The language in Amendment 3 was then amended to the Utah Constitution as Article I, § 29, which went into effect on January 1, 2005.¹

These developments were influenced by a number of events occurring nationally. In 1993, the Hawaii Supreme Court found that the State of Hawaii's refusal to grant same-sex couples marriage licenses was discriminatory. *Baehr v. Lewin*, 852 P.2d 44, 59 (Haw. 1993).²

¹Unless noted otherwise, the court will refer to Amendment 3 in this opinion to mean both the Utah constitutional amendment and the Utah statutory provisions that prohibit same-sex marriage.

²The Hawaii Supreme Court remanded the case to the trial court to determine if the state could show that its marriage statute was narrowly drawn to further compelling state interests. *Baehr*, 852 P.2d at 68. The trial court ruled that the government failed to make this showing.

And in 1999, the Vermont Supreme Court held that the State of Vermont was required to offer all the benefits of marriage to same-sex couples. *Baker v. Vermont*, 744 A.2d 864, 886-87 (Vt. 1999).³ Two court cases in 2003 immediately preceded Utah's decision to amend its Constitution. First, the United States Supreme Court ruled that the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment protected the sexual relations of gay men and lesbians. *Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558, 578 (2003). Second, the Supreme Court of Massachusetts ruled that the Massachusetts Constitution protected the right of same-sex couples to marry. *Goodridge v. Dep't of Pub. Health*, 798 N.E.2d 941, 948 (Mass. 2003).

Since 2003, every other state has either legalized same-sex marriage⁴ or, like Utah, passed a constitutional amendment or other legislation to prohibit same-sex unions. During the past two decades, the federal government has also been involved in the same-sex marriage debate. In 1996, Congress passed the Defense of Marriage Act (DOMA), which allowed states to refuse to recognize same-sex marriages granted in other states and barred federal recognition of same-sex unions for the purposes of federal law. Act of Sept. 21, 1996, Pub. L. 104-199, 110 Stat. 2419.

Baehr v. Miike, No. 91-1394, 1996 WL 694235, at *22 (Haw. Cir. Ct. Dec. 3, 1996). The trial court's decision was rendered moot after Hawaii passed a constitutional amendment that granted the Hawaii legislature the ability to reserve marriage for opposite-sex couples. Recently, the legislature reversed course and legalized same-sex marriage. Same-sex couples began marrying in Hawaii on December 2, 2013.

³The Vermont legislature complied with this mandate by creating a new legal status called a "civil union." The legislature later permitted same-sex marriage through a statute that went into effect on September 1, 2009.

⁴Six states have legalized same-sex marriage through court decisions (California, Connecticut, Iowa, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New Mexico); eight states have passed same-sex marriage legislation (Delaware, Hawaii, Illinois, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New York, Rhode Island, Vermont); and three states have legalized same-sex marriage through a popular vote (Maine, Maryland, Washington). Same-sex marriage is also legal in Washington, D.C.

In 2013, the Supreme Court held that Section 3 of DOMA was unconstitutional.⁵ *Windsor v. United States*, 133 S. Ct. 2675, 2696 (2013).

The Supreme Court also considered an appeal from a case involving California's Proposition 8. After the California Supreme Court held that the California Constitution recognized same-sex marriage, *In re Marriage Cases*, 183 P.3d 384, 453 (Cal. 2008), California voters passed Proposition 8, which amended California's Constitution to prohibit same-sex marriage. The Honorable Vaughn Walker, a federal district judge, determined that Proposition 8 violated the guarantees of equal protection and due process under the United States Constitution. *Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, 704 F. Supp. 2d 921, 1003 (N.D. Cal. 2010). Applying different reasoning, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed Judge Walker's holding that Proposition 8 was unconstitutional. *Perry v. Brown*, 671 F.3d 1052, 1095 (9th Cir. 2012). This issue was appealed to the Supreme Court, but the Court did not address the merits of the question presented. *Hollingsworth v. Perry*, 133 S. Ct. 2652, 2668 (2013). Instead, the Court found that the proponents of Proposition 8 did not have standing to appeal Judge Walker's decision after California officials refused to defend the law. *Id.* Consequently, the Supreme Court vacated the Ninth Circuit's opinion for lack of jurisdiction. *Id.* A number of lawsuits, including the suit currently pending before this court, have been filed across the country to address the question that the Supreme Court left unanswered in the California case. The court turns to that question now.

⁵As discussed below, Section 3 defined marriage as the union between a man and a woman for purposes of federal law. The Court did not consider a challenge to Section 2, which allows states to refuse to recognize same-sex marriages validly performed in other states. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1738C.

ANALYSIS

I. Standard of Review

The court grants summary judgment when “there is no genuine dispute as to any material fact and the movant is entitled to judgment as a matter of law.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(a). The court “view[s] the evidence and make[s] all reasonable inferences in the light most favorable to the nonmoving party.” *N. Natural Gas Co. v. Nash Oil & Gas, Inc.*, 526 F.3d 626, 629 (10th Cir. 2008).

II. Effect of the Supreme Court’s Decision in *United States v. Windsor*

The court begins its analysis by determining the effect of the Supreme Court’s recent decision in *United States v. Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. 2675 (2013). In *Windsor*, the Court considered the constitutionality of Section 3 of DOMA, which defined marriage as the “legal union between one man and one woman as husband and wife” for the purposes of federal law. 1 U.S.C. § 7 (2012). A majority of the Court found that this statute was unconstitutional because it violated the Fifth Amendment of the United States Constitution. *Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. at 2696.

Both parties argue that the reasoning in *Windsor* requires judgment in their favor. The State focuses on the portions of the *Windsor* opinion that emphasize federalism, as well as the Court’s acknowledgment of the State’s “historic and essential authority to define the marital relation.” *Id.* at 2692; *see also id.* at 2691 (“[S]ubject to [constitutional] guarantees, ‘regulation of domestic relations’ is ‘an area that has long been regarded as a virtually exclusive province of the States.’” (quoting *Sosna v. Iowa*, 419 U.S. 393, 404 (1975))). The State interprets *Windsor* to stand for the proposition that DOMA was unconstitutional because the statute departed from the federal government’s “history and tradition of reliance on state law to define marriage.” *Id.* at

2692. Just as the federal government cannot choose to disregard a state's decision to recognize same-sex marriage, Utah asserts that the federal government cannot intrude upon a state's decision *not* to recognize same-sex marriage. In other words, Utah believes that it is up to each individual state to decide whether two persons of the same sex may "occupy the same status and dignity as that of a man and woman in lawful marriage." *Id.* at 2689.

The Plaintiffs disagree with this interpretation and point out that the *Windsor* Court did not base its decision on the Tenth Amendment.⁶ Instead, the Court grounded its holding in the Due Process Clause of the Fifth Amendment, which protects an individual's right to liberty. *Id.* at 2695 ("DOMA is unconstitutional as a deprivation of the liberty of the person protected by the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution."). The Court found that DOMA violated the Fifth Amendment because the statute "place[d] same-sex couples in an unstable position of being in a second-tier marriage," a differentiation that "demean[ed] the couple, whose moral and sexual choices the Constitution protects[.]" *Id.* at 2694. The Plaintiffs argue that for the same reasons the Fifth Amendment prohibits the federal government from differentiating between same-sex and opposite-sex couples, the Fourteenth Amendment prohibits state governments from making this distinction.

Both parties present compelling arguments, and the protection of states' rights and individual rights are both weighty concerns. In *Windsor*, these interests were allied against the ability of the federal government to disregard a state law that protected individual rights. Here, these interests directly oppose each other. The *Windsor* court did not resolve this conflict in the

⁶The Tenth Amendment makes explicit the division between federal and state power: "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people." U.S. Const. amend. X.

context of state-law prohibitions of same-sex marriage. *See id.* at 2696 (Roberts, C.J., dissenting) (“The Court does not have before it . . . the distinct question whether the States . . . may continue to utilize the traditional definition of marriage.”). But the Supreme Court has considered analogous questions that involve the tension between these two values in other cases. *See, e.g., Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1 (1967) (balancing the state’s right to regulate marriage against the individual’s right to equal protection and due process under the law). In these cases, the Court has held that the Fourteenth Amendment requires that individual rights take precedence over states’ rights where these two interests are in conflict. *See id.* at 7 (holding that a state’s power to regulate marriage is limited by the Fourteenth Amendment).

The Constitution’s protection of the individual rights of gay and lesbian citizens is equally dispositive whether this protection requires a court to respect a state law, as in *Windsor*, or strike down a state law, as the Plaintiffs ask the court to do here. In his dissenting opinion, the Honorable Antonin Scalia recognized that this result was the logical outcome of the Court’s ruling in *Windsor*:

In my opinion, however, the view that *this* Court will take of state prohibition of same-sex marriage is indicated beyond mistaking by today’s opinion. As I have said, the real rationale of today’s opinion . . . is that DOMA is motivated by “bare . . . desire to harm” couples in same-sex marriages. How easy it is, indeed how inevitable, to reach the same conclusion with regard to state laws denying same-sex couples marital status.

133 S. Ct. at 2709 (citations and internal quotation marks omitted). The court agrees with Justice Scalia’s interpretation of *Windsor* and finds that the important federalism concerns at issue here are nevertheless insufficient to save a state-law prohibition that denies the Plaintiffs their rights to due process and equal protection under the law.

III. *Baker v. Nelson* Is No Longer Controlling Precedent

In 1971, two men from Minnesota brought a lawsuit in state court arguing that Minnesota was constitutionally required to allow them to marry. *Baker v. Nelson*, 191 N.W.2d 185, 187 (Minn. 1971). The Minnesota Supreme Court found that Minnesota's restriction of marriage to opposite-sex couples did not violate either the Equal Protection Clause or the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. *Id.* at 186-87. On appeal, the United States Supreme Court summarily dismissed the case "for want of a substantial federal question." *Baker v. Nelson*, 409 U.S. 810, 810 (1972).

Utah argues that the Court's summary dismissal in *Baker* is binding on this court and that the present lawsuit should therefore be dismissed for lack of a substantial federal question. But the Supreme Court has stated that a summary dismissal is not binding "when doctrinal developments indicate otherwise." *Hicks v. Miranda*, 422 U.S. 332, 344 (1975).

Here, several doctrinal developments in the Court's analysis of both the Equal Protection Clause and the Due Process Clause as they apply to gay men and lesbians demonstrate that the Court's summary dismissal in *Baker* has little if any precedential effect today. Not only was *Baker* decided before the Supreme Court held that sex is a quasi-suspect classification, *see Craig v. Boren*, 429 U.S. 190, 197 (1976); *Frontiero v. Richardson*, 411 U.S. 677, 688 (1973) (plurality op.), but also before the Court recognized that the Constitution protects individuals from discrimination on the basis of sexual orientation. *See Romer v. Evans*, 517 U.S. 620, 635-36 (1996). Moreover, *Baker* was decided before the Supreme Court held in *Lawrence v. Texas* that it was unconstitutional for a state to "demean [the] existence [of gay men and lesbians] or control their destiny by making their private sexual conduct a crime." 539 U.S. 558, 578 (2003). As

discussed below, the Supreme Court's decision in *Lawrence* removes a justification that states could formerly cite as a reason to prohibit same-sex marriage.

The State points out that, despite the doctrinal developments in these cases and others, a number of courts have found that *Baker* survives as controlling precedent and therefore precludes consideration of the issues in this lawsuit. *See, e.g., Massachusetts v. U.S. Dep't of Health & Human Servs.*, 682 F.3d 1, 8 (1st Cir. 2012) (holding that *Baker* "limit[s] the arguments to ones that do not presume to rest on a constitutional right to same-sex marriage."); *Sevcik v. Sandoval*, 911 F. Supp. 2d 996, 1002-03 (D. Nev. 2012) (ruling that *Baker* barred the plaintiffs' equal protection claim). Other courts disagree and have decided substantially similar issues without consideration of *Baker*. *See, e.g., Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, 704 F. Supp. 2d 921 (N.D. Cal. 2010) (ruling that California's prohibition of same-sex marriage violated the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment). In any event, all of these cases were decided before the Supreme Court issued its opinion in *Windsor*.

As discussed above, the Court's decision in *Windsor* does not answer the question presented here, but its reasoning is nevertheless highly relevant and is therefore a significant doctrinal development. Importantly, the *Windsor* Court foresaw that its ruling would precede a number of lawsuits in state and lower federal courts raising the question of a state's ability to prohibit same-sex marriage, a fact that was noted by two dissenting justices. The Honorable John Roberts wrote that the Court "may in the future have to resolve challenges to state marriage definitions affecting same-sex couples." *Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. at 2697 (Roberts, C.J., dissenting). And Justice Scalia even recommended how this court should interpret the *Windsor* decision when presented with the question that is now before it: "I do not mean to suggest disagreement . . .

. that lower federal courts and state courts can distinguish today's case when the issue before them is state denial of marital status to same-sex couples." *Id.* at 2709 (Scalia, J., dissenting). It is also notable that while the Court declined to reach the merits in *Perry v. Hollingsworth* because the petitioners lacked standing to pursue the appeal, the Court did not dismiss the case outright for lack of a substantial federal question. *See* 133 S. Ct. 2652 (2013). Given the Supreme Court's disposition of both *Windsor* and *Perry*, the court finds that there is no longer any doubt that the issue currently before the court in this lawsuit presents a substantial question of federal law.

As a result, *Baker v. Nelson* is no longer controlling precedent and the court proceeds to address the merits of the question presented here.

IV. Amendment 3 Violates the Plaintiffs' Due Process Rights

The State of Utah contends that what is at stake in this lawsuit is the State's right to define marriage free from federal interference. The Plaintiffs counter that what is really at issue is an individual's ability to protect his or her fundamental rights from unreasonable interference by the state government. As discussed above, the parties have defined the two important principles that are in tension in this matter. While Utah exercises the "unquestioned authority" to regulate and define marriage, *Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. at 2693, it must nevertheless do so in a way that does not infringe the constitutional rights of its citizens. *See id.* at 2692 (noting that the "incidents, benefits, and obligations of marriage" may vary from state to state but are still "subject to constitutional guarantees"). As a result, the court's role is not to define marriage, an exercise that would be improper given the states' primary authority in this realm. Instead, the court's analysis is restricted to a determination of what individual rights are protected by the

Constitution. The court must then decide whether the State's definition and regulation of marriage impermissibly infringes those rights.

The Constitution guarantees that all citizens have certain fundamental rights. These rights vest in every person over whom the Constitution has authority and, because they are so important, an individual's fundamental rights "may not be submitted to vote; they depend on the outcome of no elections." *W. Va. State Bd. of Educ. v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624, 638 (1943). When the Constitution was first ratified, these rights were specifically articulated in the Bill of Rights and protected an individual from certain actions of the federal government. After the nation's wrenching experience in the Civil War, the people adopted the Fourteenth Amendment, which holds: "No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws." U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1. The Supreme Court has held that the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment applies to "matters of substantive law as well as to matters of procedure. Thus all fundamental rights comprised within the term liberty are protected by the Federal constitution from invasion by the States." *Planned Parenthood of Se. Pa. v. Casey*, 505 U.S. 833, 846 (1992) (quoting *Whitney v. California*, 274 U.S. 357, 373 (1927) (Brandeis, J., concurring)).

The most familiar of an individual's substantive liberties are those recognized by the Bill of Rights, and the Supreme Court has held that the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment incorporates most portions of the Bill of Rights against the States. *See, e.g., Duncan v. Louisiana*, 391 U.S. 145, 147-48 (1968) (discussing incorporation of certain rights from the

First, Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Amendments); *McDonald v. City of Chicago*, 130 S. Ct. 3020, 3050 (2010) (incorporating the Second Amendment). In *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey*, the Supreme Court recognized the authority of an argument first made by the Honorable John Marshall Harlan II that the Due Process Clause also protects a number of unenumerated rights from unreasonable invasion by the State:

[T]he full scope of the liberty guaranteed by the Due Process Clause cannot be found in or limited by the precise terms of the specific guarantees elsewhere provided in the Constitution. This “liberty” is not a series of isolated points pricked out in terms of the taking of property; the freedom of speech, press, and religion; the right to keep and bear arms; the freedom from unreasonable searches and seizures; and so on. It is a rational continuum which, broadly speaking, includes a freedom from all substantial arbitrary impositions and purposeless restraints, . . . and which also recognizes, what a reasonable and sensitive judgment must, that certain interests require particularly careful scrutiny of the state needs asserted to justify their abridgement.

Poe v. Ullman, 367 U.S. 497, 543 (1961) (Harlan, J., dissenting from dismissal on jurisdictional grounds), *quoted in Casey*, 505 U.S. at 848-49.

A. Supreme Court Cases Protecting Marriage as a Fundamental Right

The right to marry is an example of a fundamental right that is not mentioned explicitly in the text of the Constitution but is nevertheless protected by the guarantee of liberty under the Due Process Clause. The Supreme Court has long emphasized that the right to marry is of fundamental importance. In *Maynard v. Hill*, the Court characterized marriage as “the most important relation in life” and as “the foundation of the family and society, without which there would be neither civilization nor progress.” 125 U.S. 190, 205, 211 (1888). In *Meyer v. Nebraska*, the Court recognized that the right “to marry, establish a home and bring up children” is a central part of the liberty protected by the Due Process Clause. 262 U.S. 390, 399 (1923).

And in *Skinner v. Oklahoma ex rel. Williamson*, the Court ruled that marriage is “one of the basic civil rights of man.” 316 U.S. 535, 541 (1942).

In more recent cases, the Court has held that the right to marry implicates additional rights that are protected by the Fourteenth Amendment. For instance, the Court’s decision in *Griswold v. Connecticut*, in which the Court struck down a Connecticut law that prohibited the use of contraceptives, established that the right to marry is intertwined with an individual’s right of privacy. The Court observed:

We deal with a right of privacy older than the Bill of Rights—older than our political parties, older than our school system. Marriage is a coming together for better or for worse, hopefully enduring, and intimate to the degree of being sacred. It is an association that promotes a way of life, not causes; a harmony in living, not political faiths; a bilateral loyalty, not commercial or social projects. Yet it is an association for as noble a purpose as any involved in our prior decisions.

381 U.S. 479, 486 (1965). And in *M.L.B. v. S.L.J.*, the Court described marriage as an associational right: “Choices about marriage, family life, and the upbringing of children are among associational rights this Court has ranked ‘of basic importance in our society,’ rights sheltered by the Fourteenth Amendment against the State’s unwarranted usurpation, disregard, or disrespect.” 519 U.S. 102, 116 (1996) (citation omitted).

The Supreme Court has consistently held that a person must be free to make personal decisions related to marriage without unjustified government interference. *See, e.g., Cleveland Bd. of Educ. v. LaFleur*, 414 U.S. 632, 639-40 (1974) (“This Court has long recognized that freedom of personal choice in matters of marriage and family life is one of the liberties protected by the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment.”); *Carey v. Population Servs. Int’l*, 431 U.S. 678, 684-85 (1977) (“[I]t is clear that among the decisions that an individual may make

without unjustified government interference are personal decisions relating to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, and child rearing and education.” (citations and internal quotation marks omitted)); *Hodgson v. Minnesota*, 497 U.S. 417, 435 (1990) (“But the regulation of constitutionally protected decisions, such as where a person shall reside or whom he or she shall marry, must be predicated on legitimate state concerns other than disagreement with the choice the individual has made.”). In *Planned Parenthood of Southeastern Pennsylvania v. Casey*, the Court emphasized the high degree of constitutional protection afforded to an individual’s personal choices about marriage and other intimate decisions:

These matters, involving the most intimate and personal choices a person may make in a lifetime, choices central to personal dignity and autonomy, are central to the liberty protected by the Fourteenth Amendment. At the heart of liberty is the right to define one’s own concept of existence, of meaning, of the universe, and of the mystery of human life. Beliefs about these matters could not define the attributes of personhood were they formed under compulsion of the State.

Casey, 505 U.S. at 851.

Given the importance of marriage as a fundamental right and its relation to an individual’s rights to liberty, privacy, and association, the Supreme Court has not hesitated to invalidate state laws pertaining to marriage whenever such a law intrudes on an individual’s protected realm of liberty. Most famously, the Court struck down Virginia’s law against interracial marriage in *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1, 12 (1967). The Court found that Virginia’s anti-miscegenation statute violated both the Equal Protection Clause and the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. *Id.* The Court has since noted that *Loving* was correctly decided, even though mixed-race marriages had previously been illegal in many states⁷

⁷In 1948, the California Supreme Court became the first court in the twentieth century to strike down an anti-miscegenation statute. *Perez v. Sharp*, 198 P.2d 17 (Cal. 1948); *see also*

and, moreover, were not specifically protected from government interference at the time the Fourteenth Amendment was ratified: “Marriage is mentioned nowhere in the Bill of Rights and interracial marriage was illegal in most States in the 19th century, but the Court was no doubt correct in finding it to be an aspect of liberty protected against state interference by the substantive component of the Due Process Clause in *Loving v. Virginia*.” *Casey*, 505 U.S. at 847-48; *see also Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, 704 F. Supp. 2d 921, 992 (N.D. Cal. 2010) (“[T]he Court recognized that race restrictions, despite their historical prevalence, stood in stark contrast to the concepts of liberty and choice inherent in the right to marry.”).

In addition to the anti-miscegenation laws the Supreme Court struck down in *Loving*, the Supreme Court has held that other state regulations affecting marriage are unconstitutional where these laws infringe on an individual’s access to marriage. In *Zablocki v. Redhail*, the Court considered a Wisconsin statute that required any Wisconsin resident who had children that were not currently in the resident’s custody to obtain a court order before the resident was permitted to marry. 434 U.S. 374, 375 (1978). The statute mandated that the court should not grant permission to marry unless the resident proved that he was in compliance with any support obligation for his out-of-custody children, and could also show that any children covered by such a support order “[were] not then and [were] not likely thereafter to become public charges.” *Id.* (quoting Wis. Stat. § 245.10 (1973)). The Court found that, while the State had a legitimate and substantial interest in the welfare of children in Wisconsin, the statute was nevertheless unconstitutional because it was not “closely tailored to effectuate only those interests” and “unnecessarily impinge[d] on the right to marry[.]” *Id.* at 388. The Court distinguished the

Loving, 388 U.S. at 6 n.5.

statute at issue from reasonable state regulations related to marriage that would not require any heightened review:

By reaffirming the fundamental character of the right to marry, we do not mean to suggest that every state regulation which relates in any way to the incidents of or prerequisites for marriage must be subjected to rigorous scrutiny. To the contrary, reasonable regulations that do not significantly interfere with decisions to enter into the marital relationship may legitimately be imposed.

Id. at 386. As the Honorable John Paul Stevens noted in his concurring opinion, “A classification based on marital status is fundamentally different from a classification which determines who may lawfully enter into the marriage relationship.” *Id.* at 403-04 (Stevens, J., concurring).

In *Turner v. Safley*, the Court struck down a Missouri regulation that prohibited inmates from marrying unless the prison superintendent approved of the marriage. 482 U.S. 78, 99-100 (1987). The Court held that inmates retained their fundamental right to marry even though they had a reduced expectation of liberty in prison. *Id.* at 96. The Court emphasized the many attributes of marriage that prisoners could enjoy even if they were not able to have sexual relations:

First, inmate marriages, like others, are expressions of emotional support and public commitment. These elements are an important and significant aspect of the marital relationship. In addition, many religions recognize marriage as having spiritual significance; for some inmates and their spouses, therefore, the commitment of marriage may be an exercise of religious faith as well as an expression of personal dedication. Third, most inmates eventually will be released by parole or commutation, and therefore most inmate marriages are formed in the expectation that they ultimately will be fully consummated. Finally, marital status often is a precondition to the receipt of government benefits (*e.g.*, Social Security benefits), property rights (*e.g.*, tenancy by the entirety, inheritance rights), and other, less tangible benefits (*e.g.*, legitimation of children born out of wedlock). These incidents of marriage, like the religious and personal aspects of the marriage commitment, are unaffected by the fact of confinement or the pursuit

of legitimate corrections goals.

Id. at 95-96.

These cases demonstrate that the Constitution protects an individual's right to marry as an essential part of the right to liberty. The right to marry is intertwined with the rights to privacy and intimate association, and an individual's choices related to marriage are protected because they are integral to a person's dignity and autonomy. While states have the authority to regulate marriage, the Supreme Court has struck down several state regulations that impermissibly burdened an individual's ability to exercise the right to marry. With these general observations in mind, the court turns to the specific question of Utah's ability to prohibit same-sex marriage.

B. Application of the Court's Jurisprudence to Amendment 3

The State does not dispute, nor could it, that the Plaintiffs possess the fundamental right to marry that the Supreme Court has protected in the cases cited above. Like all fundamental rights, the right to marry vests in every American citizen. *See Zablocki*, 434 U.S. at 384 (“Although *Loving* arose in the context of racial discrimination, prior and subsequent decisions of this Court confirm that the right to marry is of fundamental importance for all individuals.”). The State asserts that Amendment 3 does not abridge the Plaintiffs' fundamental right to marry because the Plaintiffs are still at liberty to marry a person of the opposite sex. But this purported liberty is an illusion. The right to marry is not simply the right to become a married person by signing a contract with someone of the opposite sex. If marriages were planned and arranged by the State, for example, these marriages would violate a person's right to marry because such arrangements would infringe an individual's rights to privacy, dignity, and intimate association. A person's choices about marriage implicate the heart of the right to liberty that is protected by

the Fourteenth Amendment. *See Casey*, 505 U.S. at 851. The State's argument disregards these numerous associated rights because the State focuses on the outward manifestations of the right to marry, and not the inner attributes of marriage that form the core justifications for why the Constitution protects this fundamental human right.

Moreover, the State fails to dispute any of the facts that demonstrate why the Plaintiffs' asserted right to marry someone of the opposite sex is meaningless. The State accepts without contest the Plaintiffs' testimony that they cannot develop the type of intimate bond necessary to sustain a marriage with a person of the opposite sex. The Plaintiffs have not come to this realization lightly, and their recognition of their identity has often risked their family relationships and work opportunities. For instance, Kody and Laurie both worried that they would lose their jobs as English teachers if they were open about their sexual identity. Kate's previous partner did lose her job because she was a lesbian, and Kate may have been let go from her position with the National Park Service for the same reason. Karen's family never accepted her identity, and Moudi testified that he remained cautious about openly discussing his sexuality because he feared that his mother might be ridiculed. The Plaintiffs' testimony supports their assertions that their sexual orientation is an inherent characteristic of their identities.

Forty years ago, these assertions would not have been accepted by a court without dispute. In 1973, the American Psychiatric Association still defined homosexuality as a mental disorder in the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-II), and leading experts believed that homosexuality was simply a lifestyle choice. With the increased visibility of gay men and lesbians in the past few decades, a wealth of new knowledge about sexuality has upended these previous beliefs. Today, the State does not dispute the Plaintiffs' testimony that

they have never been able to develop feelings of deep intimacy for a person of the opposite sex, and the State presents no argument or evidence to suggest that the Plaintiffs could change their identity if they desired to do so. Given these undisputed facts, it is clear that if the Plaintiffs are not allowed to marry a partner of the same sex, the Plaintiffs will be forced to remain unmarried. The effect of Amendment 3 is therefore that it denies gay and lesbian citizens of Utah the ability to exercise one of their constitutionally protected rights. The State's prohibition of the Plaintiffs' right to choose a same-sex marriage partner renders their fundamental right to marry as meaningless as if the State recognized the Plaintiffs' right to bear arms but not their right to buy bullets.

While admitting that its prohibition of same-sex marriage harms the Plaintiffs, the State argues that the court's characterization of Amendment 3 is incorrect for three reasons: (1) the Plaintiffs are not qualified to enter into a marriage relationship; (2) the Plaintiffs are seeking a new right, not access to an existing right; and (3) history and tradition have not recognized a right to marry a person of the same sex. The court addresses each of these arguments in turn.

1. *The Plaintiffs Are Qualified to Marry*

First, the State contends that same-sex partners do not possess the qualifications to enter into a marriage relationship and are therefore excluded from this right as a definitional matter. As in other states, the purposes of marriage in Utah include "the state recognition and approval of a couple's choice to live with each other, to remain committed to one another and to form a household based on their own feelings about one another[,] and to join in an economic partnership and support one another and any dependents." *Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, 704 F. Supp. 2d 921, 961 (N.D. Cal. 2010). There is no dispute that the Plaintiffs are able to form a

committed relationship with one person to the exclusion of all others. There is also no dispute that the Plaintiffs are capable of raising children within this framework if they choose to do so. The State even salutes “[t]he worthy efforts of same-sex couples to rear children.” (Defs.’ Mem. in Opp’n, at 46 n.7, Dkt. 84.) Nevertheless, the State maintains that same-sex couples are distinct from opposite-sex couples because they are not able to naturally reproduce with each other. The State points to Supreme Court cases that have linked the importance of marriage to its relationship to procreation. *See, e.g., Skinner v. Oklahoma ex rel. Williamson*, 316 U.S. 535, 541 (1942) (“Marriage and procreation are fundamental to the very existence and survival of the race.”).

The court does not find the State’s argument compelling because, however persuasive the ability to procreate might be in the context of a particular religious perspective, it is not a defining characteristic of conjugal relationships from a legal and constitutional point of view. The State’s position demeans the dignity not just of same-sex couples, but of the many opposite-sex couples who are unable to reproduce or who choose not to have children. Under the State’s reasoning, a post-menopausal woman or infertile man does not have a fundamental right to marry because she or he does not have the capacity to procreate. This proposition is irreconcilable with the right to liberty that the Constitution guarantees to all citizens.

At oral argument, the State attempted to distinguish post-menopausal women from gay men and lesbians by arguing that older women were more likely to find themselves in the position of caring for a grandchild or other relative. But the State fails to recognize that many same-sex couples are also in the position of raising a child, perhaps through adoption or surrogacy. The court sees no support for the State’s suggestion that same-sex couples are

interested only in a “consent-based” approach to marriage, in which marriage focuses on the strong emotional attachment and sexual attraction of the two partners involved. *See Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. at 2718 (Alito, J., dissenting). Like opposite-sex couples, same-sex couples may decide to marry partly or primarily for the benefits and support that marriage can provide to the children the couple is raising or plans to raise. Same-sex couples are just as capable of providing support for future generations as opposite-sex couples, grandparents, or other caregivers. And there is no difference between same-sex couples who choose not to have children and those opposite-sex couples who exercise their constitutionally protected right not to procreate. *See Griswold v. Connecticut*, 381 U.S. 479 (1965).

In any event, the State’s argument also neglects to consider the number of additional important attributes of marriage that exist besides procreation. As noted above, the Supreme Court has discussed those attributes in the context of marriages between inmates. *Turner v. Safley*, 482 U.S. 78, 95-96 (1987). While the Supreme Court noted that some inmates might one day be able to consummate their marriages when they were released, the Court found that marriage was important irrespective of its relationship to procreation because it was an expression of emotional support and public commitment, it was spiritually significant, and it provided access to important legal and government benefits. *Id.* These attributes of marriage are as applicable to same-sex couples as they are to opposite-sex couples.

2. *The Plaintiffs Seek Access to an Existing Right*

The State’s second argument is that the Plaintiffs are really seeking a new right, not access to an existing right. To establish a new fundamental right, the court must determine that the right is “deeply rooted in this Nation’s history and tradition” and “implicit in the concept of

ordered liberty,” such that “neither liberty nor justice would exist if [it] were sacrificed.”

Washington v. Glucksberg, 521 U.S. 702, 721 (1997) (citations omitted). Because same-sex marriage has only recently been allowed by a number of states, the State argues that an individual’s right to marry someone of the same sex cannot be a fundamental right. But the Supreme Court did not adopt this line of reasoning in the analogous case of *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1 (1967). Instead of declaring a new right to interracial marriage, the Court held that individuals could not be restricted from exercising their existing right to marry on account of the race of their chosen partner. *Id.* at 12. Similarly, the Plaintiffs here do not seek a new right to same-sex marriage, but instead ask the court to hold that the State cannot prohibit them from exercising their existing right to marry on account of the sex of their chosen partner.

The alleged right to same-sex marriage that the State claims the Plaintiffs are seeking is simply the same right that is currently enjoyed by heterosexual individuals: the right to make a public commitment to form an exclusive relationship and create a family with a partner with whom the person shares an intimate and sustaining emotional bond. This right is deeply rooted in the nation’s history and implicit in the concept of ordered liberty because it protects an individual’s ability to make deeply personal choices about love and family free from government interference. And, as discussed above, this right is enjoyed by all individuals. If the right to same-sex marriage were a new right, then it should make new protections and benefits available to all citizens. But heterosexual individuals are as likely to exercise their purported right to same-sex marriage as gay men and lesbians are to exercise their purported right to opposite-sex marriage. Both same-sex and opposite-sex marriage are therefore simply manifestations of one right—the right to marry—applied to people with different sexual identities.

While it was assumed until recently that a person could only share an intimate emotional bond and develop a family with a person of the opposite sex, the realization that this assumption is false does not change the underlying right. It merely changes the result when the court applies that right to the facts before it. Applying that right to these Plaintiffs, the court finds that the Constitution protects their right to marry a person of the same sex to the same degree that the Constitution protects the right of heterosexual individuals to marry a person of the opposite sex.

Because the right to marry has already been established as a fundamental right, the court finds that the *Glucksberg* analysis is inapplicable here. The Plaintiffs are seeking access to an existing right, not the declaration of a new right.

3. *Tradition and History Are Insufficient Reasons to Deny Fundamental Rights to an Individual.*

Finally, the State contends that the fundamental right to marriage cannot encompass the right to marry someone of the same sex because this right has never been interpreted to have this meaning in the past. The court is not persuaded by the State's argument. The Constitution is not so rigid that it always mandates the same outcome even when its principles operate on a new set of facts that were previously unknown:

Had those who drew and ratified the Due Process Clauses of the Fifth Amendment or the Fourteenth Amendment known the components of liberty in its manifold possibilities, they might have been more specific. They did not presume to have this insight. They knew times can blind us to certain truths and later generations can see that laws once thought necessary and proper in fact serve only to oppress. As the Constitution endures, persons in every generation can invoke its principles in their own search for greater freedom.

Lawrence v. Texas, 539 U.S. 558, 578-79 (2003). Here, it is not the Constitution that has changed, but the knowledge of what it means to be gay or lesbian. The court cannot ignore the

fact that the Plaintiffs are able to develop a committed, intimate relationship with a person of the same sex but not with a person of the opposite sex. The court, and the State, must adapt to this changed understanding.

C. Summary of Due Process Analysis

The Fourteenth Amendment protects the liberty rights of all citizens, and none of the State's arguments presents a compelling reason why the scope of that right should be greater for heterosexual individuals than it is for gay and lesbian individuals. If, as is clear from the Supreme Court cases discussing the right to marry, a heterosexual person's choices about intimate association and family life are protected from unreasonable government interference in the marital context, then a gay or lesbian person also enjoys these same protections.

The court's holding is supported, even required, by the Supreme Court's recent opinion concerning the scope of protection that the Fourteenth Amendment provides to gay and lesbian citizens. In *Lawrence v. Texas*, the Court overruled its previous decision in *Bowers v. Hardwick*, 478 U.S. 186 (1986), and held that the Due Process Clause protected an individual's right to have sexual relations with a partner of the same sex. 539 U.S. at 578. The Court ruled: "The Texas [sodomy] statute furthers no legitimate state interest which can justify its intrusion into the personal and private life of the individual." *Id.* While the Court stated that its opinion did not address "whether the government must give formal recognition to any relationship that homosexual persons seek to enter," *id.*, the Court confirmed that "our laws and tradition afford constitutional protection to personal decisions relating to *marriage*, procreation, contraception, family relationships, child rearing, and education" and held that "[p]ersons in a homosexual relationship may seek autonomy for these purposes, just as heterosexual persons do." *Id.* at 574

(emphasis added). The court therefore agrees with the portion of Justice Scalia’s dissenting opinion in *Lawrence* in which Justice Scalia stated that the Court’s reasoning logically extends to protect an individual’s right to marry a person of the same sex:

Today’s opinion dismantles the structure of constitutional law that has permitted a distinction to be made between heterosexual and homosexual unions, insofar as formal recognition in marriage is concerned. If moral disapprobation of homosexual conduct is “no legitimate state interest” for purposes of proscribing that conduct, . . . what justification could there possibly be for denying the benefits of marriage to homosexual couples exercising “the liberty protected by the Constitution”?

Id. at 604-05 (Scalia, J., dissenting) (citations omitted).

The Supreme Court’s decision in *Lawrence* removed the only ground—moral disapproval—on which the State could have at one time relied to distinguish the rights of gay and lesbian individuals from the rights of heterosexual individuals. The only other distinction the State has attempted to make is its argument that same-sex couples are not able to naturally reproduce with each other. But, of course, neither can thousands of opposite-sex couples in Utah. As a result, there is no legitimate reason that the rights of gay and lesbian individuals are any different from those of other people. All citizens, regardless of their sexual identity, have a fundamental right to liberty, and this right protects an individual’s ability to marry and the intimate choices a person makes about marriage and family.

The court therefore finds that the Plaintiffs have a fundamental right to marry that protects their choice of a same-sex partner.

D. Amendment 3 Does Not Survive Strict Scrutiny

The court’s determination that the fundamental right to marry encompasses the Plaintiffs’ right to marry a person of the same sex is not the end of the court’s analysis. The State may pass

a law that restricts a person's fundamental rights provided that the law is "narrowly tailored to serve a compelling state interest." *Reno v. Flores*, 507 U.S. 292, 302 (1993). For instance, a state may permissibly regulate the age at which a person may be married because the state has a compelling interest in protecting children against abuse and coercion. Similarly, a state need not allow an individual to marry if that person is mentally incapable of forming the requisite consent, or if that prohibition is part of the punishment for a prisoner serving a life sentence. *See Butler v. Wilson*, 415 U.S. 953 (1974) (summarily affirming decision to uphold a state law that prohibited prisoners incarcerated for life from marrying).

The court finds no reason that the Plaintiffs are comparable to children, the mentally incapable, or life prisoners. Instead, the Plaintiffs are ordinary citizens—business owners, teachers, and doctors—who wish to marry the persons they love. As discussed below, the State of Utah has not demonstrated a rational, much less a compelling, reason why the Plaintiffs should be denied their right to marry. Consequently, the court finds that Amendment 3 violates the Plaintiffs' due process rights under the Fourteenth Amendment.

V. Amendment 3 Violates the Plaintiffs' Right to Equal Protection

The Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment provides that no state shall "deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of its laws." U.S. Const. amend. XIV, § 1. The Constitution "neither knows nor tolerates classes among citizens." *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537, 559 (1896) (Harlan, J., dissenting). But the guarantee of equal protection coexists with the practical necessity that most legislation must classify for some purpose or another. *See Romer v. Evans*, 517 U.S. 620, 631 (1996).

To determine whether a piece of legislation violates the Equal Protection Clause, the

court first looks to see whether the challenged law implicates a fundamental right. “When a statutory classification significantly interferes with the exercise of a fundamental right, it cannot be upheld unless it is supported by sufficiently important state interests and is closely tailored to effectuate only those interests.” *Zablocki*, 434 U.S. at 388; *see also Harper v. Va. State Bd. of Elections*, 383 U.S. 663, 670 (1966) (“We have long been mindful that where fundamental rights and liberties are asserted under the Equal Protection Clause, classifications which might invade or restrain them must be closely scrutinized and carefully confined.”). Here, the court finds that Amendment 3 interferes with the exercise of the Plaintiffs’ fundamental right to marry. As discussed above, Amendment 3 is therefore unconstitutional because the State has not shown that the law is narrowly tailored to meet a compelling governmental interest. But even if the court disregarded the impact of Amendment 3 on the Plaintiffs’ fundamental rights, the law would still fail for the reasons discussed below.

The Plaintiffs argue that Amendment 3 discriminates against them on the basis of their sex and sexual identity in violation of the Equal Protection Clause. When a state regulation adversely affects members of a certain class, but does not significantly interfere with the fundamental rights of the individuals in that class, courts first determine how closely they should scrutinize the challenged regulation. Courts must not simply defer to the State’s judgment when there is reason to suspect “prejudice against discrete and insular minorities . . . which tends seriously to curtail the operation of those political processes ordinarily relied upon to protect minorities[.]” *United States v. Carolene Prods. Co.*, 304 U.S. 144, 152-53 n.4 (1938).

To decide whether a challenged state law impermissibly discriminates against members of a class in violation of the Equal Protection Clause, the Supreme Court has developed varying

tiers of scrutiny that courts apply depending on what class of citizens is affected. “Classifications based on race or national origin” are considered highly suspect and “are given the most exacting scrutiny.” *Clark v. Jeter*, 486 U.S. 456, 461 (1988). On the other end of the spectrum, courts must uphold a legislative classification that does not target a suspect class “so long as it bears a rational relation to some legitimate end.” *Romer*, 517 U.S. at 631. “Between these extremes of rational basis review and strict scrutiny lies a level of intermediate scrutiny, which generally has been applied to discriminatory classifications based on sex or illegitimacy.” *Clark*, 486 U.S. at 461. Classifications receiving this intermediate level of scrutiny are quasi-suspect classifications that can be sustained only if they are “substantially related to an important governmental objective.” *Id.*

A. Heightened Scrutiny

The Plaintiffs assert three theories why the court should apply some form of heightened scrutiny to this case. While the court discusses each of these theories below, it finds that it need not apply heightened scrutiny here because Amendment 3 fails under even the most deferential level of review.

1. *Sex Discrimination*

The Plaintiffs argue that the court should apply heightened scrutiny to Amendment 3 because it discriminates on the basis of an individual’s sex. As noted above, classifications based on sex can be sustained only where the government demonstrates that they are “substantially related” to an “important governmental objective[.]” *United States v. Virginia*, 518 U.S. 515, 533 (1996) (citation omitted); *Concrete Works v. City of Denver*, 36 F.3d 1513, 1519 (10th Cir. 1994) (“Gender-based classifications . . . are evaluated under the intermediate

scrutiny rubric”).

The State concedes that Amendment 3 involves sex-based classifications because it prohibits a man from marrying another man, but does not prohibit that man from marrying a woman. Nevertheless, the State argues that Amendment 3 does not discriminate on the basis of sex because its prohibition against same-sex marriage applies equally to both men and women. The Supreme Court rejected an analogous argument in *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1, 8-9 (1967). In *Loving*, Virginia argued that its anti-miscegenation laws did not discriminate based on race because the prohibition against mixed-race marriage applied equally to both white and black citizens. *Id.* at 7-8. The Court found that “the fact of equal application does not immunize the statute from the very heavy burden of justification which the Fourteenth Amendment has traditionally required of state statutes drawn according to race.” *Id.* at 9. Applying the same logic, the court finds that the fact of equal application to both men and women does not immunize Utah’s Amendment 3 from the heightened burden of justification that the Fourteenth Amendment requires of state laws drawn according to sex.

But because the court finds that Amendment 3 fails rational basis review, it need not analyze why Utah is also unable to satisfy the more rigorous standard of demonstrating an “exceedingly persuasive” justification for its prohibition against same-sex marriage. *Virginia*, 518 U.S. at 533.

2. *Sexual Orientation as a Suspect Class*

The Plaintiffs assert that, even if Amendment 3 does not discriminate on the basis of sex, it is undisputed that the law discriminates on the basis of a person’s sexual orientation. The Plaintiffs maintain that gay men and lesbians as a class exhibit the “traditional indicia” that

indicate they are especially at risk of discrimination. *San Antonio Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 1, 28 (1973). The Plaintiffs therefore urge the court to hold that sexual orientation should be considered at least a quasi-suspect class, a holding which would require the court to apply heightened scrutiny to its analysis of Amendment 3.

The court declines to address the Plaintiffs' argument because it finds that it is bound by the Tenth Circuit's discussion of this issue. In *Price-Cornelison v. Brooks*, the Tenth Circuit considered a claim that an undersheriff refused to enforce a protective order because the domestic violence victim was a lesbian. 524 F.3d 1103, 1105 (2008). The court held that the plaintiff's claim did not "implicate a protected class, which would warrant heightened scrutiny." *Id.* at 1113. In a footnote, the court supported its statement with a number of citations to cases from the Tenth Circuit and other Courts of Appeal. *See id.* at 1113 n.9.

The American Civil Liberties Union submitted an amicus brief arguing that the Tenth Circuit had no occasion to decide whether heightened scrutiny would be appropriate in *Price-Cornelison* because the court found that the discrimination at issue did not survive even rational basis review. *Id.* at 1114. As a result, the ACLU contends that the Tenth Circuit's statement was dicta and not binding. The court is not persuaded by the ACLU's argument. Even if the Tenth Circuit did not need to reach this question, the court's extensive footnote in *Price-Cornelison* clearly indicates that the Tenth Circuit currently applies only rational basis review to classifications based on sexual orientation. Unless the Supreme Court or the Tenth Circuit hold differently, the court continues to follow this approach.

3. *Animus*

The Plaintiffs contend that Amendment 3 is based on animus against gay and lesbian

individuals and that the court should therefore apply a heightened level of scrutiny to the law. As discussed below, there is some support for the Plaintiffs' argument in the Supreme Court opinions of *Romer v. Evans*, 517 U.S. 620 (1996) and *United States v. Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. 2675 (2013). But because the Supreme Court has not yet delineated the contours of such an approach, this court will continue to apply the standard rational basis test.

In *Romer*, the Supreme Court considered an amendment to the Colorado Constitution that prohibited any department or agency of the State of Colorado or any Colorado municipality from adopting any law or regulation that would protect gay men, lesbians, or bisexuals from discrimination. 517 U.S. at 624. The amendment not only prevented future attempts to establish these protections, but also repealed ordinances that had already been adopted by the cities of Denver, Boulder, and Aspen. *Id.* at 623-24. The Supreme Court held that the amendment was unconstitutional because it violated the Equal Protection Clause. *Id.* at 635. While the Court cited the rational basis test, the Court also stated that the Colorado law "confound[ed] this normal process of judicial review." *Id.* at 633. The Court then held that the law had no rational relation to a legitimate end for two reasons. First, the Court ruled that it was not "within our constitutional tradition" to enact a law "declaring that in general it shall be more difficult for one group of citizens than for all others to seek aid from the government[.]" *Id.* Second, the Court held that "laws of the kind now before us raise the inevitable inference that the disadvantage imposed is born of animosity toward the class of persons affected." *Id.* at 634. The Court's analysis focused more on the purpose and effect of the Colorado amendment than on a consideration of the purported legitimate interests the State asserted in support of its law.

The Supreme Court's opinion in *Windsor* is similar. The Court did not analyze the

legitimate interests cited by DOMA's defenders as would be typical in a rational basis review. *See Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. at 2707 (Scalia, J., dissenting) (“[The majority] makes only a passing mention of the ‘arguments put forward’ by the Act’s defenders, and does not even trouble to paraphrase or describe them.”). Instead, the Court focused on the “design, purpose, and effect of DOMA,” *id.* at 2689, and held that the law’s “avowed purpose and practical effect” was “to impose a disadvantage, a separate status, and so a stigma” on same-sex couples that a state had permitted to wed. *Id.* at 2693. Because DOMA’s “principal purpose” was “to impose inequality,” *id.* at 2694, the Court ruled that the law deprived legally wed same-sex couples of “an essential part of the liberty protected by the Fifth Amendment.” *Id.* at 2692.

In both *Romer* and *Windsor*, the Court cited the following statement from *Louisville Gas & Elec. Co. v. Coleman*: “Discriminations of an unusual character especially suggest careful consideration to determine whether they are obnoxious to the constitutional provision.” 277 U.S. 32, 37-38 (1928), *quoted in Romer*, 517 U.S. at 633. Indeed, the *Windsor* Court held that “discriminations of an unusual character especially *require* careful consideration.” 133 S. Ct. at 2693 (emphasis added) (citation omitted). The Court’s emphasis on discriminations of an unusual character suggests that, when presented with an equal protection challenge, courts should first analyze the law’s design, purpose, and effect to determine whether the law is subject to “careful consideration.” If the principal purpose or effect of a law is to impose inequality, a court need not even consider whether the class of citizens that the law effects requires heightened scrutiny or a rational basis approach. Such laws are “not within our constitutional tradition,” *Romer*, 517 U.S. at 633, and violate the Equal Protection Clause regardless of the class of citizens that bears the disabilities imposed by the law. If, on the other hand, the law merely

distributes benefits unevenly, then the law is subject to heightened scrutiny only if the disadvantages imposed by that law are borne by a class of people that has a history of oppression and political powerlessness.

While this analysis appears to follow the Supreme Court's reasoning in *Romer* and *Windsor*, the court is wary of adopting such an approach here in the absence of more explicit guidance. For instance, the Supreme Court has not elaborated how a court should determine whether a law imposes a discrimination of an unusual character. There are a number of reasons why Amendment 3 is similar to both DOMA and the Colorado amendment that the Supreme Court struck down in *Windsor* and *Romer*. First, the avowed purpose and practical effect of Amendment 3 is to deny the responsibilities and benefits of marriage to same-sex couples, which is another way of saying that the law imposes inequality. Indeed, Amendment 3 went beyond denying gay and lesbian individuals the right to marry and held that no domestic union could be given the same or substantially equivalent legal effect as marriage. This wording suggests that the imposition of inequality was not merely the law's effect, but its goal.

Second, Amendment 3 has an unusual character when viewed within the historical context in which it was passed. Even though Utah already had statutory provisions that restricted marriage to opposite-sex couples, the State nevertheless passed a constitutional amendment to codify this prohibition. This action is only logical when viewed against the developments in Massachusetts, whose Supreme Court held in 2003 that the Massachusetts Constitution required the recognition of same-sex marriages. *Goodridge v. Dep't of Pub. Health*, 798 N.E.2d 941, 948 (Mass. 2003). The Utah legislature believed that a constitutional amendment was necessary to maintain Utah's ban on same-sex marriage because of the possibility that a Utah court would

adopt reasoning similar to the Massachusetts Supreme Court and hold that the Utah Constitution already protected an individual's right to marry a same-sex partner. Amendment 3 thereby preemptively denied rights to gay and lesbian citizens of Utah that they may have already had under the Utah Constitution.

But there are also reasons why Amendment 3 may be distinguishable from the laws the Supreme Court has previously held to be discriminations of an unusual character. Most notably, the Court has not articulated to what extent such a discrimination must be motivated by a “bare . . . desire to harm a politically unpopular group.” *U.S. Dep't of Agric. v. Moreno*, 413 U.S. 528, 534 (1973). The Plaintiffs argue that Amendment 3 was motivated by animus and urge the court to consider the statements in the Voter Information Pamphlet that was provided to Utah voters. The Pamphlet includes arguments made by Amendment 3's proponents that the amendment was necessary to “maintain[] public morality” and to ensure the continuation of “the ideal relationship where men, women and children thrive best.” (Utah Voter Information Pamphlet to General Election on Nov. 2, 2004, at 36, Dkt. 32-2.) The Plaintiffs submit that these statements demonstrate that Amendment 3 was adopted to further privately held moral views that same-sex couples are immoral and inferior to opposite-sex couples.

While the Plaintiffs argue that many Utah citizens voted for Amendment 3 out of a dislike of gay and lesbian individuals, the court finds that it is impossible to determine what was in the mind of each individual voter. Some citizens may have voted for Amendment 3 purely out of a belief that the amendment would protect the benefits of opposite-sex marriage. Of course, good intentions do not save a law if the law bears no rational connection to its stated legitimate interests, but this analysis is the test the court applies when it follows the Supreme Court's

rational basis jurisprudence. It is unclear how a mix of animus and good intentions affects the determination of whether a law imposes a discrimination of such unusual character that it requires the court to give it careful consideration.

In any event, the theory of heightened scrutiny that the Plaintiffs advocate is not necessary to the court's determination of Amendment 3's constitutionality. The court has already held that Amendment 3 burdens the Plaintiffs' fundamental right to marriage and is therefore subject to strict scrutiny. And, as discussed below, the court finds that Amendment 3 bears no rational relationship to any legitimate state interests and therefore fails rational basis review. It may be that some laws neither burden a fundamental right nor target a suspect class, but nevertheless impose a discrimination of such unusual character that a court must review a challenge to such a law with careful consideration. But the court's analysis here does not hinge on that type of heightened review. The court therefore proceeds to apply the well-settled rational basis test to Amendment 3.

B. Rational Basis Review

When a law creates a classification but does not target a suspect class or burden a fundamental right, the court presumes the law is valid and will uphold it so long as it rationally relates to some legitimate governmental purpose. *See Heller v. Doe*, 509 U.S. 312, 319 (1993). The court defers to the judgment of the legislature or the judgment of the people who have spoken through a referendum if there is at least a debatable question whether the underlying basis for the classification is rational. *See Minnesota v. Clover Leaf Creamery Co.*, 449 U.S. 456, 464 (1981). But even under the most deferential standard of review, the court must still "insist on knowing the relation between the classification adopted and the object to be obtained." *Romer v.*

Evans, 517 U.S. 620, 632 (1996); *Lyng v. Int'l Union*, 485 U.S. 360, 375 (“[L]egislative enactments must implicate legitimate goals, and the means chosen by the legislature must bear a rational relationship to those goals.”). This search for a rational relationship “ensure[s] that classifications are not drawn for the purpose of disadvantaging the group burdened by the law.” *Romer*, 517 U.S. at 633. As a result, a law must do more than disadvantage or otherwise harm a particular group to survive rational basis review. See *U.S. Dep’t of Agric. v. Moreno*, 413 U.S. 528, 534 (1973).

The State emphasizes that the court must accept any legislative generalizations, “even when there is an imperfect fit between means and ends.” *Heller*, 509 U.S. at 321. The court will uphold a classification provided “the inclusion of one group promotes a legitimate governmental purpose, and the addition of other groups would not.” *Johnson v. Robison*, 415 U.S. 361, 383 (1974). Based on this principle, the State argues that its extension of marriage benefits to opposite-sex couples promotes certain governmental interests such as responsible procreation and optimal child-rearing that would not be furthered if marriage benefits were extended to same-sex couples. But the State poses the wrong question. The court’s focus is not on whether extending marriage benefits to heterosexual couples serves a legitimate governmental interest. No one disputes that marriage benefits serve not just legitimate, but compelling governmental interests, which is why the Constitution provides such protection to an individual’s fundamental right to marry. Instead, courts are required to determine whether there is a rational connection between the challenged statute and a legitimate state interest. Here, the challenged statute does not grant marriage benefits to opposite-sex couples. The effect of Amendment 3 is only to disallow same-sex couples from gaining access to these benefits. The court must therefore

analyze whether the State's interests in responsible procreation and optimal child-rearing are furthered by prohibiting same-sex couples from marrying.

This focus on a rational connection between the State's legitimate interests and the State's exclusion of a group from benefits is well-supported in a number of Supreme Court decisions. For instance, the Court held in *Johnson v. Robinson* that the rational basis test was satisfied by a congressional decision to exclude conscientious objectors from receiving veterans' tax benefits because their lives had not been disrupted to the same extent as the lives of active service veterans. 415 U.S. at 381-82. See also *City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Ctr., Inc.*, 473 U.S. 432, 448-50 (1985) (examining the city's interest in denying housing for people with developmental disabilities, not in continuing to allow residence for others); *Moreno*, 413 U.S. at 535-38 (testing the federal government's interest in excluding unrelated households from food stamp benefits, not in maintaining food stamps for related households); *Eisenstadt v. Baird*, 405 U.S. 438, 448-53 (1972) (requiring a state interest in the exclusion of unmarried couples from lawful access to contraception, not merely an interest in continuing to allow married couples access); *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1, 9-12 (1967) (examining whether Virginia's exclusion of interracial couples from marriage violated equal protection principles independent of Virginia's interest in providing marriage to same-race couples).

For the reasons stated below, the court finds that the legitimate government interests that Utah cites are not rationally related to Utah's prohibition of same-sex marriage.

1. *Responsible Procreation*

The State argues that the exclusion of same-sex couples from marriage is justified based on an interest in promoting responsible procreation within marriage. According to the State,

“[t]raditional marriage with its accompanying governmental benefits provides an incentive for opposite-sex couples to commit together to form [] a stable family in which their planned, and especially unplanned, biological children may be raised.” (Defs.’ Mot. Summ. J., at 28, Dkt. 33.)

The Plaintiffs do not dispute the State’s assertion, but question how disallowing same-sex marriage has any effect on the percentage of opposite-sex couples that have children within a marriage. The State has presented no evidence that the number of opposite-sex couples choosing to marry each other is likely to be affected in any way by the ability of same-sex couples to marry. Indeed, it defies reason to conclude that allowing same-sex couples to marry will diminish the example that married opposite-sex couples set for their unmarried counterparts. Both opposite-sex and same-sex couples model the formation of committed, exclusive relationships, and both establish families based on mutual love and support. If there is any connection between same-sex marriage and responsible procreation, the relationship is likely to be the opposite of what the State suggests. Because Amendment 3 does not currently permit same-sex couples to engage in sexual activity within a marriage, the State reinforces a norm that sexual activity may take place outside the marriage relationship.

As a result, any relationship between Amendment 3 and the State’s interest in responsible procreation “is so attenuated as to render the distinction arbitrary or irrational.” *City of Cleburne*, 473 U.S. at 446; *see also Perry v. Schwarzenegger*, 704 F. Supp. 2d 921, 972 (N.D. Cal. 2010) (“Permitting same-sex couples to marry will not affect the number of opposite-sex couples who marry, divorce, cohabit, have children outside of marriage or otherwise affect the stability of opposite-sex marriage.”). Accordingly, the court finds no rational connection between Amendment 3 and the state’s interest in encouraging its citizens to engage in responsible

procreation.

2. *Optimal Child-Rearing*

The State also asserts that prohibiting same-sex couples from marrying “promotes the ideal that children born within a state-sanctioned marriage will be raised by both a mother and father in a stable family unit.” (Defs.’ Mot. Summ. J., at 33, Dkt. 33.) Utah contends that the “gold standard” for family life is an intact, biological, married family. (*Id.* at 34.) By providing incentives for only opposite-sex marriage, Utah asserts that more children will be raised in this ideal setting. The Plaintiffs dispute the State’s argument that children do better when raised by opposite-sex parents than by same-sex parents. The Plaintiffs claim that the State’s position is demeaning not only to children of same-sex parents, but also to adopted children of opposite-sex parents, children of single parents, and other children living in families that do not meet the State’s “gold standard.” Both parties have cited numerous authorities to support their positions. To the extent the parties have created a factual dispute about the optimal environment for children, the court cannot resolve this dispute on motions for summary judgment. But the court need not engage in this debate because the State’s argument is unpersuasive for another reason. Once again, the State fails to demonstrate any rational link between its prohibition of same-sex marriage and its goal of having more children raised in the family structure the State wishes to promote.

There is no reason to believe that Amendment 3 has any effect on the choices of couples to have or raise children, whether they are opposite-sex couples or same-sex couples. The State has presented no evidence that Amendment 3 furthers or restricts the ability of gay men and lesbians to adopt children, to have children through surrogacy or artificial insemination, or to

take care of children that are biologically their own whom they may have had with an opposite-sex partner. Similarly, the State has presented no evidence that opposite-sex couples will base their decisions about having children on the ability of same-sex couples to marry. To the extent the State wishes to see more children in opposite-sex families, its goals are tied to laws concerning adoption and surrogacy, not marriage.

If anything, the State's prohibition of same-sex marriage detracts from the State's goal of promoting optimal environments for children. The State does not contest the Plaintiffs' assertion that roughly 3,000 children are currently being raised by same-sex couples in Utah. (Patterson Decl. ¶ 40, Dkt. 85.) These children are also worthy of the State's protection, yet Amendment 3 harms them for the same reasons that the Supreme Court found that DOMA harmed the children of same-sex couples. Amendment 3 "humiliates [] thousands of children now being raised by same-sex couples. The law in question makes it even more difficult for the children to understand the integrity and closeness of their own family and its concord with other families in their community and in their daily lives." *Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. at 2694. Amendment 3 "also brings financial harm to children of same-sex couples," *id.* at 2695, because it denies the families of these children a panoply of benefits that the State and the federal government offer to families who are legally wed. Finally, Utah's prohibition of same-sex marriage further injures the children of both opposite-sex and same-sex couples who themselves are gay or lesbian, and who will grow up with the knowledge that the State does not believe they are as capable of creating a family as their heterosexual friends.

For these reasons, Amendment 3 does not make it any more likely that children will be raised by opposite-sex parents. As a result, the court finds that there is no rational connection

between Utah's prohibition of same-sex marriage and its goal of fostering an ideal family environment for a child.

3. *Proceeding with Caution*

The State contends that it has a legitimate interest in proceeding with caution when considering expanding marriage to encompass same-sex couples. But the State is not able to cite any evidence to justify its fears. The State's argument is analogous to the City of Cleburne's position in *City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center, Inc.*, 473 U.S. 432 (1985). In that case, the City was concerned about issuing a permit for a home for the developmentally disadvantaged because of the fears of the property owners near the facility. *Id.* at 448. The Supreme Court held that "mere negative attitudes, or fear, . . . are not permissible bases for treating a home for the mentally retarded differently from apartment houses, multiple dwellings, and the like." *Id.* The State can plead an interest in proceeding with caution in almost any setting. If the court were to accept the State's argument here, it would turn the rational basis analysis into a toothless and perfunctory review.

In any event, the only evidence that either party submitted concerning the effect of same-sex marriage suggests that the State's fears are unfounded. In an amicus brief submitted to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals by the District of Columbia and fourteen states that currently permit same-sex marriage, the states assert that the implementation of same-sex unions in their jurisdictions has not resulted in any decrease in opposite-sex marriage rates, any increase in divorce rates, or any increase in the number of nonmarital births. (Brief of State Amici in *Sevcik v. Sandoval*, at 24-28, Ex. 13 to Pls.' Mem. in Opp'n, Dkt. 85-14.) In addition, the process of allowing same-sex marriage is straightforward and requires no change to state tax, divorce, or

inheritance laws.

For these reasons, the court finds that proceeding with caution is not a legitimate state interest sufficient to survive rational basis review.

4. *Preserving the Traditional Definition of Marriage*

As noted in the court’s discussion of fundamental rights, the State argues that preserving the traditional definition of marriage is itself a legitimate state interest. But tradition alone cannot form a rational basis for a law. *Williams v. Illinois*, 399 U.S. 235, 239 (1970) (“[N]either the antiquity of a practice nor the fact of steadfast legislative and judicial adherence to it through the centuries insulates it from constitutional attack”); *see also Heller v. Doe*, 509 U.S. 312, 326 (1993) (“Ancient lineage of a legal concept does not give it immunity from attack for lacking a rational basis.”).

The traditional view of marriage has in the past included certain views about race and gender roles that were insufficient to uphold laws based on these views. *See Lawrence v. Texas*, 539 U.S. 558, 577-78 (2003) (“[N]either history nor tradition could save a law prohibiting miscegenation from constitutional attack”) (citation omitted); *Nevada Dep’t of Human Res. v. Hibbs*, 538 U.S. 721, 733-35 (2003) (finding that government action based on stereotypes about women’s greater suitability or inclination to assume primary childcare responsibility was unconstitutional). And, as Justice Scalia has noted in dissent, “‘preserving the traditional institution of marriage’ is just a kinder way of describing the State’s *moral disapproval* of same-sex couples.” *Lawrence*, 539 U.S. at 601 (Scalia, J., dissenting). While “[p]rivate biases may be outside the reach of the law, . . . the law cannot, directly or indirectly, give them effect” at the expense of a disfavored group’s constitutional rights. *Palmore v. Sidoti*, 466 U.S. 429, 433

(1984).

Although the State did not directly present an argument based on religious freedom, the court notes that its decision does not mandate any change for religious institutions, which may continue to express their own moral viewpoints and define their own traditions about marriage. If anything, the recognition of same-sex marriage expands religious freedom because some churches that have congregations in Utah desire to perform same-sex wedding ceremonies but are currently unable to do so. *See* Brief of Amici Curiae Bishops et al., at 8-15, *United States v. Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. 2675 (2013) (No. 12-307) (arguing that the inherent dignity of lesbian and gay individuals informs the theology of numerous religious beliefs, including the Unitarian Universalist Church and the United Church of Christ). By recognizing the right to marry a partner of the same sex, the State allows these groups the freedom to practice their religious beliefs without mandating that other groups must adopt similar practices.

For these reasons, the court finds that the State’s interest in preserving its traditional definition of marriage is not sufficient to survive rational basis review.

C. Summary of Rational Basis Analysis

In its briefing and at oral argument, the State was unable to articulate a specific connection between its prohibition of same-sex marriage and any of its stated legitimate interests. At most, the State asserted: “We just simply don’t know.” (Hr’g Tr., at 94, 97, Dec. 4, 2013, Dkt. 88.) This argument is not persuasive. The State’s position appears to be based on an assumption that the availability of same-sex marriage will somehow cause opposite-sex couples to forego marriage. But the State has not presented any evidence that heterosexual individuals will be any less inclined to enter into an opposite-sex marriage simply because their gay and

lesbian fellow citizens are able to enter into a same-sex union. Similarly, the State has not shown any effect of the availability of same-sex marriage on the number of children raised by either opposite-sex or same-sex partners.

In contrast to the State's speculative concerns, the harm experienced by same-sex couples in Utah as a result of their inability to marry is undisputed. To apply the Supreme Court's reasoning in *Windsor*, Amendment 3 "tells those couples, and all the world, that their otherwise valid [relationships] are unworthy of [state] recognition. This places same-sex couples in an unstable position of being in a second-tier [relationship]. The differentiation demeans the couple, whose moral and sexual choices the Constitution protects." *Windsor*, 133 S. Ct. at 2694; *see also id.* at 2710 (Scalia, J., dissenting) (suggesting that the majority's reasoning could be applied to the state-law context in precisely this way). And while Amendment 3 does not offer any additional protection to children being raised by opposite-sex couples, it demeans the children of same-sex couples who are told that their families are less worthy of protection than other families.

The Plaintiffs have presented a number of compelling arguments demonstrating that the court should be more skeptical of Amendment 3 than of typical legislation. The law differentiates on the basis of sex and closely resembles the type of law containing discrimination of an unusual character that the Supreme Court struck down in *Romer* and *Windsor*. But even without applying heightened scrutiny to Amendment 3, the court finds that the law discriminates on the basis of sexual identity without a rational reason to do so. Because Amendment 3 fails even rational basis review, the court finds that Utah's prohibition on same-sex marriage violates the Plaintiffs' right to equal protection under the law.

VI. Utah's Duty to Recognize a Marriage Validly Performed in Another State

Plaintiffs Karen Archer and Kate Call contend that their rights to due process and equal protection are further infringed by the State's refusal to recognize their marriage that was validly performed in Iowa. The court's disposition of the other issues in this lawsuit renders this question moot. Utah's current laws violate the rights of same-sex couples who were married elsewhere not because they discriminate against a subsection of same-sex couples in Utah who were validly married in another state, but because they discriminate against all same-sex couples in Utah.

CONCLUSION

In 1966, attorneys for the State of Virginia made the following arguments to the Supreme Court in support of Virginia's law prohibiting interracial marriage: (1) "The Virginia statutes here under attack reflects [sic] a policy which has obtained in this Commonwealth for over two centuries and which still obtains in seventeen states"; (2) "Inasmuch as we have already noted the higher rate of divorce among the intermarried, is it not proper to ask, 'Shall we then add to the number of children who become the victims of their intermarried parents?'" (3) "[I]nter-marriage constitutes a threat to society"; and (4) "[U]nder the Constitution the regulation and control of marital and family relationships are reserved to the States." Brief for Respondents at 47-52, *Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1 (1967), 1967 WL 113931. These contentions are almost identical to the assertions made by the State of Utah in support of Utah's laws prohibiting same-sex marriage. For the reasons discussed above, the court finds these arguments as unpersuasive as the Supreme Court found them fifty years ago. Anti-miscegenation laws in Virginia and elsewhere were designed to, and did, deprive a targeted minority of the full measure of human

dignity and liberty by denying them the freedom to marry the partner of their choice. Utah's Amendment 3 achieves the same result.

Rather than protecting or supporting the families of opposite-sex couples, Amendment 3 perpetuates inequality by holding that the families and relationships of same-sex couples are not now, nor ever will be, worthy of recognition. Amendment 3 does not thereby elevate the status of opposite-sex marriage; it merely demeans the dignity of same-sex couples. And while the State cites an interest in protecting traditional marriage, it protects that interest by denying one of the most traditional aspects of marriage to thousands of its citizens: the right to form a family that is strengthened by a partnership based on love, intimacy, and shared responsibilities. The Plaintiffs' desire to publicly declare their vows of commitment and support to each other is a testament to the strength of marriage in society, not a sign that, by opening its doors to all individuals, it is in danger of collapse.


The State of Utah has provided no evidence that opposite-sex marriage will be affected in any way by same-sex marriage. In the absence of such evidence, the State's unsupported fears and speculations are insufficient to justify the State's refusal to dignify the family relationships of its gay and lesbian citizens. Moreover, the Constitution protects the Plaintiffs' fundamental rights, which include the right to marry and the right to have that marriage recognized by their government. These rights would be meaningless if the Constitution did not also prevent the government from interfering with the intensely personal choices an individual makes when that person decides to make a solemn commitment to another human being. The Constitution therefore protects the choice of one's partner for all citizens, regardless of their sexual identity.

ORDER

The court GRANTS the Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. 32) and DENIES the Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (Dkt. 33). The court hereby declares that Amendment 3 is unconstitutional because it denies the Plaintiffs their rights to due process and equal protection under the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution. The court hereby enjoins the State from enforcing Sections 30-1-2 and 30-1-4.1 of the Utah Code and Article I, § 29 of the Utah Constitution to the extent these laws prohibit a person from marrying another person of the same sex.

SO ORDERED this 20th day of December, 2013.

BY THE COURT:



ROBERT J. SHELBY
United States District Judge

Governor's Office gives direction to state agencies on same sex marriage issues

Dec 24 2013

SALT LAKE CITY - (Dec. 24, 2013) The Governor's Office sent the following email to Cabinet Members today in regards to issues stemming from the recent federal court rulings on Amendment 3 to the Utah State Constitution:

Dear Cabinet,

Thanks to each of you for providing an analysis of the impacts to the operations in your respective agencies based on the recent federal district court ruling on same sex marriage. As indicated in your responses, many agencies will experience minimal or no impact.

For those agencies that now face conflicting laws either in statute or administrative rule, you should consult with the Assistant Attorney Generals assigned to your agency on the best course to resolve those conflicts. You should also advise your analyst in GOMB of the plans for addressing the conflicting laws.

Where no conflicting laws exist you should conduct business in compliance with the federal judge's ruling until such time that the current district court decision is addressed by the 10th Circuit Court.

Press Releases and Advisories

[News Advisories](#)

[News Releases](#)

Media Contacts

Nate McDonald

Public Information Officer

OFFICE: (801) 538-1509

MOBILE: (801) 694-0294

EMAIL: nmcdonald@utah.gov

Twitter

[Follow announcements on Twitter](#)

Subscriptions

[RSS feed for News Releases](#)

[RSS feed for News Advisories](#)

[RSS feed for both News Releases & News Advisories](#)

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Related Stories

[Governor's Office gives direction to state agencies on same-sex marriages](#)

[Governor's Response to the Supreme Court's Defense of Marriage Act Decision](#)

[Governor Announces New Multicultural Commission](#)

[Flag Notification for Senator Edward M. Kennedy](#)

[Flags lowered for National Fallen Firefighters Memorial Service](#)

If you found this news piece interesting, please consider sharing it through your social network.

Like Share 13 Tweet 12



PRESS RELEASE

CONTACT
Missy Larsen
(801)538-1892

Official Statement

RE: The United States Supreme Court's decision to grant Utah's application for a stay of the Utah District Court's decision pending the 10th Circuit appeal

“ There is not clear legal precedence for this particular situation. This is the uncertainty that we were trying to avoid by asking the District Court for a stay immediately after its decision. It is very unfortunate that so many Utah citizens have been put into this legal limbo.

Utah's Office of Attorney General is carefully evaluating the legal status of the marriages that were performed since the District Court's decision and will not rush to a decision that impacts Utah citizens so personally.

I believe this was a correct decision by the Supreme Court. There is an order to the legal process and this decision is just another step in that process. Both legal teams have much work to do before the case is presented before the 10th Circuit Court on an expedited basis. I believe the stay indicates an interest by the Supreme Court in this case and as I have said before, pursuing the legal process to get a final answer from the highest court benefits all citizens of Utah.”

Governor's Office gives direction to state agencies on same-sex marriages

Jan 08 2014

SALT LAKE CITY (Jan. 8, 2014) – The Governor's Chief of Staff Derek Miller sent the following email to Cabinet Members last night providing direction on the status of same-sex marriages in Utah:

Dear Cabinet,

I'm sure you are all aware of the issuance of the stay regarding same-sex marriage in Utah from the United States Supreme Court yesterday. This stay effectively puts a hold on the decision of the district court, which found state laws prohibiting same-sex marriage in Utah to be unconstitutional.

After the district court decision was issued on Friday, December 20th, some same-sex couples availed themselves of the opportunity to marry and to the status granted by the state to married persons. This office sent an email to each of you soon after the district court decision, directing compliance.

With the district court injunction now stayed, the original laws governing marriage in Utah return to effect pending final resolution by the courts. It is important to understand that those laws include not only a prohibition of performing same-sex marriages but also recognizing same-sex marriages.

Based on counsel from the Attorney General's Office regarding the Supreme Court decision, state recognition of same-sex marital status is ON HOLD until further notice. Please understand this position is not intended to comment on the legal status of those same-sex marriages – that is for the courts to decide. The intent of this communication is to direct state agency compliance with current laws that prohibit the state from

Press Releases and Advisories

[News Advisories](#)

[News Releases](#)

Media Contacts

Nate McDonald

Public Information Officer

OFFICE: (801) 538-1509

MOBILE: (801) 694-0294

EMAIL: nmcdonald@utah.gov

Twitter

[Follow announcements on Twitter](#)

Subscriptions

[RSS feed for News Releases](#)

[RSS feed for News Advisories](#)

[RSS feed for both News Releases & News Advisories](#)

recognizing same-sex marriages.

Wherever individuals are in the process of availing themselves of state services related to same-sex marital status, that process is on hold and will stay exactly in that position until a final court decision is issued. For example, if a same-sex married couple previously changed their names on new drivers licenses, those licenses should not be revoked. If a same-sex couple seeks to change their names on drivers licenses now, the law does not allow the state agency to recognize the marriage therefore the new drivers licenses cannot be issued.

We appreciate your patience and diligence in this matter. We recognize that different state agencies have specific questions and circumstances that will need to be worked through. Please do so with the Assistant Attorney General assigned to your respective agency in coordination with the Governor's General Counsel. We also recognize that these changes affect real people's lives. Let us carefully and considerately ensure that we, and our employees throughout the state, continue to treat all people with respect and understanding as we assist them.

Regards,

*Derek B. Miller
Chief of Staff
Governor's Office
State of Utah*

Related Stories

[Governor's Office gives direction to state agencies on same sex marriage issues](#)

[Flag Notification for Senator Edward M. Kennedy](#)

[Flags lowered for National Fallen Firefighters Memorial Service](#)

[Flags lowered in honor of victims of the tragedy at Fort Hood, TX](#)

[Half-Staff Flag Notification, September 11, 2010](#)

If you found this news piece interesting, please consider sharing it through your social network.

Like Share Tweet



STATE OF UTAH



Office of the Attorney General

To all County Attorneys and County Clerks in the State of Utah:

The Utah Office of the Attorney General has been asked by certain counties for legal clarification about whether or not to mail or otherwise provide marriage certificates to persons of the same sex whose marriage ceremonies took place between December 20, 2013 and January 6, 2014, prior to the issuance of the stay by the U.S. Supreme Court. We offer the following guidance:

Although the State of Utah cannot currently legally recognize marriages other than those between a man and a woman, marriages between persons of the same sex were recognized in the state of Utah between the dates of December 20, 2013 until the stay on January 6, 2014. Based on our analysis of Utah law, the marriages were recognized at the time the ceremony was completed.

While the validity of the marriages in question must ultimately be decided by the legal appeals process presently working its way through the courts, the act of completing and providing a marriage certificate for all couples whose marriage was performed prior to the morning of January 6, 2014, is administrative and consistent with Utah law. Therefore, it is recommended that county clerks provide marriage certificates to all persons whose marriages were solemnized during this period as an administrative function and not a legal function. This would allow, for instance, same-sex couples who solemnized their marriage prior to the stay to have proper documentation in states that recognize same-sex marriage.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Sean D. Reyes".

Sean D. Reyes
Utah Attorney General

Tax Notice issued January 15, 2014:

**INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RETURNS FOR SAME-SEX COUPLES
FOR TAX YEAR 2013**

GENERAL INFORMATION

This notice addresses filing status questions relating to 2013 Utah Individual Income Tax returns for same-sex couples arising from litigation currently pending in the federal courts regarding Article 1, § 29 of the Utah Constitution, added by Amendment Three (2004), and replaces the notice previously posted on October 9, 2013.¹

2013 UTAH INDIVIDUAL INCOME TAX RETURNS

Same-sex couples who are eligible to file a joint federal income tax return and who elect to file jointly, may also file a joint 2013 Utah Individual Income Tax return as provided in Utah Code § 59-10-503. Eligible married couples may file a joint return if they are married as of the close of the tax year. (As of December 31, 2013, the Supreme Court had not yet issued its stay of the District Court's injunction.)

LIMITATIONS

This notice is limited to the 2013 tax year. Filing information for future years will be provided as court rulings and other information become available. If any taxpayers are required to file amended 2013 tax returns based on future court rulings, they will not be subject to penalties for any tax deficiencies resulting solely from following this guidance. As with all income tax returns, any original or amended returns for 2013 may be subject to audit.

The sole purpose of this notice is to provide Individual Income Tax filing guidance for the 2013 tax year. This notice should not be construed as a waiver of any legal defenses or arguments the State may make in the ongoing federal litigation or any pending or future judicial action. Any questions regarding the validity of Utah same-sex marriages or any legal requirement for the state to recognize same-sex marriages performed in Utah or any other state will be determined by the federal courts or other appropriate authorities.

¹ On December 20, 2013, the United States District Court for the District of Utah, in Case No. 2:13-cv-217, enjoined "the State from enforcing Sections 30-1-2 and 30-1-4.1 of the Utah Code and Article 1, § 29 of the Utah Constitution to the extent these laws prohibit a person from marrying another person of the same sex." That case has now been appealed to the Tenth Circuit Court of Appeals. *Kitchen, et al, v. Herbert, et al.*, case no 13-4178. On January 6, 2014, the United States Supreme Court stayed the injunction of the District Court pending final disposition of the appeal by the Court of Appeals.

Erik Strindberg (Bar No. 4154)
Lauren I. Scholnick (Bar No. 7776)
Kathryn Harstad (Bar No. 11012)
Rachel E. Otto (Bar No. 12191)
STRINDBERG & SCHOLNICK, LLC
675 East 2100 South, Ste. 350
Salt Lake City, UT 84106
Telephone: (801) 359-4169
Facsimile: (801) 359-4313
erik@utahjobjustice.com
lauren@utahjobjustice.com
kass@utahjobjustice.com
rachel@utahjobjustice.com

John Mejia (Bar No. 13965)
Leah M. Farrell (Bar No. 13696)

ACLU of Utah
355 North 300 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84103
Telephone: (801) 521-9862
Facsimile: _____
jmejia@acluutah.org **Server** C. And
lfarrell@acluutah.org **Title** Process Server

Joshua A. Block* **Date** 1-22-14 **Time** 1:00 PM
ACLU LGBT Project P/S SHULTZ EXETER
125 Broad Street, Floor 18
New York, New York, 10004
Telephone: (212) 549-2593
Facsimile: (212) 549-2650
jblock@aclu.org

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**Pro hac vice motion to follow*

**IN THE THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, STATE OF UTAH
SALT LAKE COUNTY, WEST JORDAN DEPARTMENT**

**JONELL EVANS, STACIA IRELAND,
MARINA GOMBERG, ELENOR
HEYBORNE, MATTHEW BARRAZA,
TONY MILNER, DONALD JOHNSON,
and CARL FRITZ SHULTZ,**

Plaintiffs,

vs.

**STATE OF UTAH, GOVERNOR GARY
HERBERT, in his official capacity; and
ATTORNEY SEAN REYES, in his official
capacity,**

Defendants.

SUMMONS

Case No. 140400673

Judge Barry Lawrence

THE STATE OF UTAH TO:

GOVERNOR GARY HERBERT
c/o Jacey Skinner -- Agent
350 North State Street, Suite 200
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED and required to answer the attached complaint within twenty (20) days after the service of this Summons. You must file your Answer with the clerk of the court at the following address: Third Judicial District Court, Salt Lake County, West Jordan Department, 8080 South Redwood Road, Suite 1701, West Jordan, Utah 84088. Within that same time, you must mail or deliver a copy of your Answer to the parties' attorneys at the addresses shown above. If you fail to do so, judgment by default may be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint, which has been filed with the Clerk of the Court.

DATED this 22nd day of January, 2014.

STRINDBERG & SCHOLNICK, LLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Erik Strindberg", is written over a horizontal line.

Erik Strindberg
Lauren Scholnick
Kathryn Harstad
Rachel Otto

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

RETURN OF SERVICE

State of UTAH

County of SALT LAKE

Third District Court

Case Number: 140400673

Plaintiff:

**JONELL EVANS; STACIA IRELAND; MARINA GOMBERG; ELENOR
HEYBORNE; MATTHEW BARRAZA; TONY MILNER; DONALD JOHNSON;
AND CARL FRITZ SHULTZ**

vs.

Defendant:

**STATE OF UTAH; GOVERNOR GARY HERBERT, IN HIS OFFICIAL
CAPACITY; AND ATTORNEY SEAN REYES, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY**

For:

Erik Strindberg
STRINDBERG & SCHOLNICK, L.L.C.
675 East 2100 South
Suite 350 Plaza 7-21
Salt Lake City, UT 84106

Received by ANDERSON INVESTIGATIONS, INC. on the 22nd day of January, 2014 at 9:46 am to be served on
**GOVERNOR GARY HURBERT % JACEY SKINNER/AGENT, 350 NORTH STATE STREET, SUITE 230, SALT LAKE CITY,
UT 84114.**

I, C. D. ANDERSON, do hereby affirm that on the 22nd day of January, 2014 at 1:00 pm, I:

Served a **Government Agency** by delivering a true copy of the **SUMMONS & COMPLAINT** with the date and hour of service endorsed thereon by me, to GARY HURBERT/SHELLY EXETER as GOVERNOR of the within named agency and informing such person of the contents therein.

I am over the age of 21 and have no interest in the above action.

UCA 78B-5-705. I declare under criminal penalty that the foregoing is true and correct.



C. D. ANDERSON
Private Investigator G101390

ANDERSON INVESTIGATIONS, INC.
230 West 200 South
Suite 2302
Salt Lake City, UT 84101
(801) 619-1110
Our Job Serial Number: AND-2014000304

Erik Strindberg (Bar No. 4154)
Lauren I. Scholnick (Bar No. 7776)
Kathryn Harstad (Bar No. 11012)
Rachel E. Otto (Bar No. 12191)
STRINDBERG & SCHOLNICK, LLC
675 East 2100 South, Ste. 350
Salt Lake City, UT 84106
Telephone: (801) 359-4169
Facsimile: (801) 359-4313
erik@utahjobjustice.com
lauren@utahjobjustice.com
kass@utahjobjustice.com
rachel@utahjobjustice.com

John Mejia (Bar No. 13965)
Leah M. Farrell (Bar No. 13696)

ACLU of Utah
355 North 300 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84103
Telephone: (801) 521-9862
Facsimile:
jmejia@acluutah.org
lfarrell@acluutah.org

Server C. And
Title Process Server

Date 1-22-14 Time 1:00PM

Joshua A. Block*
ACLU LGBT Project
125 Broad Street, Floor 18
New York, New York, 10004
Telephone: (212) 549-2593
Facsimile: (212) 549-2650
jblock@aclu.org

P/S SHOLLY DEXTER

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**Pro hac vice motion to follow*

**IN THE THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, STATE OF UTAH
SALT LAKE COUNTY, WEST JORDAN DEPARTMENT**

**JONELL EVANS, STACIA IRELAND,
MARINA GOMBERG, ELENOR
HEYBORNE, MATTHEW BARRAZA,
TONY MILNER, DONALD JOHNSON,
and CARL FRITZ SHULTZ,**

Plaintiffs,

vs.

**STATE OF UTAH, GOVERNOR GARY
HERBERT, in his official capacity; and
ATTORNEY SEAN REYES, in his official
capacity,**

Defendants.

SUMMONS

Case No. 140400673

Judge Barry Lawrence


THE STATE OF UTAH TO:

SEAN REYES – UTAH ATTORNEY GENERAL
Office of the Attorney General – Utah State Capitol
350 North State Street, Suite 230
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED and required to answer the attached complaint within twenty (20) days after the service of this Summons. You must file your Answer with the clerk of the court at the following address: Third Judicial District Court, Salt Lake County, West Jordan Department, 8080 South Redwood Road, Suite 1701, West Jordan, Utah 84088. Within that same time, you must mail or deliver a copy of your Answer to the parties' attorneys at the addresses shown above. If you fail to do so, judgment by default may be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint, which has been filed with the Clerk of the Court.

DATED this 22nd day of January, 2014.

STRINDBERG & SCHOLNICK, LLC



Erik Strindberg
Lauren Scholnick
Kathryn Harstad
Rachel Otto

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

RETURN OF SERVICE

State of UTAH

County of SALT LAKE

Third District Court

Case Number: 140400673

Plaintiff:

**JONELL EVANS; STACIA IRELAND; MARINA GOMBERG; ELENOR
HEYBORNE; MATTHEW BARRAZA; TONY MILNER; DONALD JOHNSON;
AND CARL FRITZ SHULTZ**

vs.

Defendant:

**STATE OF UTAH; GOVERNOR GARY HERBERT, IN HIS OFFICIAL
CAPACITY; AND ATTORNEY SEAN REYES, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY**

For:

Erik Strindberg
STRINDBERG & SCHOLNICK, L.L.C.
675 East 2100 South
Suite 350 Plaza 7-21
Salt Lake City, UT 84106

Received by ANDERSON INVESTIGATIONS, INC. on the 22nd day of January, 2014 at 9:46 am to be served on UTAH
ATTORNEY GENERAL SEAN REYES, 350 NORTH STATE STREET, SUITE 230, SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84114.

I, C. D. ANDERSON, do hereby affirm that on the 22nd day of January, 2014 at 1:00 pm, I:

Served a **Government Agency** by delivering a true copy of the **SUMMONS & COMPLAINT** with the date and hour of service
endorsed thereon by me, to SEAN REYES/SHELLEY EXERTER as UTAH ATTORNEY GENERAL of the within named
agency and informing such person of the contents therein.

I am over the age of 21 and have no interest in the above action.

UCA 78B-5-705. I declare under criminal penalty that the foregoing is true and correct.




C. D. ANDERSON
Private Investigator G101390

ANDERSON INVESTIGATIONS, INC.
230 West 200 South
Suite 2302
Salt Lake City, UT 84101
(801) 619-1110
Our Job Serial Number: AND-2014000305

Erik Strindberg (Bar No. 4154)
Lauren I. Scholnick (Bar No. 7776)
Kathryn Harstad (Bar No. 11012)
Rachel E. Otto (Bar No. 12191)
STRINDBERG & SCHOLNICK, LLC
675 East 2100 South, Ste. 350
Salt Lake City, UT 84106
Telephone: (801) 359-4169
Facsimile: (801) 359-4313
erik@utahjobjustice.com
lauren@utahjobjustice.com
kass@utahjobjustice.com
rachel@utahjobjustice.com

John Mejia (Bar No. 13965)
Leah M. Farrell (Bar No. 13696)

ACLU of Utah
355 North 300 West
Salt Lake City, Utah 84103
Telephone: (801) 521-9862
Facsimile:
jmejia@acluutah.org **Server** 
lfarrell@acluutah.org **Title** Process Server

Joshua A. Block* **Date** 1-22-14 **Time** 1:00PM
ACLU LGBT Project **VS** SHELLEY EXETER
125 Broad Street, Floor 18
New York, New York, 10004
Telephone: (212) 549-2593
Facsimile: (212) 549-2650
jblock@aclu.org

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

**Pro hac vice motion to follow*

**IN THE THIRD JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT, STATE OF UTAH
SALT LAKE COUNTY, WEST JORDAN DEPARTMENT**

**JONELL EVANS, STACIA IRELAND,
MARINA GOMBERG, ELENOR
HEYBORNE, MATTHEW BARRAZA,
TONY MILNER, DONALD JOHNSON,
and CARL FRITZ SHULTZ,**

Plaintiffs,

vs.

**STATE OF UTAH, GOVERNOR GARY
HERBERT, in his official capacity; and
ATTORNEY SEAN REYES, in his official
capacity,**

Defendants.

SUMMONS

Case No. 140400673

Judge Barry Lawrence


THE STATE OF UTAH TO:

STATE OF UTAH
c/o Shelley Exeter – Agent
350 North State Street, Suite 230
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114

YOU ARE HEREBY SUMMONED and required to answer the attached complaint within twenty (20) days after the service of this Summons. You must file your Answer with the clerk of the court at the following address: Third Judicial District Court, Salt Lake County, West Jordan Department, 8080 South Redwood Road, Suite 1701, West Jordan, Utah 84088. Within that same time, you must mail or deliver a copy of your Answer to the parties' attorneys at the addresses shown above. If you fail to do so, judgment by default may be taken against you for the relief demanded in the complaint, which has been filed with the Clerk of the Court.

DATED this 22nd day of January, 2014.

STRINDBERG & SCHOLNICK, LLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Erik Strindberg", is written over a horizontal line.

Erik Strindberg
Lauren Scholnick
Kathryn Harstad
Rachel Otto

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

RETURN OF SERVICE

State of UTAH

County of SALT LAKE

Third District Court

Case Number: 140400673

Plaintiff:

**JONELL EVANS; STACIA IRELAND; MARINA GOMBERG; ELENOR
HEYBORNE; MATTHEW BARRAZA; TONY MILNER; DONALD JOHNSON;
AND CARL FRITZ SHULTZ**

vs.

Defendant:

**STATE OF UTAH; GOVERNOR GARY HERBERT, IN HIS OFFICIAL
CAPACITY; AND ATTORNEY SEAN REYES, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY**

For:

Erik Strindberg
STRINDBERG & SCHOLNICK, L.L.C.
675 East 2100 South
Suite 350 Plaza 7-21
Salt Lake City, UT 84106

Received by ANDERSON INVESTIGATIONS, INC. on the 22nd day of January, 2014 at 9:46 am to be served on **STATE OF UTAH SHELLY EXETER/AGENT, 350 NORTH STATE STREET, SUITE 230, SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84114.**

I, C. D. ANDERSON, do hereby affirm that on the **22nd day of January, 2014 at 1:00 pm, I:**

Served a **Government Agency** by delivering a true copy of the **SUMMONS & COMPLAINT** with the date and hour of service endorsed thereon by me, to SHELLY EXETER as AGENT of the within named agency and informing such person of the contents therein.

I am over the age of 21 and have no interest in the above action.

UCA 78B-5-705. I declare under criminal penalty that the foregoing is true and correct.



C. D. ANDERSON
Private Investigator G101390

ANDERSON INVESTIGATIONS, INC.
230 West 200 South
Suite 2302
Salt Lake City, UT 84101
(801) 619-1110
Our Job Serial Number: AND-2014000303