

LAW OFFICES OF
CARR & CARR

A PARTNERSHIP OF PROFESSIONAL CORPORATIONS
LANSDOWNE PROFESSIONAL PARK
44135 WOODRIDGE PARKWAY, SUITE 260
LEESBURG, VIRGINIA 20176-1244
Email: Northvajim@aol.com

JAMES E. CARR, P.C.
ANN B. CARR, P.C..

Phone: (703) 777-9150
Facsimile : (703) 726-0125

November 24, 2010

BY HAND

Ms. Caitlin Fields, Law Clerk to the Honorable Randy I. Bellows
Judges' Chambers, Circuit Court of Fairfax County
Fairfax Judicial Center, 5th Floor
4110 Chain Bridge Rd
Fairfax, Virginia 22030-4009

In Re: *Multi-Circuit Church Property Litigation*
(Omnibus Case No. CL 2007-0248724)

Dear Ms. Fields:

Enclosed are copies of the Brief of the Church of Our Saviour As To Scheduling Order Issues filed this date in the omnibus case and the cover sheets filed in the following cases:

1. *The Episcopal Church v. Truro Church et al.* (Circuit Court of Fairfax County; CL 2007-1625);
2. *The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia v. Church of Our Saviour at Oatlands* (Circuit Court of Loudoun County Case No. 44148) (Circuit Court of Fairfax County; CL 2007-5364);

Best regards.

Very truly yours,

James E. Carr

JEC/tlc
enclosures

Ms. Caitlin Fields, Law Clerk to the Honorable Randy I. Bellows
Circuit Court of Fairfax County
Re: Multi-Circuit Church Property Litigation
(Case No. CL 2007-0248724)
November 24, 2010
Page 2 of 2

cc:

Bradfute W. Davenport, Jr., Esq.
George A. Somerville, Esq.
Joshua D. Heslinga, Esq.
Heather H. Anderson, Esq.
Mary E. Kostel, Esq.
Soyong Cho, Esq.
Adam Chud, Esq.
Mary C. Zinsner, Esq.
Scott H. Phillips, Esq.
Paul N. Farquharson, Esq.
James A. Johnson, Esq.
R. Hunter Manson, Esq.
E. Andrew Burcher, Esq.
Thomas C. Palmer, Esq.
Gordon A. Coffee, Esq.
Steffen N. Johnson, Esq.
Gene C. Schaerr, Esq.
Andrew C. Nichols, Esq.
Scott J. Ward, Esq.
Timothy R. Obitts, Esq.
Dawn W. Sikorski, Esq.
George O. Peterson, Esq.
Tania M.L. Saylor, Esq.
Mary A. McReynolds, Esq.
Robert C. Dunn, Esq.
E. Duncan Getchell, Esq.

LAW OFFICES OF
CARR & CARR

A PARTNERSHIP OF PROFESSIONAL CORPORATIONS

LANSDOWNE PROFESSIONAL PARK
44135 WOODRIDGE PARKWAY, SUITE 260
LEESBURG, VIRGINIA 20176-1244

Email: Northvajim@aol.com

JAMES E. CARR, P.C.
ANN B. CARR, P.C..

Phone: (703) 777-9150
Facsimile : (703) 726-0125

November 24, 2010

BY HAND

Office of the Clerk
Circuit Court of Fairfax County
Fairfax Judicial Center
4110 Chain Bridge Rd
Fairfax, Virginia 22030-4009

In Re: *Multi-Circuit Church Property Litigation*
(Omnibus Case No. CL 2007-0248724)

Ladies/Gentlemen:


Enclosed for filing in the Omnibus Case No. CL 2007-0248724, is an original Brief of The Church of Our Saviour at Oatlands As To Scheduling Order Issues, along with original Cover Sheets for filing in Case Nos.:

1. *The Episcopal Church v. Truro Church et al.* (Circuit Court of Fairfax County; CL 2007-1625);
2. *The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia v. Church of Our Saviour at Oatlands* (Circuit Court of Loudoun County Case No. 44,148) (Circuit Court of Fairfax County; CL 2007-5364);

If you have any questions concerning the foregoing, please advise.

Best regards.

Very truly yours,



James E. Carr

JEC/tlc
enclosures

Office of the Clerk
Circuit Court of Fairfax County
Re: Multi-Circuit Church Property Litigation
(Case No. CL 2007-0248724)
November 24, 2010
Page 2 of 2

cc:

Ms. Caitlin Fields, Law Clerk to the Honorable Randy I. Bellows
Bradfute W. Davenport, Jr., Esq.
George A. Somerville, Esq.
Joshua D. Heslinga, Esq.
Heather H. Anderson, Esq.
Mary E. Kostel, Esq.
Soyong Cho, Esq.
Adam Chud, Esq.
Mary C. Zinsner, Esq.
Scott H. Phillips, Esq.
Paul N. Farquharson, Esq.
James A. Johnson, Esq.
R. Hunter Manson, Esq.
E. Andrew Burcher, Esq.
Thomas C. Palmer, Esq.
Gordon A. Coffee, Esq.
Steffen N. Johnson, Esq.
Gene C. Schaerr, Esq.
Andrew C. Nichols, Esq.
Scott J. Ward, Esq.
Timothy R. Obitts, Esq.
Dawn W. Sikorski, Esq.
George O. Peterson, Esq.
Tania M.L. Saylor, Esq.
Mary A. McReynolds, Esq.
Robert C. Dunn, Esq.
E. Duncan Getchell, Esq.

VIRGINIA:

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF FAIRFAX COUNTY

IN RE: MULTI-CIRCUIT CHURCH
PROPERTY LITIGATION

Civil Case Number:

CL 2007- 0248724

FILED IN: Multi-Circuit Church Property Litigation CL2007-0248724; *The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia v. Church of Our Saviour at Oatlands* (No. CL 2007-5364); and *The Episcopal Church v. Truro Church et al.*, (No. CL 2007-1625).

**BRIEF OF THE CHURCH OF OUR SAVIOUR
AT OATLANDS AS TO SCHEDULING ORDER ISSUES**

COMES NOW the Defendant and Counterclaimant, the Church of Our Saviour at Oatlands, (hereinafter also referred to as "Our Saviour"), and for its Brief as to Scheduling Order Issues states as follows:

1. The Episcopal Diocese of Virginia has proposed a scheduling order in this case. That Order does not contemplate the grant of Our Saviour's Motion for Separate Trial. Counsel for all parties have used the Episcopal Diocese's Order as a base line for discussions in an attempt to resolve a number of disputed issues. The latest version of that proposed Order is attached and paragraphs thereof will be referenced in this brief. In the Motion for Separate Trial filed contemporaneously herewith the Church of Our Saviour at Oatlands has made its points in support of its request that it be awarded a bench trial of up to two days duration, separate and apart from and in advance of the trials of the other CANA Congregations. In the event Our Saviour's Motion for Separate Trial is granted, appropriate reflection can be made in paragraph 6

of the proposed Order, using such language as the Court deems appropriate. This brief will address two issues other than the separate trial issue. Those two issues remain after counsel's compromise of numerous other items in the Episcopal Diocese's proposed scheduling Order. The first issue is rendered moot for Our Saviour if the Court grants Our Saviour's Motion for a Separate Trial. The second issue is applicable regardless of whether Our Saviour's Motion for a Separate Trial is granted.

3. The first issue concerns the matter of the scheduling and ordering of trial among the various parties, if Our Saviour's Motion for Separate Trial is denied.

Assume that as a first stage of the trial process, the Episcopal Diocese of Virginia and the TEC is permitted to proceed with their requested "general evidence" trial against all of the CANA Congregations, including Our Saviour. According to the estimates given at the hearing on November 12, this would be a stage consuming a total of 6 days. Assume further this stage was concluded, and it was time for evidence to be presented specific to individual Congregations. If understood correctly from the statements made on November 12, the Diocese and TEC would be presenting against each Congregation seriatim on designated dates, to allow certainty as to the timing of witnesses and other matters. Also, if understood correctly from statements at the hearing on November 12, this process is anticipated to consume a week for each side, or a total of two weeks. Finally, assume that the consolidated trials of the other CANA Congregations would be presented first, and only after those trials were completed would the trial of Our Saviour be held. During those trials of the other CANA Congregations, there would be points of law continually being argued and determined: in connection with issues in voir dire or formulation of jury instructions, in qualifying experts, in objecting to the admission of particular testimony or types of documents, etc. In each instance, a determination of that particular matter

would be creating precedent for a decision on the same or a similar matter in the separate trial of Our Saviour which would follow. That being the practical consequence, it would seem a due process right and necessity for the undersigned counsel to have the opportunity to object, argue or otherwise interpose to protect the interests of Our Saviour on such matters as they arose, even though the immediate case was not that of Our Saviour. As a practical matter this would be an awkward exercise, and particularly so, if the other CANA Congregations are conducting a consolidated jury trial.

It is submitted that the solution for this dilemma lies in having the jury stay home for a day or two, following the presentation of the "common evidence" stage, while the case of Our Saviour is dealt with first. In the course of that comparatively brief non-jury trial, counsel for the other CANA Congregations could appear and interpose on the foregoing issues as they deemed appropriate.

4. The second issue concerns the topic of discovery (paragraph 8 in the Diocese's proposed Order).

In 2007, Our Saviour propounded very specific discovery requests to the Episcopal Diocese of Virginia and TEC concerning declaratory judgment matters. These included Requests for Admission, Interrogatories and Requests for Production of Documents. To date Our Saviour has received insufficient responses. These insufficiencies were detailed by letter and then discussed with opposing counsel, without resolution. A motion to compel was ultimately filed in August, 2008, and objection was made to the filing of the pleading for excessive page length. The motion was then struck by the Court for that reason, with leave granted to refile. Within a week of that ruling the landscape in the 57-9 case changed, declaratory judgment discovery was shut down, and the motion was not refiled. The matter of the insufficient

responses to the declaratory judgment discovery of Our Saviour still lingers. That matter has been re-discussed with counsel for the Diocese. But It appears from those discussions that the position of the Episcopal Diocese and TEC remains the same. In light of this fact, the undersigned is prepared to file a more abbreviated version of the same motion to compel as soon the Court formally lifts the stay on discovery. Relevant to this intended enforcement of the aforesaid discovery is the following provision in the proposed scheduling Order of the Diocese:

With respect to discovery requests served prior to the Court's suspension of discovery in its September 3, 2008, Order, if the propounding party contends that the responding party's responses are inadequate or seeks responses to requests for which responses have not been served, the propounding party shall serve a notice of such inadequacy on the responding party. Such notice shall identify the discovery for which further response is sought, state the reasons such responses are inadequate, and request further response. Unless otherwise agreed, the responding party shall have 21 days from the date of service of such notice to respond further.

Noting the foregoing provision in the initial proposed scheduling Order of the Diocese, the undersigned conducted a full re-review of all responses made to the declaratory judgment discovery propounded by Our Saviour and a full re-review of the insufficiencies claimed by Our Saviour in the motion to compel filed in August, 2008. Upon completion of this exercise the undersigned sent an email to counsel for the Diocese stating:

All of the requests for admission, interrogatories and requests for production of documents that are the subject of my Motion to compel appear to be still highly relevant to the declaratory judgment proceedings now before us. I also see nothing that has occurred to date which would materially change the points made in my Motion..

In light of the fact that the Church of Our Saviour at Oatlands has already indicated in verbal discussions, by email, and in the instant brief that it has the same carryover issues that it stated in its detailed motion filed in August, 2008, and the matter has been discussed between counsel, both verbally and in writing, on several occasions in 2008, and has been discussed within the past few weeks with counsel for the Diocese, all with no resolution, Our Saviour

properly should be allowed to proceed with the prosecution of its Motion without further delay. A requirement that Our Saviour file a notice that has already been given and then be delayed a further twenty one days before being able to file a motion to compel, would appear simply a time buying mechanism for the Episcopal Diocese of Virginia and TEC. It is submitted that in order to properly prepare for trial, and be able to bring on appropriate dispositive motions in advance of trial, Our Saviour needs to obtain early on the fundamental information which is contemplated by the discovery process. Accordingly, Our Saviour would request that the foregoing provision in the proposed scheduling Order of the Diocese either be omitted, or if included, that Our Saviour be allowed to proceed with its motion to compel notwithstanding. The Diocese and TEC will have the time to and through the filing of Our Saviour's Motion after April 17, 2010, and further up to the date of the hearing upon the motion, to consider and address with the undersigned a resolution of the matters set forth in that motion.

WHEREFORE, the Church of Our Saviour at Oatlands prays for the Court's consideration and action upon the foregoing matters in the course of finalizing a scheduling order.

Respectfully submitted,

CHURCH OF OUR SAVIOUR AT OATLANDS

By: _____

James E. Carr, Esquire, VSB# 014567
CARR & CARR
44135 Woodridge Parkway, Suite 260
Leesburg, Virginia 20176
703-777-9150 Phone
703-726-0125 Facsimile
northvajim@aol.com

*Counsel for Church of Our Saviour at Oatlands
And Related Trustees*

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that on the 24th day of November, 2010 he caused all counsel to be served with copies of the foregoing Brief as to Scheduling Order Issues, and cover sheet for filing, by electronic mail to the listed counsel of record and to lead counsel by first class postage prepaid mail:

Bradfute W. Davenport, Jr., Esq. (lead counsel)
brad.davenport@troutmansanders.com
George A. Somerville, Esq.
george.somerville@troutmansanders.com
Joshua D. Heslinga, Esq.
Joshua.Heslinga@troutmansanders.com
TROUTMAN SANDERS, LLP
P.O. Box 1122
Richmond, VA 23218

Mary C. Zinsner, Esq.
mary.zinsner@troutmansanders.com
TROUTMAN SANDERS, LLP
1660 International Drive, Suite 600
McLean, VA 22102

Thomas C. Palmer, Esq.(lead counsel)
TPalmer@TheBraultFirm.com
BRAULT PALMER GROVE
WHITE & STEINHILBER, LLP
3554 Chain Bridge Rd, Suite 400
Fairfax, VA 22030-1010

E. Andrew Burcher, Esq.(lead counsel)
eaburcher@thelandlawyers.com
WALSH, COLUCCI, LUBELEY,
EMRICH & WALSH, PC
4310 Prince William Pkwy
Suite 300
Prince William, Virginia 22192

Mary E. Kostel, Esq. (lead counsel)
MKostel@goodwinproctor.com
Soyong Cho, Esq.
scho@goodwinproctor.com
Adam Chud, Esq. (pro hac vice)
achud@goodwinprocter.com
GOODWIN PROCTER, LLP
901 New York Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001

Heather H. Anderson, Esq.
Heather H. Anderson, P.C.
handersonlaw@gmail.com
P.O. Box 50158
Arlington, VA 22205

R. Hunter Manson, Esq. (lead counsel)
manson@kaballero.com
PO Box 539
876 Main Street
Reedville, Virginia 22539

James A. Johnson, Esq.(lead counsel)
JJohnson@semmes.com
Paul N. Farquharson, Esq.
PFarquharson@semmes.com
Scott H. Phillips, Esq.
SPhillips@semmes.com
SEMME BOWEN & SEMMES, PC
Suite 1400
25 South Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21201

Gordon A. Coffee, Esq. (lead counsel)
GCoffee@winston.com
Steffen N. Johnson, Esq.
SJohnson@winston.com
Gene C. Schaerr, Esq.
Gschaerr@winston.com
Andrew C. Nichols, Esq.
ANichols@winston.com
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP
1700 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Scott J. Ward, Esq. (lead counsel)
SJW@GG-Law.com
Timothy R. Obitts, Esq.
TRO@GG-Law.com
Dawn W. Sikorski, Esq.
DWS@GG-Law.com
GAMMON & GRANGE, PC
8280 Greensboro Drive
7th Floor
McLean, Virginia 22102

E. Duncan Getchell, Esq. (lead counsel)
dgetchell@oag.state.va.us
Stephen R. McCullough, Esq.
SMcCullough@oag.state.va.us
Office of the Attorney General
900 East Main Street
Richmond, Virginia 23219


George O. Peterson, Esq. (lead counsel)
GPeterson@petersonsaylor.com
Tania M.L. Saylor, Esq.
tsaylor@petersonsaylor.com
Peterson Saylor, PLC
4163 Chain Bridge Road
Fairfax, VA 22030

Mary A. McReynolds, Esq. (lead counsel)
Mary A. McReynolds, PC
MaryMcReynolds@mac.com
1050 Connecticut Ave, NW
10th Floor
Washington, DC 20036

Robert C. Dunn, Esq. (lead counsel)
rdunn@robdunnlaw.com
Law Office of Robert C. Dunn
707 Prince Street
PO Box 117
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-0117

With a copy by electronic mail and hand-delivered to:

Ms. Caitlin Fields
Law Clerk to the Honorable Randy I. Bellows
Circuit Court of Fairfax County
Fairfax Judicial Center
4110 Chain Bridge Road
Fifth Floor Judges' Chambers
Fairfax, VA 22030-4009
Caitlin.Fields@fairfaxcounty.gov



James E. Carr, Esquire

EXHIBIT 1 - EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF VIRGINIA'S PROPOSED SCHEDULING ORDER
AS REVISED THROUGH NOVEMBER 23, 2010

VIRGINIA:

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF FAIRFAX COUNTY

In re Multi-Circuit Episcopal Church Property Litigation:)	Case Nos.: CL 2007-248724,
)	
)	CL 2007-1235,
)	CL 2007-1236,
)	CL 2007-1238,
)	CL 2007-1625,
)	CL 2007-5250,
)	CL 2007-5364,
)	CL 2007-5682,
)	CL 2007-5683,
)	CL 2007-5684, and
)	CL 2007-5902

ORDER

This Order shall apply to the following cases:

Omnibus case: CL 2007-248724;

The Episcopal Church v. Truro Church, et al.: CL 2007-1625;

*The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia v. Church of the
Epiphany, Herndon, et al.: CL 2007-1235;*

*The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia v. Truro Church, et al.:
CL 2007-1236;*

*The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia v. Church of the
Apostles, et al.: CL 2007-1238;*

*The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia v. The Church at the
Falls - The Falls Church, et al.: CL 2007-5250;*

*The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia v. Church of Our Savior
at Oatlands, et al.: CL 2007-5364;*

*The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia v. St. Margaret's
Church, et al.: CL 2007-5682;*

*The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia v. St. Paul's Church,
Haymarket, et al.: CL 2007-5683;*

*The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia v. Church of the Word,
et al.: CL 2007-5684; and*

*The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia, et al. v. St. Stephen's
Church, et al.: CL 2007-5902.*

For good cause shown, the Court orders the following:

1. Service of Pleadings & Other Papers to Be Served

All service of pleadings and other papers required to be served per Va. Sup. Ct. R. 1:12 in this matter shall be effected by (i) mailing a copy of the pleading, filing, etc. via first class mail to the designated lead counsel at each firm of record, and (ii) sending an electronic correspondence (“e-mail”) to all counsel of record with an attachment of the particular pleading, filing, etc. With respect to large and/or lengthy pleadings and exhibits or other papers, counsel shall use their best efforts to effect service by e-mail, including (if necessary) sending such pleadings and/or exhibits in multiple e-mails such that no attachment to an e-mail exceeds 10 megabytes in size. If a document cannot be e-mailed, the party serving such document shall notify opposing counsel by e-mail of such fact and send the document by overnight delivery to lead counsel on the opposing side.

2. Electronic Correspondence (“e-mail”)

All counsel of record who have not previously provided the Court a current e-mail address are ordered promptly to do so. E-mail addresses may be sent to the Court’s law clerk, Ms. Caitlin Fields, at Caitlin.Fields@fairfaxcounty.gov. All counsel of record should be included in all electronic correspondence with Ms. Fields if it pertains to this matter.

3. Filing Procedures

- (a) All filings, motions, briefs, memoranda, etc. should be filed with the Clerk of Court, attention [Mr/Ms.]_____. When a pleading or other filing pertains to more than one case, counsel are required to file only one complete copy of such pleading, filing, etc. The copy should list all appropriate case numbers which to which it applies. This complete filing will be filed in the omnibus case file.

Counsel also shall file the appropriate number of copies of a coversheet reference pleading corresponding to the number of cases to which the filing relates, not including the omnibus case file, which will be filed in each other case file to which the complete filing corresponds. For example, if a brief is filed in three individual cases, the original brief shall be filed in the omnibus case file, CL 2007-248724, and counsel shall provide three copies of a coversheet, which shall make reference to the pleading filed in the omnibus case file and shall include the following information from that pleading: its full title / name, the complete case style and case numbers listed on it, and the date of the filing. Coversheets need not and shall not contain their own certificates of service, and counsel shall use their best efforts to ensure that coversheets are no more than one page in length.

Counsel shall also send courtesy copies of all filings to the Court’s law clerk, Ms. Fields. Unless the Court requests otherwise, a courtesy copy must be

delivered to her attention in Circuit Court Chambers and shall also be e-mailed to Ms. Fields's attention at the e-mail address above.

- (b) The text of all filings, including all footnotes, must be in at least twelve (12) point type font. The margins of all filings must be standard one inch margins.
- (c) The style of each filing should include the omnibus style and corresponding case number and the case numbers of each individual case to which the filing relates. All filings should indicate the party or parties on whose behalf the filing is made at the beginning of the filing.
- (d) The parties shall adhere to the page limitations set forth in the Fairfax County Circuit Court manual absent leave from the Court. The Court may direct, or a party may request, extended briefing on particular issues, with page limitations set at that time. If any party believes it needs more than five (5) pages to brief any particular motion or issue, or additional pages beyond another limit set by the Court, it shall seek leave for such extended briefing through a letter of request filed with the clerk and copied to Ms. Fields, to which the Court will respond in due course.
- (e) Each party may file its own motions, memoranda/briefs, pleadings, and/or other papers, or it may choose to adopt the position articulated in another party's filing. When a party chooses to adopt a position advanced in another party's filing, this may be reflected either by (i) submitting a separate filing with the Court stating that the particular party chooses to adopt another party's position, or (ii) including a reference in the adopted filing stating which parties are adopting such filing or position. Motions, memoranda/briefs, pleadings, and/or other papers adopted by other parties should include a reference at the beginning of the document that lists the parties who are adopting the filing. At the end of the filing, the attorney who is submitting the filing should include his or her signature block and signature. The adopting parties' signature block should also be included at the end of the filing. The adopting attorneys may do one of the following to satisfy the signature requirement and to preserve rights and objections: (i) sign the filing in their appropriate signature block (the Court will accept faxed or scanned signatures, if necessary), or (ii) give permission to the submitting attorney required to sign the filing to also sign the filing on the adopting attorney's behalf.

4. Attendance At Hearings

Should a party desire to file a written response or memorandum, but not participate at a hearing, the party may file its memorandum and not attend the hearing.

5. Trial Dates

[The parties disagree about what the scheduling order should say about trial order / evidence presentation. Their respective positions will be detailed in the briefs being filed pursuant to the Court's direction at the hearing on November 12, 2010.]

The Court reserves the following dates for trial of the above cases: _____.

The "Trial Start Date," as used in this Order, is the first date of trial of the above cases, regardless of what evidence may be presented on that date or to what church/congregation such evidence may pertain.

6. Prior Trial Evidence

No party shall be required to re-authenticate any document previously admitted into evidence.

Any party which intends to rely on evidence which has previously been admitted in this matter must file and serve a specific designation of such evidence on counsel for all parties to the trial to which such evidence will be applied, no later than twenty-eight (28) days before the Trial Start Date. Objections to such evidence must be served no later than twenty-one (21) days before the Trial Start Date, including relevance objections, or such objections shall be waived.

7. Dispositive motions

All dispositive motions shall be presented to the Court for hearing as far in advance of the trial date as practical and must be filed no later than forty-five (45) days before the Trial Start Date.

8. Discovery

Discovery concerning all issues related to this litigation may resume immediately upon entry of this Order. The parties shall complete discovery by forty (40) days before the Trial Start Date and shall complete depositions by thirty (30) days before the Trial Start Date. "Complete" means that all interrogatories, requests for production of documents, requests for admissions, and other discovery requests must be served sufficiently in advance of trial to allow a timely response by at least forty (40) days before the Trial Start Date. Depositions taken in lieu of live testimony at trial shall be completed no later than twenty (20) days before the Trial Start Date. Depositions may be taken after the specified time period by agreement of counsel of record or for good cause shown, provided, however, that the taking of a deposition after the deadline established herein shall not provide a basis for continuance of the trial date or the scheduling of motions inconsistent with the normal procedures of the Court.

The fact that a person was deposed previously in this litigation shall not excuse such person from being deposed a second time in connection with the remaining actions.

Counsel shall make all reasonable efforts to consolidate depositions and thereby to avoid burden and inconvenience to party and third-party witnesses. This paragraph does not preclude any party or recipient of a subpoena from objecting to a particular deposition and seeking relief from this Court regarding such deposition.

Joint discovery requests are encouraged whenever practicable. All discovery must clearly indicate on its face the party or parties to whom the discovery request is made. If discovery is directed at more than one party, each party has an obligation to respond to the discovery request, in accordance with the Rules of the Supreme Court of Virginia. Should parties serve separate but substantively identical discovery requests, the responding party or parties may respond jointly, but such responses must specifically and clearly identify all discovery being responded to and the party or parties responding.

While the individual defendants have not been and will continue not to be served with discovery, the CANA Congregations will continue to seek, obtain, and produce from the persons identified in Exhibits A&B of the Stipulated Order entered August 28, 2007, such materials as may be responsive to the discovery served on the congregations. This paragraph does not preclude either depositions of individual defendants, clergy, or vestry members, or the service of subpoenas duces tecum on individual defendants, clergy, or vestry members. This paragraph also does not preclude parties, individual defendants, clergy, or vestry members from objecting to and/or seeking relief from this Court regarding any particular discovery requests or subpoenas.

If discovery requests are made or have been made in connection with particular cases, responses to those discovery requests and documents or materials produced in response to those discovery requests may be used in any of the proceedings before this Court, to the extent that the responses, documents, or materials meet the requirements of law with respect to evidence. Any party's responses to requests for admissions may continue to be used in any case involving that party. Depositions and other discovery previously taken in these consolidated actions may be used in the remaining actions.

With respect to discovery requests served prior to the Court's suspension of discovery in its September 3, 2008, Order, if the propounding party contends that the responding party's responses are inadequate or seeks responses to requests for which responses have not been served, the propounding party shall serve a notice of such inadequacy on the responding party. Such notice shall identify the discovery for which further response is sought, state the reasons such responses are inadequate, and request further response. Unless otherwise agreed, the responding party shall have 21 days from the date of service of such notice to respond further. ***[The Church of Our Saviour at Oatlands opposes this paragraph.]***

The parties have a duty to supplement timely and amend discovery responses, per Va. Sup. Ct. R. 4:1(e).

No provision of this Order supersedes the Rules of Supreme Court of Virginia governing discovery.

9. Designation of Experts

Plaintiffs and counterclaimants shall identify expert witnesses on or before 91 days before the Trial Start Date. Opposing experts shall be identified on or before 60 days before the Trial Start Date. Experts or opinions responsive to new matters raised in the opposing parties' identification of experts shall be designated no later than 45 days before the Trial Start Date. All information discoverable under Rule 4:1(b)(4)(A)(1) of the Rules of Supreme Court of Virginia shall be provided, or the expert will not ordinarily be permitted to express any non-disclosed opinions at trial. The foregoing deadlines shall not relieve a party of the obligation to respond to discovery requests within the time periods set forth in the Rules of Supreme Court of Virginia, including, in particular, the duty to supplement or amend prior responses pursuant to Rule 4:1(e).

10. Exhibit and Witness Lists

Counsel of record shall exchange _____ () days before the Trial Start Date lists specifically identifying the fact witnesses that they may call for trial. The list of witnesses shall include a brief summary of the subject matter of the expected testimony and/or nature of the testimony, and such witnesses shall be made available for deposition prior to the discovery cutoff. ***[The parties disagree on the timing of this provision. TEC and the Diocese have proposed 84 days. The CANA Congregations, other than the Church of Our Saviour at Oatlands, have proposed 70 days.]***

Counsel of record shall exchange fifty-six (56) days before the Trial Start Date lists specifically identifying each exhibit that may be offered at trial. ***[The parties' respective positions on this provision will be detailed in the briefs being filed pursuant to the Court's direction at the hearing on November 12, 2010.]***

Counsel of record shall exchange twenty-eight (28) days before the Trial Start Date a final list of witnesses to be called at trial, a final list specifically identifying each exhibit to be introduced at trial, and copies of all listed exhibits. If filed on behalf of more than one Congregation, final lists of witnesses and exhibits shall clearly indicate (with headings or otherwise) to which congregations each of the listed witnesses and exhibits relate. ***[The parties' respective positions on the second sentence of this paragraph will be detailed in the briefs being filed pursuant to the Court's direction at the hearing on November 12, 2010.]***

The final lists of exhibits and witnesses shall be filed with the Clerk of the Court simultaneously therewith but the exhibits shall not then be filed. Any exhibit or witness not so identified and filed will not be received in evidence, except in rebuttal or for impeachment or unless the admission of such exhibit or testimony of the witness would cause no surprise or prejudice to the opposing party and the failure to

list the exhibit or witness was through inadvertence. Any objections to exhibits or witnesses shall state the legal reasons therefor except on relevancy grounds, and shall be filed with the Clerk of the Court and a copy delivered to opposing counsel at least twenty-one (21) days before the Trial Start Date or the objections will be deemed waived absent leave of court for good cause shown.

11. Pretrial Conference and Motions in Limine

Pursuant to Rule 1:19, there shall be a final pre-trial conference on _____.

Motions *in limine* or other pretrial motions shall be filed no later than fourteen (14) days before the Trial Start Date. Oppositions to such motions must be filed within seven (7) days after such motions are filed. Such motions *in limine* or other pretrial motions may be heard at dates scheduled by the Court upon application of the parties or may be decided at trial, as the Court sees fit, or may be decided without a hearing with the consent of all parties interested in such motions.

12. Good Faith Efforts to Resolve Motions and Stipulations

Stipulations of fact previously entered into by two or more parties remain binding on those parties and may be introduced in evidence if they have not previously been introduced.

The Court appreciates counsel's prior efforts to enter into stipulations, which were generally successful, and strongly encourages counsel for all parties to reach stipulations that streamline the presentation of evidence and/or narrow the issues to be decided. In particular, the Court is mindful that, although evidence regarding the "dealings between the parties" may be extensive (particularly for churches whose history dates back more than 100 years), in many instances the parties will dispute not the actual historical facts or documents but their relevance or legal significance. Accordingly, and in the interests of judicial economy, the parties are encouraged to streamline the presentation of evidence through stipulations.

13. Witness Subpoenas

Subpoenas should be served at least ten (10) days before the Trial Start Date.

14. Continuances

Continuances will only be granted by the Court for good cause shown.

15. Deposition Transcripts to be Used at Trial:

- (a) The parties shall exchange deposition designations no later than twenty-one (21) days before the Trial Start Date. Any objections to such designations shall be served no later than fourteen (14) days before the Trial Start Date.

(b) Deposition testimony responsive to new matters raised in an opposing party's deposition designation shall be designated no later than fourteen (14) days before the Trial Start Date with objections thereto being served ten (10) days before the Trial Start Date.

16. The Commonwealth of Virginia's position in this litigation

The Commonwealth moved to intervene "for the limited purpose of defending the constitutionality of Va. Code 57-9(A)," and the Court granted the Commonwealth's motion "solely for its requested purpose." Letter Opinion (July 16, 2008) at 1 & n.1. That purpose has been fulfilled. The Commonwealth wishes to remain a party to this litigation solely for the purpose of defending the constitutionality of any other state statute, if some other statute's constitutionality is challenged. Accordingly, the Commonwealth shall remain a party to this litigation for that limited purpose. The Commonwealth need not file any pleadings, and it is not required to respond to motions or other filings regarding any other issues. The Commonwealth shall not propound or be required to respond to discovery requests, except as all parties may agree or the Court shall further order. This order is without prejudice to TEC's and the Diocese's previously stated position that the Commonwealth should be allowed to participate only as an *amicus curiae*.

17. Waiver or Modification of Terms of Order

Upon motion, the time limits and prohibitions contained in this in this order may be waived or modified by leave of Court for good cause shown.

Entered this ___ day of _____, 2010.

Randy I. Bellows,
Circuit Court Judge

Endorsement of this Order by counsel of record for the parties is waived in the discretion of the Court pursuant to Rule 1:13 of the Rules of the Supreme Court of Virginia.

VIRGINIA:

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF FAIRFAX COUNTY

IN RE: MULTI-CIRCUIT CHURCH
PROPERTY LITIGATION

Civil Case Number:

CL 2007 – 0248724

FILED IN: *The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia v. Church of Our Saviour at Oatlands* (No. CL 2007-5364); and *The Episcopal Church v. Truro Church et al.*, (No. CL 2007-1625).


**COVER SHEET FOR BRIEF OF THE CHURCH OF
OUR SAVIOUR AT OATLANDS AS TO SCHEDULING ORDER ISSUES**

This will serve as a one page cover sheet pleading for the **BRIEF OF THE CHURCH OF OUR SAVIOUR AT OATLANDS AS TO SCHEDULING ORDER ISSUES**, which is being filed in CL 2007-248724 (the omnibus case file), on November 24, 2010. The foregoing pleading and this corresponding one-page reference pleading applies to the Multi-Circuit Church Property Litigation Omnibus case number CL 2007-48724 and the following cases: *The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia v. Church of Our Saviour at Oatlands* (No. CL 2007-5364); and *The Episcopal Church v. Truro Church et al.*, (No. CL 2007-1625). For the complete foregoing pleading, please see the Omnibus case file, CL 2007 – 248724.

Dated: November 24, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

CHURCH OF OUR SAVIOUR AT OATLANDS
By Counsel



JAMES E. CARR, ESQUIRE, VSB#14567

CARR & CARR

44135 Woodridge Pkwy, Suite 260

Leesburg, Virginia 20176

703-777-9150 Phone

703-726-0125 Facsimile

northvajim@aol.com

*Counsel for Church of Our Saviour at Oatlands
And Related Trustees*

VIRGINIA:

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT OF FAIRFAX COUNTY

IN RE: MULTI-CIRCUIT CHURCH
PROPERTY LITIGATION

Civil Case Number:

CL 2007 – 0248724

FILED IN: *The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia v. Church of Our Saviour at Oatlands* (No. CL 2007-5364); and *The Episcopal Church v. Truro Church et al.*, (No. CL 2007-1625).

**COVER SHEET FOR BRIEF OF THE CHURCH OF
OUR SAVIOUR AT OATLANDS AS TO SCHEDULING ORDER ISSUES**

This will serve as a one page cover sheet pleading for the **BRIEF OF THE CHURCH OF OUR SAVIOUR AT OATLANDS AS TO SCHEDULING ORDER ISSUES**, which is being filed in CL 2007-248724 (the omnibus case file), on November 24, 2010. The foregoing pleading and this corresponding one-page reference pleading applies to the Multi-Circuit Church Property Litigation Omnibus case number CL 2007-48724 and the following cases: *The Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Virginia v. Church of Our Saviour at Oatlands* (No. CL 2007-5364); and *The Episcopal Church v. Truro Church et al.*, (No. CL 2007-1625). For the complete foregoing pleading, please see the Omnibus case file, CL 2007 – 248724.

Dated: November 24, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

CHURCH OF OUR SAVIOUR AT OATLANDS
By Counsel



JAMES E. CARR, ESQUIRE, VSB#14567

CARR & CARR

44135 Woodridge Pkwy, Suite 260

Leesburg, Virginia 20176

703-777-9150 Phone

703-726-0125 Facsimile

northvajim@aol.com

*Counsel for Church of Our Saviour at Oatlands
And Related Trustees*