



MEDIA ADVISORY

Release Number: 30

Release Date: October 5, 2006

JUDICIAL COUNCIL OF
CALIFORNIA
ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
OF THE COURTS
Public Information Office
455 Golden Gate Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94102-3688
www.courtinfo.ca.gov

415-865-7740

Lynn Holton
Public Information Officer

Court of Appeal to File Opinion In Same-Sex Marriage Cases Today at 2 p.m.

San Francisco – The Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Three, today issued a Notice of Forthcoming Filing that announces that the court intends to file a written opinion in six coordinated same-sex marriage cases today at 2:00 p.m. (*Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding No. 4365.*)

At the time of filing, the opinion will be available on the California Courts Web site at this link:

[\(http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courts/courtsfappeal/1stDistrict/\)](http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courts/courtsfappeal/1stDistrict/).

The complete text of the court's Notice of Forthcoming Filing is attached.

#

**COURT OF APPEAL
FIRST APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION THREE**

NOTICE OF FORTHCOMING FILING

The Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, Division Three, has indicated that a written opinion in the following appeals will be filed on Thursday, October 5, 2006, at 2:00 p.m. At that time, the filed opinion will be posted to the California Courts Web site (<http://www.courtinfo.ca.gov/courts/courts/appeal/1stDistrict/>).

In re MARRIAGE CASES.

{Six consolidated appeals.}
(JCCP No. 4365)

The six consolidated appeals are:

A110449 *City and County of San Francisco v. State of California*

A110450 *Tyler v. State of California*

A110451 *Woo v. Lockyer*

A110463 *Clinton v. State of California*

A110651 *Proposition 22 Legal Defense and Education Fund v. City and County of San Francisco*

A110652 *Campaign for California Families v. Newsom*

The appeals, which arose from a Judicial Council Coordination Proceeding, present the issue of whether California Family Code provisions defining marriage as the union of a man and a woman (Fam. Code, §§ 300, 308.5) are unconstitutional.