1 James R. Wheaton, State Bar No. 115230 David A. Greene, State Bar No. 160107 ENDORSED Geoffrey W. King State Bar No. 267438 FIRST AMENDMENT PROJECT 2 FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY 3 1736 Franklin Street, 9th Floor Oakland, CA 94612 2010 Telephone: (510) 208-7744 4 WRERIOR COURT Facsimile: (510) 208-4562 CLERK OF THE 5 Attorneys for Movant Ву ..... DAVID MORSE 6 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 9 10 IN RE SEARCH WARRANT ISSUED Warrant No. 2009-2775 11 DECEMBER 12, 2009 MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND 12 AUTHORITIES IN OPPOSITION TO UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA'S MOTION TO CONTINUE HEARING ON 13 MOTION TO QUASH SEARCH WARRANT AND RETURN PROPERTY 14 15 Date: June 4, 2010 Time: 2:00 p.m. Dept: 115 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN OPPOSITION TO UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA'S MOTION TO

CONTINUE HEARING ON MOTION TO QUASH SEARCH WARRANT AND RETURN PROPERTY

INTRODUCTION

David Morse opposes the University of California's ("UC") motion to continue. Every day that UC retains copies of Morse's photographs for its own investigative purposes is another day Morse's First Amendment right to gather news is compromised. Every day that goes by is a day that Morse cannot exercise his First Amendment right to publish his work. Morse fears that he is perceived as an agent of the government and is consequently concerned about his journalistic independence, both now and in the future. Any further delay in hearing the motion to quash the search warrant and return Morse's unpublished photographs constitutes an ongoing harm to his First Amendment rights.

By contrast, any prejudice UC now claims is the product of its own neglect. UC has been aware of this matter since it was served with papers on April 16, 2010. UC chose not to respond with papers, not to attend the original hearing, and not to contact counsel for Morse until May 26.

Morse reasonably relied on UC's demonstrated disinterest. Indeed, even UC did not believe it would be involved in opposing Morse's motion.

The Court must deny UC's motion.

#### **FACTS**

On April 16, 2010 Morse filed a motion to quash a warrant secured and executed in violation of section 1524(g) of the California Penal Code, which prohibits the issuance of a search warrant for journalistic work product. (*Declaration of Geoffrey King ("King Decl.")* ¶ 2) The motion also seeks the return of that work product—Morse's unpublished news photographs—which the University of California Police ("UCPD") have refused to return for nearly six months, despite multiple requests. (*Declaration of David Morse ("Morse Decl.")* ¶ 3; *King Decl.* ¶ 2)

Morse served the 1524(g) motion and supporting papers on UCPD, the Alameda County District Attorney, and the UC General Counsel's Office. A copy of the Proof of Service for those documents is attached as Exhibit A to the declaration of Monica Aguilar, filed herewith. The Clerk

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Morse's counsel called UC prior to service so as to ascertain the proper service agent. (*Declaration of Monica Aguilar*  $\P\P$  3,4)

of the Court set a hearing date on the motion for May 11, 2010, and each of the aforementioned entities was re-noticed with the time, date and location of that hearing. A copy of the Proof of Service for notice of the May 11 hearing is attached as Exhibit B to the declaration of Monica Aguilar, filed herewith. Morse's counsel did not receive opposition papers or any other communication from the District Attorney, UCPD or UC prior to the hearing. (*King Decl.* ¶ 5)

Morse and his counsel appeared at the May 11 hearing, expecting to address the merits of the motion. (King Decl.  $\P$  6) As the Court will recall, the Assistant Alameda County District Attorney who appeared did not have a copy of the papers and requested a continuance. (King Decl.  $\P$  6) UC did not appear. (King Decl.  $\P$  6) The Court noted the urgency of the matter and rejected the Assistant District Attorney's request that the hearing be continued for one month. The court and the parties present then agreed to continue the hearing to June 4. (King Decl.  $\P$  6)

On May 26, counsel for Morse received a telephone call from UC asking for a continuance, the first communication from UC since the filing of the motion on April 16. (*King Decl.* ¶ 5, 7) Counsel for UC explained that it failed to file papers or appear because UC believed that the District Attorney would timely oppose Morse's motion. (*King Decl.* ¶ 7)

Given the seriousness of the rights at stake, the urgency of the situation, and UC's previous non-involvement, Morse, through counsel, informed UC that he would not stipulate to a continuance. (King Decl.  $\P$  8) UC then filed the motion for a continuance that is at issue here.<sup>2</sup> (King Decl.  $\P$  8)

#### **ARGUMENT**

## A. Granting the Continuance Would Prejudice Morse By Compounding His Ongoing Constitutional Injury

"The loss of First Amendment freedoms, for even minimal periods of time, unquestionably constitutes irreparable injury." <u>Elrod v. Burns</u>, 427 U.S. 347, 373 (1976). A continuance of the hearing in this matter would further the ongoing constitutional injury to Morse. Morse has been

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> UC stated in its motion for a continuance that the 1524(g) motion was filed when a criminal case was pending against Morse. This is incorrect. The motion was filed April 16, 2010. The criminal charges were dismissed at Morse's initial appearance on December 15, 2009. (*King Decl.*  $\P$  2)

unable to exercise his First Amendment right to publish his newsworthy photographs for nearly six months. (Morse Decl. ¶ 4) Every day that UC withholds Morse's photographs from him is another day his First Amendment right to publish them is denied. Every day that UC retains copies of Morse's photographs for its own investigative purposes is another day Morse's First Amendment right to gather news is compromised. Morse is suffering the very injury section 1524(g) is intended to prevent—preserving journalists' ability to gather news without being seen as investigative agents of the state.3

Morse will be prejudiced by any further delay. Thus, a hearing on the motion to quash the warrant and return all copies of Morse's unpublished news photographs should not be further delayed.

UC Received Notice of the New Hearing Through its Representative the District Attorney; in the Alternative, UC Failed to File a Timely Opposition or Appear at the May 11 Hearing

Morse served UC notice of the May 11 hearing on April 16. (Aguilar Decl. Ex. B) UC's opposition papers, for which it now seeks more time, were due prior to that May 11 hearing. UC does not deny that it was aware of the May 11 hearing. Rather, it purposefully and intentionally chose to file no opposition and to make no appearance, instead relying on the District Attorney to represent its interests at that hearing.4

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20 21

22

27

<sup>18</sup> 

<sup>23</sup> 

<sup>24</sup> 25

<sup>26</sup> 

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> "[T]he University[] was told that the District Attorney's office would oppose the Motion to Quash and therefore did not appear at the original hearing on that motion which was scheduled for May 11, 2010." Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Ex Parte Motion to Continue Hearing on Motion to Quash Search Warrant and Return of Property ("UC MPA") at 1 (emphasis added). UC's representations to Morse are consistent with this statement. (King Decl. ¶ 7)

By UC's own reckoning, the District Attorney was appearing on UC's behalf at the May 11 hearing. UC thus received notice of the June 4 hearing when its representative, the District Attorney, agreed to that date.

UC cannot have it both ways. Either the District Attorney represented UC and in obtaining the first continuance accepted notice of the new date on UC's behalf, or UC received no relief at all from this Court for its failure to oppose the motion on May 11.

If even UC believed that the District Attorney alone was opposing Morse's motion and that UC did not need to participate, clearly, then, Morse cannot be charged with believing any different.

## C. UC Has Not Shown Good Cause for a Continuance, As Is Required in This Criminal Proceeding

A continuance in a criminal case may be granted only for good cause. Cal. Penal Code § 1050(e). Rather, in assessing whether good cause for a continuance exists, a court "must consider not only the benefit which the moving party anticipates, but also the likelihood that such benefit will result, the burden on other witnesses, jurors and the court and, *above all*, whether substantial justice will be accomplished or defeated by a granting of the motion." <u>People v. Doolin</u>, 45 Cal. 4th 390, 450 (2009) (emphasis added) (citations and quotes omitted). A continuance is properly denied where the party's lack of preparation is due to its own neglect. <u>People v. Loomis</u>, 27 Cal. App. 2d 236, 238-39 (1938). Neither convenience nor a stipulation between the parties constitutes good cause for a continuance. Cal. Penal Code § 1050(e).

The prejudice UC asserts is the result of its own neglect. Moreover, a continuance of the hearing would further the constitutional injury to Morse. UC has thus not shown good cause to continue the hearing.

## D. The Code of Civil Procedure Does Not Require Re-Notice to a Party That Has Voluntarily Chosen Not to File Opposition Papers or Appear

UC contends that the California Code of Civil Procedure required that it be noticed of the June 4 hearing negotiated by the Court and the parties present at the May 11 hearing. See Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1005(c). As this matter is a criminal proceeding, the Code of Civil Procedure does not apply. But even if it did, UC's reliance on section 1005(c) is misplaced. A party that elects not to

appear in a proceeding waives its right to notice of a subsequent hearing. Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1010.5 CONCLUSION Based on the foregoing, the Court must reject UC's motion for a continuance of the hearing on the motion to quash and return of property. Dated: June \_a^, 2010 FIRST AMENDMENT PROJECT Attorneys for Movant David Morse <sup>5</sup> Despite the fact that UC missed the deadlines to file papers in time for both the May 11

and June 4 hearings, counsel for Morse offered on May 26 to accommodate UC by accepting its opposition papers as late as close of business on Tuesday, June 1. (King Decl.  $\P 8$ )

1 James R. Wheaton, State Bar No. 115230 David A. Greene, State Bar No. 160107 **ENDORSED** Geoffrey W. King State Bar No. 267438 FILED FIRST AMENDMENT PROJECT ALAMPDA COUNTY 3 1736 Franklin Street, 9th Floor Oakland, CA 94612 JUN 2 Telephone: (510) 208-7744 4 CLERK OF THE SUPERIUR COURT Facsimile: (510) 208-4562 5 Attorneys for Movant DAVID MORSE 6 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 9 10 IN RE SEARCH WARRANT ISSUED Warrant No. 2009-2775 DECEMBER 12, 2009 11 DECLARATION OF DAVID MORSE IN 12 OPPOSITION TO UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA'S MOTION TO CONTINUE 13 HEARING ON MOTION TO QUASH SEARCH WARRANT AND RETURN 14 PROPERTY 15 Date: June 4, 2010 Time: 2:00 p.m. Dept: 115 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

DECLARATION OF DAVID MORSE IN OPPOSITION TO UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA'S MOTION TO CONTINUE

HEARING ON MOTION TO QUASH SEARCH WARRANT AND RETURN PROPERTY

#### DECLARATION OF DAVID MORSE

I, DAVID MORSE, declare under penalty of perjury that, unless otherwise indicated, the following is true and correct of my own personal knowledge, and I would testify hereto if called at trial:

- 1. I am a 42-year old photojournalist and media professional. I began my journalism career with a monthly column in a music magazine in 1991. Since late 2002, I have focused my work on the documentation of social and political movements, which has led me to photograph, video record, audio record, and otherwise report on hundreds of demonstrations, rallies, conferences, public meetings and court hearings, encompassing a wide variety of causes. My work often requires me to attend contentious protests that feature large police presences.
- 2. On December 12, 2009, the University of California Police ("UCPD") secured and executed a search warrant for unpublished photographs I made while covering a demonstration at UC Berkeley in my capacity as a journalist for the online news organization *Indybay*. The search warrant affidavit made no mention of my protestations that I was a journalist who was newsgathering, nor the fact that I presented my *Indybay* press pass to numerous officers, including a sergeant. A more comprehensive recitation of the facts of the incident can be found in my motion to quash the search warrant and return property and supporting declarations filed in Alameda County Superior Court as *In Re Search Warrant issued December 12, 2009 (Warrant No. 2009-2775)* on April 16, 2010.
- 3. I asked the UCPD to return my unpublished photographs in December 2009. They refused my requests. My photographs still have not been returned to me. Nor have any copies been furnished to me.
- 4. The UCPD's continued possession of my unpublished photographs and the possibility that those photographs may be used to prosecute people continues to harm me. I have been unable to publish my own photographs for nearly six months now. I am also impeded from covering newsworthy events because the subjects of my reportage cannot be sure of my independence from the police. Even my current status as an unwilling supplier of information to police has undermined my relationship with those I cover, and thus access to stories. Since the search warrant issued I have



been asked by subjects of my work whether I willingly handed my photographs over to the police, further complicating my reportage. The longer I am forced to wait before I can vindicate these rights, the more likely it is that the harm to my perceived independence will become permanently entrenched.

I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and executed this Zwday of June, 2010 in Scan Francisco, California.

Ву:

David Morse

DECLARATION OF DAVID MORSE IN OPPOSITION TO UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA'S MOTION TO CONTINU HEARING ON MOTION TO QUASH SEARCH WARRANT AND RETURN PROPERTY

James R. Wheaton, State Bar No. 115230 1 David A. Greene, State Bar No. 160107 Geoffrey W. King State Bar No. 267438 FIRST AMENDMENT PROJECT 3 1736 Franklin Street, 9th Floor Oakland, CA 94612 Telephone: (510) 208-7744 4 Facsimile: (510) 208-4562 5 Attorneys for Movant DAVID MORSE 6 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 9 10 IN RE SEARCH WARRANT ISSUED Warrant No. 2009-2775 11 **DECEMBER 12, 2009** DECLARATION OF GEOFFREY KING IN 12 OPPOSITION TO UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA'S MOTION TO CONTINUE HEARING ON MOTION TO QUASH 13 SEARCH WARRANT AND RETURN PROPERTY 14 15 Date: June 4, 2010 Time: 2:00 p.m. Dept: 115 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26

DECLARATION OF GEOFFREY KING IN OPPOSITION TO UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA'S MOTION TO CONTINUE HEARING ON MOTION TO QUASH SEARCH WARRANT AND RETURN PROPERTY

27

~~

#### **DECLARATION OF GEOFFREY KING**

I, GEOFFREY KING, declare under penalty of perjury that, unless otherwise indicated, the following is true and correct of my own personal knowledge, and I would testify hereto if called at trial:

- 1. I am the Staff Attorney at First Amendment Project ("FAP") and counsel for David Morse.
- 2. On April 16, 2010 my office filed a motion to quash the search warrant issued for Mr.
- Morse's journalistic work product on December 12, 2009 and to return all copies of Morse's unpublished photographs. The motion was brought pursuant to California Penal Code section 1524(g), which prohibits the issuance of a search warrant for any item or items covered by the California journalist shield law. All criminal charges against Morse were dropped at his initial appearance on December 15, 2009.
- 3. My assistant Monica Aguilar called the University of California Police Department ("UCPD") and UC General Counsel's office ("UC") on or about April 15 to ensure proper service. The motion was properly served on both the Alameda County District Attorney and UC.
- 4. The Clerk of the Court scheduled a hearing on the motion for May 11. My office then filed and served a second Notice of Motion to reflect the hearing time, date and location that had been assigned.
- 5. Neither the District Attorney, UCPD or UC filed papers opposing the 1524(g) motion. Nor did any of these entities contact FAP prior to the May 26, 2010 phone call from Eric Behrens described below.
- 6. On May 11, 2010 Morse and his counsel appeared on the motion to quash the warrant and return property. The Assistant District Attorney present at the hearing was unfamiliar with the file and was thus unprepared to proceed. UC did not appear. The Court noted the urgency of the matter and denied the Assistant District Attorney's request for a one month continuance. The Court and the parties present at the hearing then negotiated a revised hearing date of June 4, 2010. FAP then noticed the District Attorney of the June 4 hearing, but not UCPD or UC because it did not appear that those entities wished to oppose the motion.

7. On May 26, 2010, Eric Behrens of UC left a message for FAP Staff Counsel David Greene
seeking a continuance of the hearing. I returned Mr. Behren's call and he indicated to me that UC
wished for a continuance based on the fact that UC had assumed that the District Attorney would
oppose Morse's motion, but that this did not seem to be the case. I explained to Mr. Behrens that my
client was eager to vindicate his rights, but that I would speak with him. I also stated that among
other harms, Morse was unable to publish his photographs because the UCPD would not return
them. Mr. Behrens responded that Morse could have copies of his photographs returned, but that the
University would not waive its rights to use them. I stated that Morse would very much like copies
of his images, but that he also wanted all copies returned. I told Mr. Behrens that I would speak with
Morse about the continuance issue. As of the time of filing, the photographs have not been returned
to Morse or FAP.

- 8. After speaking with Morse I called Mr. Behrens back to let him know that I was not authorized to continue the hearing. Mr. Behrens then stated that he would seek an ex parte order continuing the hearing, and that he would now seek a date farther in the future. I called Mr. Behrens back and offered to accept UC's opposition papers as late as close of business on Tuesday, June 1 if UC would forego the motion for a continuance and argue the merits of Morse's motion on June 4. I noted that the Court would have to approve this plan. Later that day, I received a copy of the motion for a continuance at issue here via facsimile.
- 9. In subsequent communications with Mr. Behrens, he stated that UC would file opposition papers by Wednesday, June 2, but would seek the continuance anyway.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and executed this 2<sup>rd</sup> day of June, 2010 in \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, California.

By: Geoffrey King

1 2 3 4 5 6	James R. Wheaton, State Bar No. 115230 David A. Greene, State Bar No. 160107 Geoffrey W. King State Bar No. 267438 FIRST AMENDMENT PROJECT 1736 Franklin Street, 9th Floor Oakland, CA 94612 Telephone: (510) 208-7744 Facsimile: (510) 208-4562 Attorneys for Movant DAVID MORSE	ENDORSED FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY  JUN 9. VIIII) CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT By  Deputy	
7	SUPERIOR COURT O	F THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA E COUNTY OF ALAMEDA	
8	IN AND FOR TH		
10			
11	IN RE SEARCH WARRANT ISSUED DECEMBER 12, 2009	Warrant No. 2009-2775	
12		DECLARATION OF MONICA AGUILAR IN OPPOSITION TO UNIVERSITY OF	
13		CALIFORNIA'S MOTION TO CONTINUE HEARING ON MOTION TO QUASH	
14		SEARCH WARRANT AND RETURN PROPERTY	
15		Date: June 4, 2010 Time: 2:00 p.m.	
16		Dept: 115	
17			
18 19			
20			
21		·	
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			

DECLARATION OF MONICA AGUILAR IN OPPOSITION TO UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA'S MOTION TO CONTINUE HEARING ON MOTION TO QUASH SEARCH WARRANT AND RETURN PROPERTY

///

I, MONICA AGUILAR, declare under penalty of perjury that, unless otherwise indicated, the following is true and correct of my own personal knowledge, and I would testify hereto if called at trial:

- 1. I am a legal assistant at First Amendment Project ("FAP"). On or about April 15, 2010, I spoke by telephone with Detective Isaac Koh of the University of California Police Department ("UCPD") regarding the service of the following papers: Notice of Motion and Motion to Quash Search Warrant and Return Property; Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Motion to Quash Search Warrant and Return Property; and the Declarations of Geoffrey King, David Morse, Peter Maiden, Mary Ratcliff and J.T. Johnson. Detective Koh communicated to me that I could use him as the agent for process of service for UCPD.
- 2. In the same conversation with Detective Koh, I inquired about other UC departments and/or personnel I should also serve and he suggested I call the UC General Counsel's office ("UC") to ensure proper service. I called UC and spoke with an assistant to Michael R. Smith, the Chief Campus Counsel, who informed me that I should issue service to Mr. Smith.
- 3. On April 16, 2010, FAP filed the Notice of Motion and Motion to Quash Search Warrant and Return Property; Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Support of Motion to Quash Search Warrant and Return Property; and the Declarations of Geoffrey King, David Morse, Peter Maiden, Mary Ratcliff and J.T. Johnson were filed with the Superior Court of California, Alameda County. My colleague Nicole Feliciano issued the service of these documents, via Federal Express, to the following service list:

```
University of California Police Department, Berkeley Attn: Detective Isaac Koh
1 Sproul Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720-1199
Phone: 510 642-6760
Fax: 510 643-4655
```

1 2 3 4	Michael R. Smith Chief Campus Counsel and Associate General Counsel UC Berkeley Office of Legal Affairs 200 California Hall, #1500 Berkeley, CA 94720-1500 Phone: (510) 642-7122 Fax: (510) 643-5980			
5 6 7	Nancy E. O' Malley, District Attorney Alameda County District Attorney's Office 1225 Fallon St. Suite 900 Oakland, Ca 94612 Phone: (510) 272-6222			
8	Fax: (510) 271-5156			
9	A true and correct copy of the Proof of Service for these documents is attached hereto as Exhibit A			
10	4. After the aforementioned pleadings were filed with the Clerk of the Court, and also on April			
11	16, FAP served a subsequent Notice of Motion containing the hearing time, date and location for the			
12	initial hearing on the same service list. A true and correct copy of the Proof of Service for that			
13	document is attached hereto as Exhibit B.			
14	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing			
15	is true and correct and executed this <u>2</u> day of June, 2010 in <u>OAULANY</u> , California.			
16				
17	$\cap A_{h}$			
18				
19	By: Monica Aguilar			
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
20				

DECLARATION OF MONICA AGUILAR IN OPPOSITION TO UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA'S MOTION TO CONTINUE HEARING ON MOTION TO QUASH SEARCH WARRANT AND RETURN PROPERTY

# Exhibit A

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	·	ENDORSED FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY  APR 1 6 2010  CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT ByA. SALTA  THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  COUNTY OF ALAMEDA
9	IN DE CEADOU WARD AND TOOLER	Case No.: 2009 - 2975
10	IN RE SEARCH WARRANT ISSUED DECEMBER 12, 2009	PROOF OF SERVICE
12		
13		DATE: May 11,2010 TIME: 9:00 am DEPT: 115
14	•	Hon.
15		
16		
17		
18	•	
19	•	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		·

PROOF OF SERVICE

1	SERVICE LIST
2	Michael R. Smith  Chief Campus Counsel and Associate General Counsel
3	UC Berkeley Office of Legal Affairs
4	200 California Hall, #1500 Berkeley, CA 94720-1500
5	Phone: (510) 642-7122 Fax: (510) 643-5980
6	1 ax. (310) 043-3700
7	Nancy E. O' Malley, District Attorney  Alameda County District Attorney's Office  By FEDEX
8	1225 Fallon St. Suite 900 Oakland, Ca 94612
9	Phone: (510) 272-6222 Fax: (510) 271-5156
10	
11	University of California Police Department, Berkeley By FEDEX Attn: Detective Isaac Koh
12	1 Sproul Hall Berkeley, CA 94720-1199
13	Phone: 510 642-6760 Fax: 510 643-4655
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	•
25	
26	·
27	
28	

## Exhibit B

1 2 3 4 5 6	James R. Wheaton, State Bar No. 115230 David A. Greene, State Bar No. 160107 Geoffrey W. King State Bar No. 267438 FIRST AMENDMENT PROJECT 1736 Franklin Street, 9th Floor Oakland, CA 94612 Telephone: (510) 208-7744 Facsimile: (510) 208-4562  Attorneys for Movant DAVID MORSE	ENDORSED FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY  APR 2 6 2010  CLERK OF THE SUPPLIEDS COURT  By  Deputy	
7	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
8	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA		
9			
10	IN RE SEARCH WARRANT ISSUED	Warrant No.: 2009-2775	
12	DECEMBER 12, 2009	REVISED NOTICE OF MOTION TO	
13		QUASH SEARCH WARRANT AND RETURN PROPERTY	
14		DATE: May 11, 2010	
15	,	TIME: 9:00 a.m. DEPT: 115	
16		Hon.	
17			
18			
19			
20			
21		•	
22			
<ul><li>23</li><li>24</li></ul>			
25			
26			
27			
28			

REVISED NOTICE OF MOTION TO QUASH SEARCH WARRANT AND RETURN PROPERTY

#### REVISED NOTICE OF MOTION

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT at 9:00 a.m. on May 11, 2010 in Department 115, Movant DAVID MORSE will and does hereby move the Court for an order to quash search warrant number 2009-2775, issued on December 12, 2009, as it pertains to the Sony Digital Camera, Model MVC-CD500, serial number 36459 and two Memorex CD-R discs, 210 MB each, belonging to DAVID MORSE; and to order the return of all copies of unpublished photographs seized pursuant to the warrant. The motion will be based upon this Revised Notice of Motion; Notice of Motion to Quash Search Warrant and Return Property; Memorandum of Points and Authorities; and declarations of DAVID MORSE, GEOFFREY KING, J.T. JOHNSON, PETER MAIDEN AND MARY RATCLIFF with exhibits thereto, filed with the motion on April 16, 2010; and any other pleadings, papers, evidence, and written or oral arguments that the parties may submit.

FIRST AMENDMENT PROJECT

Dated: April 16, 2010

By:

Geoffrey King

Attorneys for Movant David Morse

<sup>1</sup> The original Notice of Motion stated that the hearing date, time and department were to be determined. This Revised Notice of Motion includes the date, time and department as set by the Clerk of the Court upon filing of the Motion. It also includes the warrant number.

ENDORSED FILED ALAMEDA COUNTY

#### PROOF OF SERVICE

CLERK Og frit se

APR 2

Deputy

I am over the age of 18 years and am not a party to this action. I am employed in the county of Alameda. My business address is First Amendment Project, 1736 Franklin Street, Ninth Floor, Oakland, CA 94612.

On April 16, 2010, I caused to be served the attached:

I, Nicole Feliciano, hereby declare:

### REVISED NOTICE OF MOTION TO QUASH SEARCH WARRANT AND RETURN PROPERTY

X BY FEDERAL EXPRESS. I caused the above identified document(s) to be placed in a sealed Federal Express envelope(s) with delivery fees fully prepaid, for next business day delivery to the party(ies) listed below.

Susan R. Oie

I declare under penalty of perjury, under the laws of the State of California, that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this Declaration was executed at Oakland, California on April 16, 2010.

Nicole Feliciano DECLARANT

1 SERVICE LIST By FEDEX 2 Michael R. Smith Chief Campus Counsel and Associate General Counsel UC Berkeley 3 Office of Legal Affairs 200 California Hall, #1500 4 Berkeley, CA 94720-1500 Phone: (510) 642-7122 Fax: (510) 643-5980 6 Nancy E. O' Malley, District Attorney Alameda County District Attorney's Office 1225 Fallon St. Suite 900 7 By FEDEX Oakland, Ca 94612 Phone: (510) 272-6222 9 Fax: (510) 271-5156 10 By FEDEX University of California Police Department, Berkeley 11 Attn: Detective Isaac Koh 12 1 Sproul Hall Berkeley, CA 94720-1199 13 Phone: 510 642-6760 Fax: 510 643-4655 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

1 James R. Wheaton, State Bar No. 115230 David A. Greene, State Bar No. 160107 Geoffrey W. King State Bar No. 267438 2 ENDORSED FIRST AMENDMENT PROJECT FILED 1736 Franklin Street, 9th Floor 3 ALAMEDA COUNTY Oakland, CA 94612 Telephone: (510) 208-7744 Facsimile: (510) 208-4562 4 2010 CLERA OF THE UPERIOR COURT 5 Attorneys for Movant DAVID MORSE 6 Deputy 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF ALAMEDA 9 Case/Warrant No. 2009-2775 10 IN RE SEARCH WARRANT ISSUED DECEMBER 12, 2009 11 PROOF OF SERVICE Date: June 4, 2010 12 Time: 2:00 p.m. Dept: 115 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 PROOF OF SERVICE

1	SERVICE LIST	
2	Michael R. Smith Chief Campus Counsel and Associate General Counsel	By MAIL & FACSIMILE
3	Chief Campus Counsel and Associate General Counsel UC Berkeley Office of Legal Affairs	
4	200 California Hall, #1500 Berkeley, CA 94720-1500	
5	Phone: (510) 642-7122 Fax: (510) 643-5980	
6	1 ax. (310) 0+3-3760	
7	Nancy E. O' Malley, District Attorney Alameda County District Attorney's Office	By MAIL & FACSIMILE
8	1225 Fallon St. Suite 900 Oakland, Ca 94612	
9	Phone: (510) 272-6222 Fax: (510) 271-5156	
10		
11	University of California Police Department, Berkeley Attn: Detective Isaac Koh	By MAIL & FACSIMILE
12	1 Sproul Hall Berkeley, CA 94720-1199	
13	Phone: 510 642-6760 Fax: 510 643-4655	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
22		
23		
24		
25	•	
26		
27	·	
28		