Page: 1 of 3 Case: 10-17720 06/07/2012 ID: 8205511 DktEntry: 44-1 (1 of 8)

#### NOT FOR PUBLICATION

JUN 07 2012

#### UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

#### FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

PLANS INC.,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT and TWIN RIDGES ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT,

Defendants - Appellees.

No. 10-17720

D.C. No. 2:98-cv-00266-FCD-**EFB** 

MEMORANDUM\*

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of California Frank C. Damrell, Senior District Judge, Presiding

> Argued and Submitted May 17, 2012 San Francisco, California

Before: REINHARDT, CLIFTON, and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

PLANS appeals from the district court's entry of judgment after a bench trial on the basis of a partial finding under Rule 52(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Exercising jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, we affirm.

This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

(2 of 8)

The district court's "evidentiary rulings are reviewed for an abuse of discretion, and will not be reversed absent a showing of prejudice." *Larez v. City of Los Angeles*, 946 F.2d 630, 638 (9th Cir. 1991). We hold that the district court did not abuse its discretion in excluding all but one of the exhibits that PLANS proposed.

Reviewing the district court's findings of fact for clear error and its conclusions of law de novo, *Dubner v. City & Cnty. of San Francisco*, 266 F.3d 959, 964 (9th Cir. 2001), we agree that PLANS failed to meet its burden of showing that anthroposophy is a religion for purposes of the Establishment Clause. Although we express no view as to whether anthroposophy could be considered a religion on the basis of a fuller or more complete record, the record as it is before us is simply too thin to sustain that conclusion.

PLANS argues on appeal that a determination that anthroposophy is a religion is not necessary for it to prevail on its Establishment Clause claim. This argument may be correct. PLANS waived it, however, by failing to raise it below, in response to the motion for judgment under Rule 52(c), and by twice agreeing to the bifurcation of the trial. PLANS's counsel signed a Joint Final Pretrial Conference Statement describing the question "whether Anthroposophy is a religion" as a "threshold issue," which would "be adjudicated first." PLANS failed to object to the district court's inclusion of the same language in the Pretrial Conference Order. It is clear from the record that

(3 of 8)

the parties agreed, for purposes of this case, that unless anthroposophy is a religion, PLANS could not prevail. There could be no other purpose to the bifurcation of the trial. "We have consistently held that issues not preserved in the pretrial order have been eliminated from the action." *S. Cal. Retail Clerks Union & Food Emp'rs Joint Pension Trust Fund v. Bjorklund*, 728 F.2d 1262, 1264 (9th Cir. 1984).

PLANS had yet another opportunity to raise the issue in response to the defendants' motion for judgment on the basis of a partial finding: it could have argued that its claim was not one that could "be maintained or defeated only with a favorable finding on" the question whether anthroposophy is a religion. Fed. R. Civ. P. 52(c). It made no such argument.

Because PLANS failed to argue below that it could prevail even if anthroposophy is not a religion, we will not consider that argument here. *Smith v. Marsh*, 194 F.3d 1045, 1052 (9th Cir. 1999); *see also Mendoza v. Block*, 27 F.3d 1357, 1359-60 (9th Cir. 1994).

#### AFFIRMED.

Case: 10-17720 06/07/2012 ID: 8205511 DktEntry: 44-2 Page: 1 of 5 (4 of 8)

## **United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit**

#### **Office of the Clerk**

95 Seventh Street San Francisco, CA 94103

## **Information Regarding Judgment and Post-Judgment Proceedings**

### Judgment

• This Court has filed and entered the attached judgment in your case. Fed. R. App. P. 36. Please note the filed date on the attached decision because all of the dates described below run from that date, not from the date you receive this notice.

# Mandate (Fed. R. App. P. 41; 9th Cir. R. 41-1 & -2)

• The mandate will issue 7 days after the expiration of the time for filing a petition for rehearing or 7 days from the denial of a petition for rehearing, unless the Court directs otherwise. To file a motion to stay the mandate, file it electronically via the appellate ECF system or, if you are a pro se litigant or an attorney with an exemption from using appellate ECF, file one original motion on paper.

Petition for Panel Rehearing (Fed. R. App. P. 40; 9th Cir. R. 40-1) Petition for Rehearing En Banc (Fed. R. App. P. 35; 9th Cir. R. 35-1 to -3)

# (1) A. Purpose (Panel Rehearing):

- A party should seek panel rehearing only if one or more of the following grounds exist:
  - ► A material point of fact or law was overlooked in the decision;
  - A change in the law occurred after the case was submitted which appears to have been overlooked by the panel; or
  - An apparent conflict with another decision of the Court was not addressed in the opinion.
- Do not file a petition for panel rehearing merely to reargue the case.

# B. Purpose (Rehearing En Banc)

• A party should seek en banc rehearing only if one or more of the following grounds exist:

- Consideration by the full Court is necessary to secure or maintain uniformity of the Court's decisions; or
- ► The proceeding involves a question of exceptional importance; or
- The opinion directly conflicts with an existing opinion by another court of appeals or the Supreme Court and substantially affects a rule of national application in which there is an overriding need for national uniformity.

## (2) Deadlines for Filing:

- A petition for rehearing may be filed within 14 days after entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(1).
- If the United States or an agency or officer thereof is a party in a civil case, the time for filing a petition for rehearing is 45 days after entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(1).
- If the mandate has issued, the petition for rehearing should be accompanied by a motion to recall the mandate.
- See Advisory Note to 9th Cir. R. 40-1 (petitions must be received on the due date).
- An order to publish a previously unpublished memorandum disposition extends the time to file a petition for rehearing to 14 days after the date of the order of publication or, in all civil cases in which the United States or an agency or officer thereof is a party, 45 days after the date of the order of publication. 9th Cir. R. 40-2.

### (3) Statement of Counsel

• A petition should contain an introduction stating that, in counsel's judgment, one or more of the situations described in the "purpose" section above exist. The points to be raised must be stated clearly.

## (4) Form & Number of Copies (9th Cir. R. 40-1; Fed. R. App. P. 32(c)(2))

- The petition shall not exceed 15 pages unless it complies with the alternative length limitations of 4,200 words or 390 lines of text.
- The petition must be accompanied by a copy of the panel's decision being challenged.
- An answer, when ordered by the Court, shall comply with the same length limitations as the petition.
- If a pro se litigant elects to file a form brief pursuant to Circuit Rule 28-1, a petition for panel rehearing or for rehearing en banc need not comply with Fed. R. App. P. 32.

(5 of 8)

Case: 10-17720 06/07/2012 ID: 8205511 DktEntry: 44-2 Page: 3 of 5

• The petition or answer must be accompanied by a Certificate of Compliance found at Form 11, available on our website at www.ca9.uscourts.gov under *Forms*.

• You may file a petition electronically via the appellate ECF system. No paper copies are required unless the Court orders otherwise. If you are a pro se litigant or an attorney exempted from using the appellate ECF system, file one original petition on paper. No additional paper copies are required unless the Court orders otherwise.

## Bill of Costs (Fed. R. App. P. 39, 9th Cir. R. 39-1)

- The Bill of Costs must be filed within 14 days after entry of judgment.
- See Form 10 for additional information, available on our website at www.ca9.uscourts.gov under *Forms*.

### **Attorneys Fees**

- Ninth Circuit Rule 39-1 describes the content and due dates for attorneys fees applications.
- All relevant forms are available on our website at www.ca9.uscourts.gov under *Forms* or by telephoning (415) 355-7806.

### **Petition for a Writ of Certiorari**

• Please refer to the Rules of the United States Supreme Court at www.supremecourt.gov

# **Counsel Listing in Published Opinions**

- Please check counsel listing on the attached decision.
- If there are any errors in a published <u>opinion</u>, please send a letter in writing within 10 days to:
  - ► West Publishing Company; 610 Opperman Drive; PO Box 64526; St. Paul, MN 55164-0526 (Attn: Kathy Blesener, Senior Editor);
  - ▶ and electronically file a copy of the letter via the appellate ECF system by using "File Correspondence to Court," or if you are an attorney exempted from using the appellate ECF system, mail the Court one copy of the letter.

(6 of 8)

Case: 10-17720	06/07/2012	ID: 8205511	DktEntry: 44-2	Page: 4 of 5	(7 of 8
Form 10. Bill of Costs				(Re	v. 12-1-09)

# **United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit**

### **BILL OF COSTS**

Note:	service, within 1 late bill of costs	you wish to file a bill of costs, it MUST be submitted on this form and filed, with the clerk, with proof of rvice, within 14 days of the date of entry of judgment, and in accordance with 9th Circuit Rule 39-1. A te bill of costs must be accompanied by a motion showing good cause. Please refer to FRAP 39, 28 .S.C. § 1920, and 9th Circuit Rule 39-1 when preparing your bill of costs.									
			v.				9th	Cir. No.			
The Cle	rk is requested to	tax the fo	llowing co	sts against:							
under 28 U.S	Faxable FRAP 39, S.C. § 1920, r. R. 39-1	REQUESTED Each Column Must Be Completed			ALLOWED To Be Completed by the Clerk						
		No. of Docs.	Pages per Doc.	Cost per Page*	TOTAL COST	No. of Docs.	Pages per Doc.	Cost per Page*	TOTAL COST		
Excerp	ot of Record			\$	\$			\$	\$		
Openii	ng Brief			\$	\$			\$	\$		
Answe	ering Brief			\$	\$			\$	\$		
Reply	Brief			\$	\$			\$	\$		
Other*	**			\$	\$			\$	\$		

TOTAL: | \$ |

Attorneys' fees cannot be requested on this form.

TOTAL: | \$ |

<sup>\*</sup> Costs per page may not exceed .10 or actual cost, whichever is less. 9th Circuit Rule 39-1.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Other: Any other requests must be accompanied by a statement explaining why the item(s) should be taxed pursuant to 9th Circuit Rule 39-1. Additional items without such supporting statements will not be considered.

Form 10	Case: 10-17720 0  O. Bill of Costs - Continued	6/07/2012	ID: 8205511	DktEntry: 44-2	Page: 5 of 5	(8 of 8)
I,		, swear ı	under penalty of p	perjury that the serv	ices for which costs	are taxed
were actu	ually and necessarily perform	ed, and that	the requested cos	ts were actually exp	pended as listed.	
Signature	e					
("s/" plus	s attorney's name if submitted	l electronical	lly)			
Date						
Name of	Counsel:					
Attorney	for:					
	,					
(To Be C	Completed by the Clerk)					
Date		Costs	are taxed in the ar	mount of \$		
		Clerk	of Court			
		By:			, Deputy Clerk	