

1 GORDON P. ERSPAMER (CA SBN 83364)  
 Gerspamer@mofo.com  
 2 ARTURO J. GONZALEZ (CA SBN 121490)  
 AGonzalez@mofo.com  
 3 HEATHER A. MOSER (CA SBN 212686)  
 HMoser@mofo.com  
 4 STACEY M. SPRENKEL (CA SBN 241689)  
 SSprenkel@mofo.com  
 5 PAUL J. TAIRA (CA SBN 244427)  
 PTaira@mofo.com  
 6 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
 425 Market Street  
 7 San Francisco, California 94105-2482  
 Telephone: 415.268.7000  
 8 Facsimile: 415.268.7522

9 **[see next page for additional counsel for Plaintiffs]**

10 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
 VETERANS FOR COMMON SENSE and  
 11 VETERANS UNITED FOR TRUTH, INC.

12 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 13 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 14 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

15 VETERANS FOR COMMON SENSE and  
 VETERANS UNITED FOR TRUTH, INC.,  
 16  
 17 Plaintiffs,  
 18 v.  
 19 JAMES B. PEAKE, M.D., Secretary of Veterans  
 Affairs, *et al.*,  
 20 Defendants.

Case No. C-07-3758-SC

**CLASS ACTION**

**DECLARATION OF HEATHER A.  
 MOSER IN SUPPORT OF  
 ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION FOR  
 ADEQUATE TIME TO RESPOND  
 TO NEW LEGAL ARGUMENT  
 RAISED ON REPLY**

Place: Courtroom 1, 17th Floor  
 Judge: Hon. Samuel Conti

Complaint Filed July 23, 2007

1 **ADDITIONAL COUNSEL FOR PLAINTIFFS:**

2 SIDNEY M. WOLINSKY (CA SBN 33716)  
3 SWolinsky@dralegal.org  
4 JENNIFER WEISER BEZOZA (CA SBN 247548)  
5 JBezoza@dralegal.org  
6 KATRINA KASEY CORBIT (CA SBN 237931)  
7 KCorbit@dralegal.org  
8 DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES  
9 2001 Center Street, Third Floor  
10 Berkeley, California 94704-1204  
11 Telephone: 510.665.8644  
12 Facsimile: 510.665.8511

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

8 BILL D. JANICKI (CA SBN 215960)  
9 WJanicki@mofo.com  
10 MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
11 400 Capitol Mall, Suite 2600  
12 Sacramento, California 95814  
13 Telephone: 916.448.3200  
14 Facsimile: 916.448.3222

1 I, HEATHER A. MOSER, declare:

2 1. I am an associate at Morrison & Foerster LLP, counsel of record for Plaintiffs in this  
3 action. I make this declaration on my own personal knowledge, and if called as a witness to  
4 testify, I could and would testify competently to the following facts:

5 2. As required by Northern District Civil Local Rule 7-11(a), on February 22, 2008,  
6 Plaintiffs offered to enter into a stipulation with Defendants before filing this Administrative  
7 Motion. A true and correct copy of my letter to Defendants is attached hereto as Exhibit A. On  
8 February 25, 2008, Defendants declined to stipulate on the terms set forth in my letter. A true  
9 and correct copy of Defendants' letter declining to enter into a stipulation is attached hereto as  
10 Exhibit B.

11 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America and the  
12 State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

13 Executed this 25th day of February, 2008 at San Francisco, California.

14  
15 /s/ Heather A. Moser  
16 Heather A. Moser

17 I hereby attest that I have on file all holograph signatures for any signatures indicated by a  
18 "conformed" signature (/S/) within this efiled document.

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**MORRISON | FOERSTER**

425 MARKET STREET  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105-2482

TELEPHONE: 415.268.7000

FACSIMILE: 415.268.7522

WWW.MOFO.COM

MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
NEW YORK, SAN FRANCISCO,  
LOS ANGELES, PALO ALTO,  
SAN DIEGO, WASHINGTON, D.C.  
NORTHERN VIRGINIA,  
ORANGE COUNTY, DENVER  
SACRAMENTO, WALNUT CREEK  
TOKYO, LONDON, BEIJING,  
SHANGHAI, HONG KONG,  
SINGAPORE, BRUSSELS

February 22, 2008

Writer's Direct Contact

(415) 268-7091

HMoser@mofocom

*Via e-mail and facsimile*

Mr. Daniel Bensing, Senior Counsel  
U.S. Department of Justice  
Civil Division, Federal Programs Branch  
20 Massachusetts Ave., NW  
Washington, DC 20530

Re: *Veterans for Common Sense v. Mansfield*  
N.D. Cal. No. C-07-3758


Dear Mr. Bensing:

I am writing with respect to Defendants' recently filed reply on their motion to dismiss Defendant Greene. Defendants' reply brief (last section, pages 7-8) raises a brand new legal argument – judicial immunity. The case law relevant to the newly raised judicial immunity argument was not cited in previous briefing. Moreover, this is not the first time this has happened. As you recall, the present motion to dismiss Greene is an outgrowth of a new legal argument raised on reply in your original motion to dismiss. Plaintiffs cannot consistently suffer prejudice in this seriatim fashion and are entitled to an opportunity to fully brief the issues before the Court. Assuming the Court is even inclined to address a new issue improperly raised on reply for the second time, Plaintiffs propose that the parties enter into a stipulation granting Plaintiffs adequate opportunity to fully research and brief this potentially complicated issue for the Court. In light of the up-coming preliminary injunction hearing, Plaintiffs propose that the hearing on the motion to dismiss Greene be rescheduled for April 11, 2008, with Plaintiffs' brief on judicial immunity due March 21, 2008. In light of the fact that this is the third round of briefing on issues that could have and should have been raised in the original motion to dismiss, Plaintiffs ask that Defendants waive their right to reply.

Mr. Daniel Bensing  
February 22, 2008  
Page Two

If Defendants are amenable to the proposed stipulation, please let me know by noon PST on Monday, February 25, 2008. If I have not heard anything from Defendants at that time, we will assume that Defendants are not inclined to enter into the proposed stipulation. Please be advised that Plaintiffs plan to make an appropriate motion to set a proper briefing schedule on the judicial immunity issue should Defendants decline our offer to stipulate. Thank you in advance for your anticipated professional courtesy in this regard.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Heather A. Moser". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Heather A. Moser



U.S. Department of Justice

Civil Division

---

Washington, D.C. 20530

February 25, 2008

Ms. Heather Moser  
Morrison & Foerster  
425 Market St.  
San Francisco, Cal. 94105-2482

RE: Veterans for Common Sense v. Mansfield, (N.D. Cal. No. C-07-3758)

By: Regular mail and E-mail [Hmoser@mofoc.com]

Dear Ms. Moser:

This is in response to your letter dated February 22, 2008, in which you request that defendants agree to not oppose a request by plaintiffs to file a sur-reply to defendants' Motion to Dismiss the claims against Chief Judge Greene (D.E. 95). You claim that defendants have raised a "brand new" issue in their Reply to the motion to dismiss that could not be anticipated by plaintiffs. This is not the case. In their opening memorandum, defendants made clear that it would be improper for the Court to interfere with the actions of another federal court. In their Reply, defendants appropriately addressed a new argument raised by plaintiffs in their Opposition that could not be fairly discerned from the Complaint. It should not need to be noted that this situation is precisely the reason that movants are entitled to file a reply.

As you know, there is an extensive record documenting the fact that as far back as September 2007, defendants have repeatedly requested orally and in writing that plaintiffs identify which particular policies and procedures they are challenging. This is necessary because the complaint is long, but exceedingly vague. Plaintiffs refusal to do so forces defendants on a motion to dismiss to address the arguments that *appear* to be encompassed in the complaint. As we stated in our opening memorandum "it is unclear from the Complaint what relief plaintiffs ask this Court to order directed against the CAVC." See Motion to Dismiss at 5. Defendants then articulated the claim plaintiffs appeared to be making:

Under plaintiffs' fanciful theory, this Court could enjoin and order Chief Judge

Greene to amend the CAVC's Rules of Practice and Procedure, as well as second-guess his internal staffing, management and budget determinations relating to the administration of the CAVC. *Plaintiffs offer no authority for this unprecedented, and bizarre claim.*

*Id.* at 5 (footnote omitted and emphasis added). Since plaintiffs had refused to articulate the basis for their claim, much less that they would contend the limits of sovereign immunity do not apply, defendants briefly outlined the not difficult issues requiring dismissal of Judge Greene.

In their Opposition, for the first time, plaintiffs advanced their novel theory that “[d]efendant Greene plays a pivotal role” and “controls the process afforded veterans in having their service-connected benefits claims” decided. Plfs. Opp. at 6. Based on these allegations, plaintiffs argued that the “officer’s suit” exception to sovereign immunity applies.


As defendants noted in their Reply, “plaintiffs contend for the first time that the jurisdictional hurdle of sovereign immunity can somehow be disregarded entirely in this case.” Def’s’ Reply at 1. Defendants can hardly have expected to have known that plaintiffs would stretch to argue that the largely legislatively-overruled exception in *Larson v. Domestic & Foreign Commerce Corp.*, U.S. 337 (1949) would support their claims. Nevertheless, defendants initially made the point that even beyond the limitations of sovereign immunity, plaintiffs claim could not succeed. Consistent with that fact, in defendants Reply it was specifically noted that plaintiffs “have also failed to answer defendants’ argument that there is no legal authority for the extraordinary relief they seek against another judicial entity.” Def.s Reply at 7. In direct response to plaintiffs new argument that sovereign immunity did not apply to Judge Greene, defendants then elaborated on the point they had made in their opening papers.

Although plaintiffs are not entitled to further briefing on the motion to dismiss Judge Greene, we do not believe any amount of briefing can save plaintiffs’ theory and would not oppose such a request if the harm to defendants from delay is addressed. Plaintiffs have resisted any stay of discovery pending resolution of the motion to dismiss Judge Greene. Until a stay is in place, defendants cannot agree to extend the hearing date on the motion to dismiss. However, if plaintiffs agree to a stay of discovery directed at CAVC or Judge Greene until resolution of the motion to dismiss, defendants would agree to further briefing on the following conditions. First, plaintiffs’ sur-reply and defendant’s response should be limited to the issue of the validity of plaintiffs’ claims if sovereign immunity does not apply. Second, since defendants have appropriately addressed in their Reply issues raised for the first time by plaintiffs in their Opposition to the motion to dismiss, a neutral stipulation should be filed with the stated purpose being to “fully brief the issues.” Third, since plaintiffs request four weeks to March 21 to address one page of text, defendants request two weeks to respond or until April 4, making the earliest hearing date April 18.

We find your suggestion that plaintiffs have been prejudiced before to be baffling. The fact that defendants noted the fact that Judge Greene was an improper defendant in their reply on the motion to dismiss did not prejudice plaintiffs because the issue was not decided on that motion. The Court suggested the issue of whether Judge Greene should be dismissed should be handled by separate motion, and the issue has now been briefed.

Finally, should you decide to file a contested motion, do not purport to characterize defendants' position. There have been too many misrepresentations in the past. Instead, we request that you submit this letter as explanation.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'DB' followed by a long horizontal stroke.

Daniel Bensing  
Senior Counsel  
Federal Programs Branch

cc: Gordon Erspamer  
Sidney Wolinsky