



**BY CRPA PRESIDENT &
GENERAL COUNSEL
C.D. MICHEL**

Civil rights attorney C.D. "Chuck" Michel is President & General Counsel for CRPA. He is a former prosecutor and currently runs the law firm Michel & Associates, PC in Long Beach. The firm's clients include the NRA and CRPA, as well as firearm manufacturers, distributors, retailers and owners.

COURT REPORT

"GUNMAGEDDON"

After our win in the Presidential election earlier this month, CRPA and the NRA are ready to launch a full scale legal battle against not only Proposition 63, but also the seven "Gunmageddon" gun bills signed in July. And the *Peruta* case, that could bring shall-issues to California, is now Supreme Court bound! We will be filing our petition for review by the Supreme Court in the coming weeks.

Although the Supreme Court does not have to take any case, thanks to the NRA the Supreme Court will be comprised of Justices who respect the Second Amendment.

This is a game changer folks. In our favor!

Hoping for the best, the CRPA and NRA legal team was preparing a legal plan of action for California even before the election results came in. The plan includes litigation, regulatory challenges, and other legal and political action.

Even with the generous discounts our legal team offers CRPA, the cost of successful lawsuits is high. So we need your help! Your tax-deductible donation to The CRPA Foundation will help us win this battle!

It takes great resources to fight for our rights in the courts. So please make

a generous tax-deductible donation to The CRPA Foundation to help finance the *Peruta* case and other lawsuits we are planning! And consider joining the NRA's official state association, CRPA, if you aren't already a member. NRA and CRPA are working together to do great things.

Stand with CRPA and NRA as we look to capitalize on the tremendous victory in the presidential race and work to preserve our right to keep and bear arms for generations to come.

To learn more about The CRPA Foundation visit: <http://crpa.org/about-the-crpa-foundation/>

NRA/CRPA CALIFORNIA AND NINTH CIRCUIT LITIGATION MATTERS

ISSUE	CASE NAME	CASE STATUS	WHAT'S NEXT
Challenge to CA and Los Angeles Firearm Carry Restrictions that Prohibit Both Open and Concealed Carry	<i>Flanagan v. Harris</i>	The case was filed on August 17, 2016 as a direct response to <i>Peruta</i> . The suit seeks to force the court to decide whether or not it is willing to uphold a complete prohibition on the right of law-abiding citizens to carry a firearm for self-defense.	The State and Sheriff McDonnell filed motions to dismiss in October. Plaintiffs' opposition brief was filed on December 1, 2016. A hearing on the motions is expected to take place in February 2017.
New Litigation Coming Soon: Challenges to "Gun-mageddon," Prop 63, and LA's Ultra-Compact Handgun Ban	<i>N/A</i>	CRPA and NRA attorneys are preparing multiple challenges to the new laws that were passed in 2016 that improperly punish law-abiding gun owners. Plaintiffs submitted a pre-litigation demand letter to the City of Los Angeles on September 21, 2016.	Multiple lawsuits are being prepared for filing in 2017.
Challenge to "good cause" requirement for CCWs	<i>Peruta v. San Diego</i>	In June 2016, a divided "en banc" panel of the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals ruled 7-4 in favor of the County, holding that the government's denial of the only means of carrying a firearm under state law does not implicate the Second Amendment. The decision reverses an earlier three-judge panel decision of the 9th circuit and now stands in direct conflict with the Supreme Court's decision in <i>Heller</i> .	On August 15, the Ninth Circuit denied Plaintiffs' Petition for Full Court En Banc Rehearing by all sitting members of the Ninth Circuit. The case is now being petitioned for review by the United States Supreme Court.
Challenge to DOJ's excessive DROS fees that generated massive surplus.	<i>Bauer v. Harris</i>	In March 2015, the district court issued an opinion upholding California's use of DROS fees to fund APPS and other law enforcement activities. Plaintiffs have appealed. The case has been fully briefed and is awaiting oral arguments.	Oral arguments have been scheduled for March 2017.
Challenges DOJ's Use of DROS surplus to fund APPS	<i>Gentry v. Harris</i>	An amended complaint alleging that the DROS fee is an invalid property tax was filed with the district. The case is currently in the discovery process.	The case is expected to go to trial in 2017.
Challenge to CA DOJ's underground regulations regarding the Firearm Safety Certificate Program	<i>Belemjian v. Harris</i>	This case forced DOJ to finally begin the process of enacting regulations for the FSC program in February 2015. Plaintiffs appealed the lower court's denial of Plaintiffs' request for attorneys' fees.	Briefing is currently in progress in the California Court of Appeals.
Challenge to improper denial of use permit to operate firearms retail and repair business.	<i>Settergren v. Daly City</i>	The case was filed on January 15, 2016. On February 18, 2016, Daly City filed an answer. The case is now in the discovery process.	After discovery is complete, Plaintiffs will file a motion for summary judgment.
Vagueness challenge to "handgun ammunition" sales registration requirement and mail order ban	<i>Parker v. California</i>	The appeal will likely be dismissed soon following the failure of the voter referendum that would have repealed SB 1235 and the passage of Proposition 63, because they effectively moot the case.	If and when the appeal is dismissed, Plaintiffs will seek recovery of their attorney's fees. Further litigation is being prepared to challenge the new laws
10+ Round Magazine Possession Ban	<i>Fyock v. Sunnyvale</i>	In 2015, the 9th Circuit upheld the lower court's denial of plaintiffs' request for an order prohibiting enforcement while the case proceeds.	The case was set to resume in the trial court following resolution of <i>Peruta</i> , but the passage of SB 1446 and Proposition 64 prohibiting the possession of 10+ round magazines statewide now preempts the local ordinance. A new suit may be filed challenging the state law.

Preemption challenge to LA ordinance banning possession of 10+ Round Magazines	<i>Bosenko v. City of Los Angeles</i>	The City is currently in the process of repealing the ordinance because it is now preempted by state law.	A status conference is scheduled for February to confirm that the City has repealed the ordinance. review the City's actions.
--	--	---	---

In addition to these cases, NRA and CRPA regularly provide consulting advice and prepare amicus curiae or "friend of the court" briefs in a number of other firearm related cases. NRA and CRPA have supported or will be supporting the following cases:


CALIFORNIA AND 9TH CIRCUIT AMICUS AND CONSULTING SUPPORT

FFL Zoning Restrictions	<i>Teixeira v. Alameda County</i>	The County recently filed a petition for en banc review by an eleven-judge, after a three-judge panel issued a favorable ruling overturning the lower court's decision that had improperly granted the County's Motion to Dismiss the case.	A decision from the Ninth Circuit regarding whether the Court will rehear the case en banc could come at anytime.
Sacramento and Yolo County CCW Issuance Policies	<i>Richards v. Prieto</i>	The <i>Richards</i> plaintiffs joined the <i>Peruta</i> plaintiffs in petitioning for full court en banc rehearing by all sitting members of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals.	On August 15, the Ninth Circuit denied Plaintiffs' Petition for Full Court En Banc Rehearing by all sitting members of the Ninth Circuit.
Hawaii CCW Scheme	<i>Baker v. Kealoha</i>	The court is currently reviewing supplemental briefing from the parties following the en banc decision in <i>Peruta</i> .	A decision from the Court regarding whether to remand the case to the district court could come at any time
California Handgun Roster	<i>Pena v. Cid</i>	The federal district court upheld the Roster in 2015. Plaintiffs appealed, and the case has been fully briefed before the 9th Circuit.	Oral arguments are expected to take place sometime in March 2017.
10-Day Wait as applied to current firearm owners	<i>Silvester v. Harris</i>	The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals recently reversed the district court's decision, concluding that the 10-day waiting period for individuals who already own firearms does not violate the Second Amendment.	The plaintiffs have the option of requesting further review of the case by an eleven judge "en banc" panel of the Ninth Circuit. They may also petition the case for review by the Supreme Court.
1st Amendment challenge to handgun advertisement prohibition	<i>Tracy Rifle and Pistol v. Harris</i>	In July 2015, the district court denied a request to prohibit enforcement while the case proceeds. That decision was appealed, and in February 2016 the 9th Circuit upheld the lower court's order within two weeks of oral arguments.	Litigation in this case will now resume in the lower court.
FFL zoning ordinance	<i>NSSF v. Pleasant Hill</i>	Plaintiffs recently dismissed the suit and are currently seeking to recover attorneys' fees.	Unknown.
Challenges DOJ regulation barring sale of more than one handgun in 30 days to COE holders	<i>Doe v. Harris</i>	The California trial court upheld DOJ's regulation and the plaintiffs have appealed the decision to the California Court of Appeals.	The case will now be briefed before the California Court of Appeals. Oral arguments will likely take place in late 2017.
Challenge to ban on possession and carriage of firearms on recreational Army Corps' lands.	<i>Nesbitt v. U.S. Army Corps of Engineer</i>	The case has been fully briefed and is awaiting oral arguments before the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals.	Oral arguments are expected to take place sometime in March 2017.
State Court challenge to California's micro-stamping requirements	<i>NSSF v. CA</i>	On December 1, the California Court of Appeals issued a ruling in favor of NSSF, allowing the lawsuit to proceed in the lower court.	Litigation in this case will now resume in the lower court.

NRA and CRPA also provide assistance in a number of critical Second Amendment cases across the country that could set precedent for future challenges to California gun laws. The following are some of the more significant examples of these cases:

NATIONAL AMICUS SUPPORT

<p>Challenges Maryland’s ban on “assault weapons” and 10+ round magazines</p>	<p><i>Kolbe v. Hogan</i></p>	<p>On February 4, 2016, the 4th Circuit overturned the district court’s approval of the ban under intermediate scrutiny, and ordered the district court to apply “strict scrutiny.” The State appealed and the case was reheard by the full 4th Circuit sitting “en banc” on May 11, 2016.</p>	<p>An audio recording of the recent “en banc” oral arguments is available at: http://michellawyers.com/kolbe-v-omalley/.</p> <p>A decision from the 4th Circuit could come at anytime.</p>
<p>Challenges Washington D.C.’s “good reason” requirement for the issuance of a CCW permit</p>	<p><i>Grace v. District of Columbia</i></p>	<p>On May 17, 2016, the Court granted the Plaintiffs’ request for an order blocking enforcement of the “good reason” requirement. The government appealed the decision to the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals and the Court issued a stay of the lower court’s order that prohibited D.C. from enforcing its “good reason” requirement.</p>	<p>Oral arguments in the case were held on September 20, 2016, along with <i>Wrenn v. District of Columbia</i>. A decision from the Court of Appeals can be expected anywhere in the next 3-9 months.</p>



Written by long-time CRPA and NRA attorney and life member C.D. Michel, this book will go over all the details for the NEW gun laws in California, along with current state and federal firearm laws affecting firearm owners, and particularly warns about legal traps and troublesome “gray areas.”

Donate \$60 to CRPA
and receive a FREE copy of the 4th edition of *California Gun Laws!*

Available now at
bit.ly/shopCRPA