

J. JOSEPH CURRAN, JR.
Attorney General



DONNA HILL STATON
MAUREEN M. DOVE
Deputy Attorneys General

STATE OF MARYLAND
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

September 7, 2004

TELECOPIER NO.
(410) 576-6955

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NO.
(410) 576-7291

E-Mail Address: manolan@oag.state.md.us

Frank Conaway, Clerk
Circuit Court for Baltimore City
Courthouse East, Civil Division
111 N. Calvert Street, Room 462
Baltimore, MD 21202

Re: **Deane and Polyak, et al. v. Frank Conaway, et al.**
Circuit Court for Baltimore City, No.: 24-C-04-005390

Dear Mr. Conaway:

Enclosed for filing please find State of Maryland's Answer in the above-referenced matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Margaret Ann Nolan".

Margaret Ann Nolan
Chief, Civil Litigation

MAN:slm

Enclosure

cc: Andrew H. Baida, Esq.
Caroline D. Ciraolo, Esq.
Kenneth Y. Choe, Esq.
James D. Esseks, Esq.
David R. Rocah, Esq.
Arthur B. Spitzer, Esq.
Steven L. Tiedemann, Esquire
David R. Langdon, Esquire
Benjamin W. Bull, Esquire
Glen E. Lavy, Esquire

200 Saint Paul Place ♦ Baltimore, Maryland 21202-2021

Main Office (410) 576-6300 ♦ Main Office Toll Free (888) 743-0023 ♦ D.C. Metro (301) 470-7534

Consumer Complaints and Inquiries (410) 528-8662 ♦ Health Advocacy Unit/Billing Complaints (410) 528-1840

Health Advocacy Unit Toll Free (877) 261-8807 ♦ Homebuilders Division Toll Free (877) 259-4525 ♦ Telephone for Deaf: (410) 576-6372

www.oag.state.md.us



GITANJALI DEANE and LISA
POLYAK, et al.
Plaintiffs,
v.
FRANK CONAWAY, et al.
Defendants.

* IN THE
* CIRCUIT COURT
* FOR
* BALTIMORE CITY
* Case No.: 24-C-04-005390
*

* * * * *

ANSWER

Come now Defendants, by undersigned counsel, and for answer to Plaintiffs' Complaint state the following:

1. Paragraphs 1 through 4 of the complaint consist of rhetorical argument to which neither admission nor denial is required. To the extent that factual allegations are included, defendants deny same.

2. Defendants admit that Maryland Family Law Code Ann. §2-201 provides that "[o]nly a marriage between a man and a woman is valid in this State." The remaining portion of paragraph 5 consists of rhetorical statements to which neither admission nor denial is required.

3. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in paragraph 6 relating specifically to plaintiffs. The remaining portion of paragraph 6 consists of rhetorical statements to which neither admission nor denial is required.

4. Defendants deny that Md. Family Law Code Ann. § 2-201 violates the Maryland Constitution. The remaining portions of paragraph 7 consist of rhetorical statements to which neither admission nor denial is required.

5. Defendants admit the allegations of paragraphs 8 and 9.

6. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth of the factual allegations in paragraphs 10 through 119. To the extent these paragraphs contain legal argument and rhetorical statements, neither admission nor denial is required.

7. Defendants deny the factual allegations of paragraphs 120 through 124 to the extent those paragraphs allege that plaintiffs are “qualified couples” entitled to marriage licenses under Maryland law. Defendants admit that they are authorized to issue marriage licenses in accordance with the requirements of Title 2, Subtitle 4 of the Md. Family Law Code Ann.

8. Defendants admit the allegations of paragraph 125.

9. Defendants are without knowledge or information sufficient to admit or deny that the named plaintiffs made application for a marriage license on the dates and in the manner specified in paragraphs 126 through 135. Further, defendants note, as a matter of law, that “[u]ntil a license is issued, a clerk may not disclose the fact that an application for a license has been made except to the parent or guardian of a party to be married.” Md. Family Law Code Ann. §2-402(f). Defendants admit that Maryland law effectively prohibits the issuance of such licenses, and deny any

