1 2 3 4 5 6	BARRETT S. LITT, SBN 45527 Email: blitt@kmbllaw.com KAYE, MCLANE, BEDNARSKI 234 Colorado Boulevard, Suite 230 Pasadena, California 91101 Telephone: (626) 844-7660 Facsimile: (626) 844-7670		
7 8 9 10 11 12	CAROL A. SOBEL, SBN 84483 Email: carolsobel@aol.com LAW OFFICE OF CAROL A. SOBEL 3110 Main Street, Suite 210 Santa Monica, CA 90405 Telephone: (310) 393-3055 Facsimile. (310) 451-3858  ADDITIONAL COUNSEL LISTED ON NEXT PAGE		
14 15 16	Attorneys for Plaintiffs  UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26	Charmaine Chua, et al.  Plaintiffs,  vs.  City of Los Angeles, et al.,  Defendants.	SUPPORT OF SU	A. Kronstadt] OF CAROL A. SOBEL IN PPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN AINTIFFS' MOTION FOR
27		I	

28

1 ADDITIONAL PLAINTIFFS' COUNSEL 2 SCHONBRUN, SEPLOW, HARRIS & HOFFMAN 3 PAUL HOFFMAN, SBN 71244 Email: hoffpaul@aol.com 4 CATHERINE SWEETSER, SBN 271142 5 Email: catherine.sdshhh@gmail.com 732 Ocean Front Walk 6 Venice, California 90291 7 Telephone: (310) 396-0731 Facsimile:.(310) 399-7040 8 9 LAW OFFICE OF COLLEEN FLYNN COLLEEN M. FLYNN, SBN 234281 10 Email: cflynnlaw@yahoo.com 11 3435 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite.2910 12 Los Angeles, California 9001 0 Telephone: (213) 252-9444 13 Facsimile: (213) 252-0091 14 Matthew Strugar, SBN 232951 15 Email: matthewstrugar@gmail.com 16 LAW OFFICE OF MATTHEW STRUGAR 2108 Cove Avenue 17 Los Angeles, California 90039 18 Telephone: (323) 696-2299 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

## SUPPLEMENTAL DECLARATION OF CAROL A. SOBEL

## I, CAROL SOBEL, declare:

- 1. I am an attorney admitted to practice before the Supreme Court of California and the United States District Court for the Central District of California. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth below and, if called to testify to them, could and would do so competently.
- 2. I submitted a declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Class Certification. This supplemental declaration is submitted to address the concerns raised by the Court at the hearing on this motion on Monday, November 7, 2016.
- 3. I have been involved with the National Lawyers Guild ("NLG") since approximately 1974. Since approximately 1998, my involvement has been very extensive. I served as the president of the Los Angeles Chapter of the National Lawyers Guild for approximately 10 years beginning in 1998. I was also a member of the National Executive Committee of the National Lawyers Guild in one capacity or another for more than ten years. During most of that time, I also co-chaired the National Lawyers Guild's Mass Defense Committee, which is the entity in the NLG that coordinates the organizations response to protests around the nation.
- 4. On behalf of the National Lawyers Guild, for the past 16 years, I litigated both damages and injunctive relief cases on behalf of demonstrators whose First Amendment rights were abridged. In addition to the *Aichele* case referenced in our motion, I have done this around the country beginning with the Democratic National Convention ("DNC") in Los Angeles in 2000, the Free

1 2 3

3

567

8 9

11

10

1213

1415

16

1718

19

2021

22

2324

25

26 27

28

Trade Area of the Americas ("FTAA") in Miami in 2003 and the *MIWON* case in Los Angeles on May Day in 2007.

- 5. In this case, there is no allegation in the complaint that Mr. Todd was singled out because of his role as an NLG legal observer. In the DNC, FTAA and MIWON litigation, some of the plaintiffs were NLG legal observers who were arrested by local law enforcement agencies or otherwise subjected to practices challenged as violative of constitutional rights. In each of these cases, the NLG did not make the argument that its legal observers should be treated any differently than other individuals who were unlawfully dispersed, detained, arrested or subjected to excessive force. Only when the NLG legal observers are targeted for selective enforcement do we make this argument. For example, in the Miami FTAA litigation, several of the plaintiffs were NLG legal observers. As counsel in that case, I am aware of the arguments that were made. One of the NLG legal observers who was arrested in that event was standing with reporters and taking notes outside of the dispersal zone when he was targeted by officers, pulled out of that safe area and arrested. More recently, in protests in Phoenix, Arizona after the enactment of anti-immigrant laws there, three individuals wearing identifiable NLG legal observer hats were singled out for arrest from among several dozens of protestors. I reviewed the videos of these events, as well as the lawsuits filed, and also spoke with the lawyers representing the plaintiffs and on that basis I am aware of the facts alleged.
- 6. In fact, three of Plaintiffs' counsel in this matter have been plaintiffs in similar litigation with non-NLG legal observers but none have ever asserted that, in those cases, they should be treated differently based on their role as legal

observers. The three attorneys are me in post-DNC litigation in Los Angeles with several plaintiffs who were not present at NLG legal observers, and Matthew Strugar and Colleen Flynn, both of whom I represented in the FTAA litigation in Miami.

7. The second issue raised by the Court at the November 10, 2016 hearing involved the NLG's role as an organizational plaintiff in this matter. The NLG is a member of several coalitions in Los Angeles working on issues raised by this litigation, including the Stop LAPD Spying Coalition, which opposes a broad array of surveillance activities by law enforcement. The NLG is also a member of several coalitions addressing police misconduct issues. As a participant in these and other coalitions, the NLG urges its members to participate in demonstrations organized by the coalitions. The NLG will also provide legal observers for these protests, but only a small number of NLG members fill this role.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed this 10th day of November, 2016 at Santa Monica, California.

/s/ Carol A. Sobel Carol A. Sobel