

1 Mark Holscher (S.B.N. 139582)
R. Alexander Pilmer (S.B.N. 166196)
2 Mark T. Cramer (S.B.N. 198952)
KIRKLAND & ELLIS LLP
3 777 South Figueroa Street
Los Angeles, California 90017
4 Telephone: (213) 680-8400
Facsimile: (213) 680-8500
5 E-mail: mholscher@kirkland.com
E-mail: apilmer@kirkland.com
6 E-mail: mcramer@kirkland.com

7 Attorneys for Defendant
California Institute of Technology
8

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
10 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
11 WESTERN DIVISION
12

13 Robert M. Nelson, William Bruce)
Banerdt, Julia Bell, Josette Bellan,)
14 Dennis V. Byrnes, George Carlisle, Kent)
Robert Crossin, Larry R. D'Addario,)
15 Riley M. Duren, Peter R. Eisenhardt,)
Susan D.J. Foster, Matthew P.)
16 Golombek, Varoujan Gorjian, Zareh)
Gorjian, Robert J. Haw, James Kulleck,)
17 Sharon L. Laubach, Christian A.)
Lindensmith, Amanda Mainzer, Scott)
18 Maxwell, Timothy P. McElrath, Susan)
Paradise, Konstantin Penanen, Celeste M.)
19 Satter, Peter M.B. Shames, Amy Snyder)
Hale, William John Walker and Paul R.)
20 Weissman,)

21 Plaintiffs,)

22 vs.)

23 National Aeronautics and Space)
Administration, an Agency of the United)
24 States; Michael Griffin, Director of)
NASA, in his official capacity only;)
25 Department of Commerce; Carlos M.)
Gutierrez, Secretary of Commerce, in his)
26 official capacity only; California Institute)
of Technology; and Does 1-100,)
27)

28 Defendants.)

Case No. CV-07-05669 ODW (VBKx)

**CALTECH'S MOTION TO DISMISS
FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT
FOR INJUNCTIVE AND
DECLARATORY RELIEF
PURSUANT TO RULE 12(B)(6)**

Complaint Filed: August 30, 2007

Date: January 7, 2008

Time: 1:30 p.m.

Courtroom: 11

Judge Otis D. Wright, II

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION.....1

FACTUAL BACKGROUND2

ARGUMENT4

I. PLAINTIFFS’ ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURE ACT CLAIM SHOULD BE DISMISSED BECAUSE CALTECH IS NOT A FEDERAL AGENCY.....5

II. PLAINTIFFS’ FEDERAL CONSTITUTION CLAIMS SHOULD BE DISMISSED AGAINST CALTECH BECAUSE CALTECH IS NOT A STATE ACTOR.....5

 A. A Private Entity Like Caltech Is Not A Government Actor When It Follows Federal Law.6

 B. Plaintiffs’ Allegations Establish That Caltech Is *Not* A Willful Participant In A Joint Activity With The Government.9

 C. Caltech Does Not Determine Employee Suitability.....12

III. PLAINTIFFS’ CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION CLAIM SHOULD BE DISMISSED BECAUSE THE CLAIM IS PREEMPTED BY FEDERAL LAW AND CALTECH IS NOT ENGAGING IN THE CHALLENGED CONDUCT, IN ANY EVENT.....13

 A. Federal Law Preempts State Law Where, As Here, There Is A Uniquely Federal Interest And The State Law Either Conflicts Or Interferes With That Federal Interest.13

 1. NASA And The Federal Government Have A Unique Interest In The Security Of NASA Facilities.14

 2. As Alleged In the First Amended Complaint, California Law Would Conflict With NASA’s Directives And Frustrate The Federal Interest In Uniform Security Measures In NASA Facilities.15

 B. The California Constitution Does Not Apply To Caltech Because The Challenged Conduct Is The Federal Government’s Conduct.17

CONCLUSION19

