

1 Raymond M. DiGuiseppe
2 California State Bar No. 228457
3 The DiGuiseppe Law Firm, P.C.
4 4320 Southport-Supply Road, Suite 300
5 Southport, NC 28461
6 Tel.: 910-713-8804
7 Email: law.rmd@gmail.com

8 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11 MICHELLE NGUYEN, an individual;
12 DOMINIC BOGUSKI, an individual;
13 JAY MEDINA, an individual;
14 FRANK COLLETTI, an individual;
15 JOHN PHILLIPS, an individual; PWGG,
16 L.P., a California Limited Partnership;
17 DARIN PRINCE, an individual; NORTH
18 COUNTY SHOOTING CENTER, INC.,
19 a California Corporation; FIREARMS
20 POLICY COALITION, INC.; SAN
21 DIEGO COUNTY GUN OWNERS
22 PAC; and SECOND AMENDMENT
23 FOUNDATION,

24 Plaintiffs,

25 vs.

26 XAVIER BECERRA, in his official
27 capacity as Attorney General of
28 California; and LUIS LOPEZ, in his
official capacity as Director of the
Department of Justice Bureau of
Firearms,

Defendants.

Case No. 3:20-cv-02470-WQH-WVG

**PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF
RELATED CASES**

1 Pursuant to Local Rule 40.1(f), Plaintiffs Michelle Nguyen, Dominic Boguski,
2 Jay Medina, Frank Colletti, John Phillips, PWGG, L.P., Darin Prince, North County
3 Shooting Center, Inc., Firearms Policy Coalition, Inc., San Diego County Gun
4 Owners PAC, and Second Amendment Foundation (collectively “Plaintiffs”), by and
5 through counsel of record, provide notice of the following matters as potentially
6 related cases: *Duncan v. Becerra*, Case No. 3:17-cv-1017-BEN-JLB, filed in the
7 Southern District of California, on May 17, 2017; *Miller v. Becerra*, Case No. 3:19-
8 cv-01537-BEN-JLB, filed in the Southern District of California, on August 15, 2019;
9 *Fouts v. Becerra*, Case No. 3:19-cv-1662-BEN-JLB, filed in the Southern District of
10 California, on September 1, 2019; and *Renna v. Becerra*, Case No. 3:20-cv-02190-
11 DMS-DEB, filed in the Southern District of California, on November 10, 2020.

12 The *Duncan* case involves a Second Amendment challenge to California’s
13 categorical prohibition against “large-capacity” magazines, commonly used for self-
14 defense and other lawful purposes as integral parts of otherwise lawfully owned and
15 commonly used firearms. The *Miller* case involves a Second Amendment challenge
16 to California’s categorical prohibition against so-called “assault weapons,” which,
17 despite the menacing label, are commonly used for self-defense and other lawful
18 purposes. The *Fouts* case involves a Second Amendment challenge to California’s
19 categorical prohibition against billies/batons which are also commonly used as
20 bearable arms for self-defense and other lawful purposes. Lastly, the *Renna* case
21

1 involves a Second Amendment challenge to California’s handgun “roster” which
2 effectively constitutes a categorical prohibition against numerous handguns
3 commonly used as bearable arms for self-defense and other lawful purposes.
4

5 All the laws, and related regulations, policies, practices, and customs
6 challenged in these actions carry the weight of criminal sanctions, and the plaintiffs
7 in each case are ordinary law-abiding citizens who otherwise remain subject to such
8 sanctions should they attempt to exercise their constitutional rights to bear arms in
9 contravention of the statutes respectively barring their access to these bearable arms.
10
11

12 Thus, all four cases involve Second Amendment challenges to related
13 California laws prohibiting the possession, manufacture, transportation, sale, and
14 transfer of otherwise lawfully owned and commonly used bearable arms.
15 Consequently, they all involve substantially similar legal issues concerning whether
16 and the extent to which the state may constitutionally restrain law-abiding citizens
17 from possessing, manufacturing, transporting, selling, and/or transferring bearable
18 arms in common use for self-defense and other lawful purposes. Additionally, each
19 action seeks substantially the same relief against the offending related statutory
20 schemes—a declaration that the respective scheme is unconstitutional and an
21 injunction against further enforcement of the same on that grounds.
22
23
24
25

26 All the cases involve the Attorney General, Xavier Becerra, as a defendant,
27 and both this case and the *Renna* case involve the Director of the California
28

1 Department of Justice, Bureau of Firearms, while the *Miller* case involves the Chief
2 of the California Department of Justice, Bureau of Firearms. This case also involves
3 many of the same plaintiffs who are plaintiffs the *Miller* and *Renna* cases—John
4 Phillips, PWGG, L.P., Darin Prince, Firearms Policy Coalition, San Diego County
5 Gun Owners Political Action Committee, and Second Amendment Foundation.
6
7

8 Further, the consideration of this matter alongside these related matters would
9 effect a savings of judicial effort and avoid or minimize the risk of multiple,
10 inconsistent rulings and judgments within the same District. Accordingly, and
11 pursuant to CivLR 40.1.h, the Clerk of the Court is requested to report the related
12 cases to “the judges concerned at the earliest date practicable.”
13
14

15 Date: December 18, 2020

/s/Raymond M. DiGuiseppe

Raymond M. DiGuiseppe

The DiGuiseppe Law Firm, P.C.

4320 Southport-Supply Road, Suite 300

Southport, NC 28461

Tel.: 910-713-8804

Email: law.rmd@gmail.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs