

Michael Newdow, *pro hac vice*  
PO Box 233345  
Sacramento, CA 95823  
(916) 427-6669

Rosanna Fox, NH SBN: 17693  
O'Brien Law Firm P.C.  
One Sundial Avenue, Fifth Floor  
Manchester, NH 03103  
(603) 627-3800

---

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**Civil Action No. 1:07-cv-356-JM**

THE FREEDOM FROM RELIGION FOUNDATION;  
JAN DOE AND PAT DOE, PARENTS; DOECHILD-1, DOECHILD-2 and  
DOECHILD-3, MINOR CHILDREN;

Plaintiffs,

v.

THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;  
THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;  
THE HANOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT ("HSD");  
THE DRESDEN SCHOOL DISTRICT ("DSD");  
SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT 70 ("SAU #70");

Defendants.

---

**PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER**

---

Pursuant to case law<sup>1</sup> and Rule 26(a)(1)<sup>2</sup> of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiffs move to have the Court enter a protective order that protects the true identity of the Plaintiffs (other than the Freedom From Religion Foundation (“FFRF”)). Submitted herewith in support of this Motion is a stipulated Protective Order agreed to by counsel for each party, and a Memorandum in support of this Motion.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ - Michael Newdow

Michael Newdow, *pro hac vice*  
Counsel for Plaintiffs  
PO Box 233345  
Sacramento CA 95823

Phone: (916) 427-6669

E-mail: [NewdowLaw@gmail.com](mailto:NewdowLaw@gmail.com)

/s/ - Rosanna Fox

Rosanna Fox, NH SBN: 17693  
O’Brien Law Firm, P.C.  
One Sundial Avenue, #510  
Manchester, NH 03103

Phone: (603) 627-3800

E-mail: [rosief13@comcast.net](mailto:rosief13@comcast.net)

January 8, 2008

---

<sup>1</sup> *Doe v. Porter*, 370 F.3d 558 (6th Cir. 2004); *Doe v. Stegall*, 653 F.2d 180 (5th Cir. 1981).

<sup>2</sup> Fed. R. Civ. P. Rule 26(a)(1)(A) states that disclosures must be made “[e]xcept as ... ordered by the court.”

1 Michael Newdow, *pro hac vice*  
2 PO Box 233345  
3 Sacramento, CA 95823  
4 (916) 427-6669

5  
6 Rosanna Fox, NH SBN: 17693  
7 O'Brien Law Firm P.C.  
8 One Sundial Avenue, Fifth Floor  
9 Manchester, NH 03103  
10 (603) 627-3800

---

11  
12  
13 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
14 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

15  
16 **Civil Action No. 1:07-cv-356-JM**

17  
18  
19 THE FREEDOM FROM RELIGION FOUNDATION;  
20 JAN DOE AND PAT DOE, PARENTS; DOECHILD-1, DOECHILD-2 and  
21 DOECHILD-3, MINOR CHILDREN;

22  
23 Plaintiffs,

24 v.

25  
26 THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;  
27 THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;  
28 THE HANOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT ("HSD");  
29 THE DRESDEN SCHOOL DISTRICT ("DSD");  
30 SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT 70 ("SAU #70");

31  
32 Defendants.

33  
34  
35 **STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER**  
36  
37

---

1 Plaintiffs THE FREEDOM FROM RELIGION FOUNDATION (“FFRF”),  
 2 JAN DOE, PAT DOE, DOECHILD-1, DOECHILD-2 and DOECHILD-3, by and  
 3 through their undersigned counsel; Defendants THE CONGRESS OF THE  
 4 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, THE  
 5 HANOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT (“HSD”), THE DRESDEN SCHOOL  
 6 DISTRICT (“DSD”), SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT 70 (“SAU #70”), by  
 7 and through their undersigned counsel; and planned Intervenor-Defendant THE  
 8 STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, by and through its undersigned counsel; hereby  
 9 stipulate as follows:

- 10  
 11 (1) The true identities of the Plaintiffs, except that of Plaintiff FFRF, will be  
 12 protected from disclosure through the discovery process and in pleadings  
 13 filed in this case and will be kept confidential. (Hereinafter, “Plaintiffs”  
 14 means all Plaintiffs in this action except Plaintiff FFRF.) The identities of  
 15 the Plaintiffs and any documents that reveal their identities as Plaintiffs will  
 16 be deemed “confidential information” for purposes of this stipulation.  
 17 However, this stipulation does not address whether Plaintiffs must be  
 18 present in person at depositions, open court hearings or whether their  
 19 identities will be required to be disclosed at trial. That issue will be  
 20 discussed by the parties at a later date.
- 21  
 22 (2) In conjunction with the Parties entering into this stipulation, the true  
 23 identities of Plaintiffs shall be disclosed to defense counsel (if requested)  
 24 for the purpose of obtaining information necessary to defend the case,  
 25 including but not limited to, residency status, taxpayer status,  
 26 custody/guardianship status or school enrollment status of Plaintiffs.
- 27  
 28 (3) No Confidential information produced by any party shall be used for any  
 29 purpose other than the litigation of this case.

1 (4) There shall be no disclosure of confidential information to anyone other  
2 than the following:

- 3
- 4 (a) The parties to the case, including their current employees or agents who  
5 have a reasonable need to know the confidential information;
- 6 (b) The parties' attorneys and all attorneys affiliated with the respective  
7 parties, and the attorneys' staff;
- 8 (c) Experts and consultants retained by attorneys for the parties in the  
9 preparation or presentation of the case;
- 10 (d) Employees of the insurance companies or claims administrators that  
11 insure any of the Defendants and/or oversee the litigation;
- 12 (e) Any persons responsible for storing or maintaining the parties' case  
13 files at the conclusion of the case; and
- 14 (f) The court or any other officer who presides over any proceeding in the  
15 case, and to court reporters as necessary.
- 16

17

18 (5) In filing documents with the Court, confidential information may be used in  
19 court if the documents are filed under seal.

20

21 (6) Disclosure:

22

- 23 (a) A request to a party for authorization to disclose confidential  
24 information, other than as permitted herein, shall identify the  
25 information for which disclosure is sought, shall identify the person or  
26 entity to whom disclosure is proposed, shall state the reasons why  
27 disclosure is necessary or appropriate, and shall be made in writing to  
28 counsel for the other party(s). Counsel for the party(s) shall respond in  
29 writing to the request within a reasonable time. If there is no objection  
30 to the request for disclosure, the identified confidential information may  
31 be disclosed to the person or entity previously identified. If the  
32 designating party denies authorization for disclosure of identified  
33 documents, no such disclosure shall be made unless, after application to  
34 the court, the court so orders.
- 35 (b) Any person to whom confidential information is disclosed shall be  
36 advised of the confidential nature of the information and instructed that  
37 the information is to be kept confidential. All individuals should be  
38 advised that unauthorized disclosure of confidential information may  
39 subject them to a potential contempt citation.
- 40

- 1 (7) This Stipulated Protective Order may be modified or terminated by the  
2 court for good cause shown, or by signed stipulation by all of the parties  
3 who agree to this stipulation.  
4
- 5 (8) Any party for good cause may apply to the court to obtain further  
6 protection than that provided by the process of filing documents under  
7 seal.  
8
- 9 (9) The party designating information as confidential may waive any of the  
10 provisions of this Stipulated Protective Order in writing.  
11
- 12 (10) This Stipulated Protective Order shall continue to be binding after the  
13 conclusion of this action.  
14
- 15 (11) Nothing contained herein shall preclude any party to the Stipulation from  
16 seeking to secure from the Court greater protection for particular  
17 information or for relief from the Stipulation if such is deemed to be  
18 necessary by the Party.  
19
- 20 (12) Nothing in this Stipulated Protective Order shall prevent disclosure of  
21 confidential information as required by law or as compelled by any Court.  
22  
23

24 DATED: January 8, 2008  
25

26 /s/ - Michael A. Newdow

27 Attorney for Plaintiffs THE FREEDOM FROM RELIGION FOUNDATION, JAN  
28 DOE, PAT DOE, DOECHILD-1, DOECHILD-2 and DOECHILD-3.  
29

30 /s/ - Eric B. Beckenhauer

31 Attorney for Defendants THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF  
32 AMERICA and THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.  
33

34 /s/ - David Bradley

35 Attorney for Defendants THE HANOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT, THE DRESDEN  
36 SCHOOL DISTRICT and SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT 70.  
37

38 /s/ - Nancy J. Smith

39 Attorney for planned Intervenor-Defendant THE STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE.

**ORDER**

**IT IS SO ORDERED:**

DATED: \_\_\_\_\_

/s/ - C.J. McAuliffe  
U.S. District Judge  
United States District Court

1 Michael Newdow, *pro hac vice*  
2 PO Box 233345  
3 Sacramento, CA 95823  
4 (916) 427-6669

5  
6 Rosanna Fox, NH SBN: 17693  
7 O'Brien Law Firm P.C.  
8 One Sundial Avenue, Fifth Floor  
9 Manchester, NH 03103  
10 (603) 627-3800

---

11  
12  
13 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
14 **FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

15  
16 **Civil Action No. 1:07-cv-356-JM**

17  
18  
19 THE FREEDOM FROM RELIGION FOUNDATION;  
20 JAN DOE AND PAT DOE, PARENTS; DOECHILD-1, DOECHILD-2 and  
21 DOECHILD-3, MINOR CHILDREN;

22  
23 Plaintiffs,

24 v.

25  
26 THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;  
27 THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA;  
28 THE HANOVER SCHOOL DISTRICT ("HSD");  
29 THE DRESDEN SCHOOL DISTRICT ("DSD");  
30 SCHOOL ADMINISTRATIVE UNIT 70 ("SAU #70");

31  
32 Defendants.

---

33  
34  
35  
36 **MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR**  
37 **PROTECTIVE ORDER**  
38

---

1 Plaintiffs, through counsel, submit this Memorandum in Support of Plaintiffs'  
2 Motion for Protective Order.

### 3 4 **BACKGROUND**

5 This lawsuit has been filed with pseudonyms, rather than true names, for all  
6 Plaintiffs except Freedom From Religion Foundation ("FFRF"). As alleged in the  
7 Complaint, these pseudonymous Plaintiffs are all residents and citizens of  
8 Hanover, New Hampshire. This case involves objections to the use of the words,  
9 "under God," in the Pledge of Allegiance as recited in the public schools. Each of  
10 the pseudonymous Plaintiffs is a minor child enrolled in a public school where the  
11 Pledge is recited, or the parent of such a child. It is believed that disclosure of the  
12 actual and true names of either the children or their parents will subject the minor  
13 children (and their parents) to potential harm.

### 14 15 **LAW AND ARGUMENT**

16 "Judicial proceedings are supposed to be open ... in order to enable the  
17 proceedings to be monitored by the public. The concealment of a party's name  
18 impedes public access to the facts of the case, which include the parties' identity."  
19 *Doe v. City of Chicago*, 360 F.3d 667, 669 (7<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2004). Nonetheless, "[t]he  
20 presumption that parties' identities are public information, and the possible

prejudice to the opposing party from concealment, can be rebutted by showing that the harm to the plaintiff ... exceeds the likely harm from concealment. *Id.* In other words:

In cases where the plaintiffs have demonstrated a need for anonymity, the district court should use its powers to manage pretrial proceedings, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 16(b), and to issue protective orders limiting disclosure of the party's name, see Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(c), to preserve the party's anonymity to the greatest extent possible without prejudicing the opposing party's ability to litigate the case.

*Doe v. Advanced Textile Corp.*, 214 F.3d 1058, 1069 (9th Cir. 2000).

It should initially be noted that the United States Supreme Court has permitted pseudonymous filings in precisely this type of litigation. *Santa Fe Independent School District v. Doe*, 530 U.S. 290 (2000) (parents individually and as "next friends" to their children challenged prayers at public high school football games).<sup>1</sup> This Court has the authority in its discretion to enter a protective order to control discovery and protect the rights of the parties. *Doe v. Porter*, 370 F.3d 558, 560-561 (6th Cir. 2004) (upholding lower court's grant of protective order allowing the use of pseudonyms in challenge to religious instruction in schools); *Doe v. Stegall*, 653 F.2d 180 (5th Cir. 1981) (reversing lower court's denial of protective order allowing for pseudonyms. The *Stegall* court noted that "religion is perhaps the

---

<sup>1</sup> Subsequently, the high Court decided a case involving a pseudonymous filing where the justification appears to be nowhere near as compelling as in the instant action. In *City of San Diego v. Roe*, 543 U.S. 77 (2004), a police officer who was

quintessentially private matter,” and that the plaintiffs’ disclosures about their religion “have invited an opprobrium analogous to the infamy associated with criminal behavior.” *Id.*, at 186).

This Circuit has indicated that pseudonymous filings can be appropriate even when the plaintiffs are adults. *Brown v. Secretary of Health & Human Servs.*, 46 F.3d 102, 105 (n.5) (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1995) (where “[t]he district court granted named plaintiffs leave to use pseudonyms in order to protect their privacy,” apparently due solely to the plaintiffs having low income, necessitating AFDC benefits.) When children are involved, the need for protection is obviously greater. In fact, this was discussed relative to a statutory prohibition in *United States v. Three Juveniles*, 61 F.3d 86 (1<sup>st</sup> Cir. 1995).

A sister circuit has looked at this matter in some detail. Holding “that a party may preserve his or her anonymity in judicial proceedings in special circumstances when the party’s need for anonymity outweighs prejudice to the opposing party and the public’s interest in knowing the party’s identity,” *Advanced Textile*, 214 F.3d at 1068, the Ninth Circuit found three factors to be of consequence:

[I]n cases where, as here, pseudonyms are used to shield the anonymous party from retaliation, the district court should determine the need for anonymity by evaluating the following factors: (1) the severity of the threatened harm, (2) the reasonableness of the anonymous party’s fears, and (3) the anonymous party’s vulnerability to such retaliation.

---

terminated from his job because of sexually explicit videotapes he had made was permitted to file pseudonymously.

1  
2 *Id.* In the instant case, the evaluation of those factors demonstrates that need. Even  
3 the mildest threatened harm – harassment of children in the public schools –  
4 warrants the requested relief. Additionally – as the attached Exhibits show – the  
5 fears are reasonable, and each of the children (and each adult) is vulnerable to the  
6 harms.

7 Exhibit A pertains to Joann Bell, a parent who had three children enrolled in a  
8 public school district. Ms. Bell filed a federal lawsuit to stop school-sponsored  
9 prayer meetings. She has written:

10 After I filed the lawsuit, my family and I received numerous threatening  
11 telephone calls and letters. These threats promised physical harm and even  
12 death to my family members and me as a result of my involvement as a  
13 plaintiff in the lawsuit. Many of the telephone calls told me that our home  
14 would be burned. I could not even perform such simple tasks as shopping  
15 for groceries in the community without being confronted by other persons  
16 about the lawsuit.

17  
18 Additionally, when she responded to a bomb threat at her children’s school,  
19 “several school employees circled the car. One of the employees grabbed me by  
20 the hair of the head and battered my head against the frame of the car’s door.”

21 After the family’s home “was burned in a fire of suspicious origin,” the family  
22 moved from the school district “motivated by a grave concern for the safety of our  
23 family.” Exhibit A.

24 Megan Black – a third grader – was grabbed and yanked by her public school  
25 teacher for not reciting the now-religious Pledge of Allegiance. This was followed

1 by more than two years of taunts and harassment by her fellow students, which did  
2 not end until she changed schools. Exhibit B.

3 Bailey Wood was pushed up against a building by a classmate who made the  
4 sign of the cross, was called a “monkey” because she believed in evolution, and  
5 was called “stupid” because she didn’t believe in God. This apparently all stemmed  
6 from the fact that her atheism was exposed when she didn’t say the words, “under  
7 God,” in the Pledge. Exhibit C.

8 “I dreaded the first day of school each and every year,” writes Abigail  
9 Schweter, because her not saying the Pledge as a child resulted in her being  
10 “ostracized” and risked a “confrontation with the teacher.” Exhibit D.

11 Ellen Janowitz was “frequently ridiculed in front of the class” by her teacher,  
12 because she could not, in good conscience, recite the entire Pledge. At age 15, she  
13 suffered “stares and silence of my fellow students [that] were excruciating [and]  
14 are still painful to recall” twenty years later. Exhibit E.

15 A book written by Professor Frank Ravitch of the Michigan State University  
16 College of Law details numerous other cases involving religious outsiders.<sup>2</sup> For  
17 instance, the Herdahls were a Lutheran family in a Southern Baptist Mississippi  
18 town. When the Herdahl children did not participate in “decidedly Southern  
19 Baptist” public school prayers, they were harassed by “[b]oth teachers and

1 students.” When the family filed suit to stop this clearly unlawful practice, “the  
2 harassment got even worse. Her family received bomb threats. She received a  
3 death threat, and the name calling and ridicule worsened.”<sup>3</sup>

4 A second story recounted by Professor Ravitch concerned individuals in  
5 Alabama. The Herrings were “a Jewish family whose children had been subjected  
6 to severe religious discrimination and harassment in school.” The children “were  
7 physically assaulted by classmates because of their religion; swastikas were drawn  
8 on their lockers, bookbags, and jackets; and they were regularly taunted by the  
9 other children.” The mother, in a sworn statement to the Court, stated:

10 Every day that I send my children to Pike County schools, I wonder if I am  
11 sending them into a war zone. ... The consequences of the school environment  
12 on my children’s psyches are devastating. My children are growing up  
13 believing that America is a caste society and they are untouchables – except for  
14 the purpose of getting beaten up. One child suffered “serious nightmares.”<sup>4</sup>  
15

16 “Rachel Bauchman, a Jewish high school student, objected to overtly religious  
17 songs, which were sung at high school graduations by the high school choir of  
18 which she was a member. ... Rachel obtained a court order prohibiting the  
19 graduation songs. However, at the urging of parents and some students, the choir  
20 performed one of the religious songs anyway. ... When Rachel and her mother got

---

<sup>2</sup> Ravitch FS. *School Prayer and Discrimination: The Civil Rights of Religious Minorities and Dissenters*. (Northeastern University Press: Boston, 2001).

<sup>3</sup> *Id.*, at 8-9.

<sup>4</sup> *Id.*, at 9-11.

up to leave – Rachel in tears – parents and students in the audience jeered and spat on them.”<sup>5</sup>

The proposed ORDER provides Defendants with adequate means of ascertaining the residency status, taxpayer status, or school enrollment status of the Plaintiffs. Discovery, if needed, can also be accomplished under the proposed ORDER while preserving Defendants’ rights.

### CONCLUSION

Good cause having been shown, Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court preserve the anonymity of the Plaintiffs by entering a protective order.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ - Michael Newdow

Michael Newdow, *pro hac vice*  
Counsel for Plaintiffs  
PO Box 233345  
Sacramento CA 95823

Phone: (916) 427-6669

E-mail: [NewdowLaw@gmail.com](mailto:NewdowLaw@gmail.com)

January 8, 2008

/s/ - Rosanna Fox

Rosanna Fox, NH SBN: 17693  
O’Brien Law Firm, P.C.  
One Sundial Avenue, #510  
Manchester, NH 03103

Phone: (603) 627-3800

E-mail: [rosief13@comcast.net](mailto:rosief13@comcast.net)

---

<sup>5</sup> Id., at 11-12.

1                   **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
2                   **FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW HAMPSHIRE**

3  
4                   **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

5  
6                   **Civil Action No. 1:07-cv-356-JM**

7  
8                   **Freedom From Religion Foundation v. U.S. Congress**  
9

10 I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copies of

- 11  
12                   (1) PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER  
13                   (2) STIPULATED PROTECTIVE ORDER  
14                   (3) MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR  
15                   PROTECTIVE ORDER  
16                   (4) EXHIBITS ACCOMPANYING MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF  
17                   PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER  
18

19 were provided by electronic service to the Clerk of the Court via CM/ECF on this  
20 8<sup>th</sup> day of January, 2008. Uncertain at this time as to whether or not the Clerk is  
21 forwarding material to the following email addresses, email notification was also  
22 provided directly to:

23  
24                   United States Defendants: [eric.beckenhauer@usdoj.gov](mailto:eric.beckenhauer@usdoj.gov)

25  
26                   School District Defendants: [dbradley@stebbinsbradley.com](mailto:dbradley@stebbinsbradley.com)

27  
28                   State of New Hampshire: [Nancy.Smith@doj.nh.gov](mailto:Nancy.Smith@doj.nh.gov)  
29

30  
31                   January 8, 2008

/s/ Michael Newdow

32  
33                   Michael Newdow  
34                   PO Box 233345  
35                   Sacramento CA 92823  
36                   916-427-6669

37  
38                   [NewdowLaw@gmail.com](mailto:NewdowLaw@gmail.com)  
39