

13 OCT 24 PM 3: 13

LEGAL PROCESS #3

Mark E. Ellis - 127159 William A. Lapcevic - 238893 Amanda N. Griffith - 288164 ELLIS LAW GROUP, LLP 740 University Avenue, Suite 100 Sacramento, CA 95825 Tel: (916) 283-8820 Fax: (916) 283-8821

Attorneys for

DEFENDANT/CROSS COMPLAINANT ROBERT MCFARLAND

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

THE NATIONAL GRANGE OF THE ORDER OF PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY, a Washington, D.C., nonprofit corporation,

Plaintiff.

4 || V

THE CALIFORNIA STATE GRANGE, a California nonprofit corporation, and ROBERT MCFARLAND, JOHN LUVAAS, GERALD CHERNOFF, and DAMINA PARR,

Defendants.

ROBERT MCFARLAND, an individual,

0 Cross-Complainant,

10. inclusive.

V.

27

28

THE NATIONAL GRANGE OF THE ORDER OF PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY, a Washington, D.C., nonprofit corporation, and MARTHA STEFENONI, an indivdual, and EDWARD L. LUTTRELL, an indivdual, and SHIRLEY BAKER, and individual, and DOES 1-

Cross-Defendants.

Case No.: 34-2012-00130439

OBJECTIONS TO CROSS-DEFENDANTS'
MARTHA STEFENONI AND SHIRLEY
BAKER'S REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL
NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF SPECIAL
MOTION TO STRIKE

DATE: October 29, 2013

TIME: 2:00 p.m.

DEPT: 53

Hon. David Brown

Complaint Filed: October 1, 2012

Trial Date: None set

Cross-Complainant Robert McFarland hereby makes the following objections to Cross-

Evidence Objected To	Grounds For Objection	Court's Ruling
Request for Judicial Notice:	This Court cannot take judicial	□ Sustained
Exhibit 5 (in its entirety) and	notice of a posting on a website.	, B Sustamou
described as "a true and correct		□ Overruled
copy of a posting on the California	Under California Code of Civil	
State Grange website, dated	Procedure, section 451, judicial	•
October 11, 2013 (after the filing	notice must be taken of the following:	
of this motion is strike."	(1) the decisions, constitutional, and	
	public statutory law of California or	
1	the United States; (2) certain	
	administrative regulations; (3) the	
	Rules of Professional Conduct; (4)	
	rules of pleading, practice, and	
	procedure of the courts; (5) English	
	words and phrases and all legal	
	expressions; or (6) facts and	
	propositions of generalized knowledge that are so universally known that the	
	cannot reasonably be subject to	
	dispute. Cal. Code of Civ. Proc.	
	§§451(a)-(f). A posting on the	
	California Grange's website does not	
	fall within any of the above categories	
	and thus, the Court is not compelled to	
	take judicial notice of Exhibit 5.	
	Under California Code of Civil	
	Procedure, section 452, judicial	
	notice may be taken of the following:	
	(1) the decisions, constitutional, and	
	public statutory law of California or	
	the United States; (2) regulations and	
	legislative enactments; (3) official acts	
	of the legislative, executive, and	
	judicial departments; (4) records of	
	state and federal courts; (5) rules of	
	state and federal courts; (6) the law of	
	an organization of nations and of	
	foreign nations; (7) facts and	
	propositions of such common	
	knowledge within the territorial district of the court that cannot be	
	reasonable subject to dispute; or (8)	
	reasonable subject to dispute, of (8)	<u> </u>

	facts and propositions that are not		
1	reasonably subject to dispute and are		
2	capable of immediate and accurate		
	determination by resort to resources of reasonably indisputable accuracy. Cal.		
3	Code of Civ. Proc. §§452(a)-(h).		
4	Likewise, a posting from the		
	California Grange's website does not		
5	fall within one of these categories and,		
6	thus, the Court may not take judicial		
	notice of Exhibit 5.		
7	However, assuming arguendo, that		
8	the Court did want to take judicial		
	notice of Exhibit 5, it can only		
9	judicially notice the fact that the		
10	California State Grange's website is in		
	existence. Ragland v. U.S. Bank Nat. Assn. (2012) 209 Cal. App. 4 th 182,		
11	193. [A court may take judicial notice		
12	of the website, it may not accept its		
13	contents as true.] Thus, if the Court		
13	decides to take judicial notice of the		
14	website, it may not accept the contents of the blog posting on the California		
15	State Grange's website as true.		
16			
17			
18	Dated: October 24, 2013		
	ELLIS LAW GROUP, LLP		
19			
20	Brankler Tritti		
21	Amanda N. Griffith Attorney for		
21	DEFENDANT/CROSS COMPLAINANT ROBERT		
22	MCFARLAND		
23			
رے			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
۵ ک			

Ш

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Sharon Silva, declare:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

I am a citizen of the United States, am over the age of eighteen years, and am not a party to or interested in the within entitled cause. My business address is 740 University Avenue, Suite 100, Sacramento, CA 95825.

On October 24, 2013, I served the following document(s) on the parties in the within action:

OBJECTIONS TO CROSS-DEFENDANTS' MARTHA STEFENONI AND SHIRLEY BAKER'S REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN SUPPORT OF SPECIAL MOTION TO STRIKE

X VIA OVERNIGHT SERVICE: The above-described document(s) will be delivered by overnight service, to the following:

i i		
10	Martin Jensen	Attorneys for
11	Thomas Riordan	Plaintiffs/Cross-Defendants The National Grange of the Order of Patrons of
11	Porter Scott	of the Order of Lations of
12	350 University Avenue,	
	Suite 200 Sacramento, CA 95825	
13	Sacramento, CA 75025	
14	Robert Swanson	Attorneys for
1.5	Daniel Stouder	Defendants The California State Grange, John Luvaas, Gerald Chernoff, and D
15	BOUTIN JONES, INC.	Euvaas, Geraid Chemon, and D
16	555 Capitol Mall Suite 1500	
17	Sacramento, CA 95814	
17	Sucramono, O. 1 250 X 1	
18	Michael A. Farbstein	Attorneys for
10	Farbstein & Blackman	Cross-Defendants Shirley Baker and Martha Stefenoni
19	411 Borel Avenue	Stelenom
20	Suite 425	
	San Mateo, CA 94402	
21		

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is a true and correct statement and that this Certificate was executed on October 24,2013.

Sharon Silva

26

22

23

24

25

27

28