

EXHIBIT 10

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

----- X
 :
 KRISTY DUMONT; DANA DUMONT;
 :
 ERIN BUSK-SUTTON; and REBECCA
 :
 BUSK-SUTTON,
 :
 :
Plaintiffs,
 :
 :
 v.
 :
 :
 NICK LYON, in his official capacity
 :
 as the Director of the Michigan
 :
 Department of Health and Human
 :
 Services; and HERMAN MCCALL,
 :
 in his official capacity as the
 :
 Executive Director of the Michigan
 :
 Children’s Services Agency,
 :
 :
Defendants,
 :
 :
 and
 :
 :
 ST. VINCENT CATHOLIC CHARITIES;
 :
 MELISSA BUCK; CHAD BUCK; and
 :
 SHAMBER FLORE,
 :
 :
Intervenor Defendants.
 :
 :
 ----- X

No. 17-cv-13080-PDB-EAS
HON. PAUL D. BORMAN
MAG. ELIZABETH A. STAFFORD

**PLAINTIFFS’ SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO
INTERVENOR DEFENDANTS’ FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES**

Plaintiffs Kristy Dumont, Dana Dumont, Erin Busk-Sutton, and Rebecca Busk-Sutton (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), by and through their undersigned counsel, pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 33 and the Local Rules of the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Michigan, supplement their answers and

seemed to be viable options. In addition, the Dumont Plaintiffs recognized the names of both St. Vincent and Bethany Christian Services from billboards and word of mouth.

The Busk-Sutton Plaintiffs first learned of Bethany Christian Services from a member of Erin Busk-Sutton's Bible study who was an employee at Bethany Christian Services at the time. When the Busk-Sutton Plaintiffs began to research child placing agency options and reviewed the MARE website, they recognized the name of Bethany Christian Services from Erin's friend from Bible study and found the agency's website on Google. They decided to contact Bethany Christian Services because it had two convenient locations, in Detroit and in Madison Heights, and because they were interested in working with someone who was as dedicated to their job as a social worker as their personal friend who worked at Bethany Christian Services.

INTERROGATORY NO. 5:

Explain why you have not begun the adoption process with a foster agency other than St. Vincent or Bethany.

SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 5:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if set forth fully herein. Plaintiffs further object to Interrogatory No. 5 to the extent that it seeks information that is protected from disclosure under the attorney-client privilege, the work-product doctrine, or any other applicable privilege, immunity, discovery protection, law or rule. Plaintiffs further object to Interrogatory No. 5 on the grounds that it seeks information that is not relevant to the claims or defenses of any party to the Action.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing general and specific objections, Plaintiffs refer to their response to Interrogatory No. 4. Plaintiffs further state

that they have not begun the adoption process with another agency because through this litigation they seek to better understand the full scope of their constitutional rights and the options available to them with respect to fostering and/or adopting in Michigan.

INTERROGATORY NO. 6:

Describe how the State Defendants' actions have prevented you from becoming an adoptive parent.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 6:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if set forth fully herein. Plaintiffs further object to Interrogatory No. 6 on the grounds that it seeks information that is not relevant to the claims or defenses of any party to the Action.

Subject to and without waiving the foregoing general and specific objections, Plaintiffs state that the State Defendant's practice of permitting state-contracted and taxpayer-funded child placing agencies to use religious criteria to screen prospective foster and adoptive parents for children in the foster care system denies Plaintiffs, and other families headed by same-sex couples, the same opportunities to work with a child placing agency that are available to every other family in Michigan seeking to adopt. Plaintiffs further state that the State Defendant's practice results in both stigma and practical barriers to same-sex couples who wish to adopt a child out of the state-run foster care system.

INTERROGATORY NO. 7:

Describe how you became involved in this lawsuit.

RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7:

Plaintiffs incorporate their General Objections as if set forth fully herein. Plaintiffs further object to Interrogatory No. 7 to the extent that it seeks information or

VERIFICATION

I, Kristy Dumont, hereby verify, under penalty of perjury and pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, that my foregoing supplemental responses to Intervenor Defendants' First Set of Interrogatories to Plaintiffs, dated October 18, 2018, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

This is the 11th day of January, 2019.

/s/ Kristy Dumont

Kristy Dumont

VERIFICATION

I, Dana Dumont, hereby verify, under penalty of perjury and pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1746, that my foregoing supplemental responses to Intervenor Defendants' First Set of Interrogatories to Plaintiffs, dated October 18, 2018, are true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

This is the 11th day of January, 2019.

/s/ Dana Dumont

Dana Dumont