

1 Raymond M. DiGuiseppe
2 The DiGuiseppe Law Firm, P.C.
3 4320 Southport-Supply Road, Suite 300
4 Southport, NC 28461
5 Tel.: 910-713-8804
6 Email: law.rmd@gmail.com

7 Michael P. Sousa
8 Law Offices of Michael P. Sousa, APC
9 3232 Governor Dr., Suite A
10 San Diego, CA 92122
11 Tel.: 858-453-6122
12 Email: msousa@msousalaw.com

13 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

14 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
15 **FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

16 LANA RAE RENNA, an individual;
17 DANIELLE JAYMES, an individual;
18 HANNAH SPOUSTA, an individual;
19 LAURA SCHWARTZ, an individual;
20 MICHAEL SCHWARTZ, an individual;
21 RICHARD BAILEY, an individual;
22 JOHN KLIER, an individual; JUSTIN
23 SMITH, an individual; JOHN
24 PHILLIPS, an individual; PWGG, L.P., a
25 California Limited Partnership;
26 CHERYL PRINCE, an individual;
27 DARIN PRINCE, an individual; NORTH
28 COUNTY SHOOTING CENTER, INC.,
a California Corporation; RYAN
PETERSON, an individual;
GUNFIGHTER TACTICAL, LLC, a
California Limited Liability Company;
FIREARMS POLICY COALITION,
INC.; SAN DIEGO COUNTY GUN
OWNERS PAC; CITIZENS

Case No. 3:20-cv-02190-DMS-DEB

**PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF
RELATED CASES**

1 COMMITTEE FOR THE RIGHT TO
2 KEEP AND BEAR ARMS; and
3 SECOND AMENDMENT
FOUNDATION,

4 Plaintiffs,

5 vs.

6 XAVIER BECERRA, in his official
7 capacity as Attorney General of
8 California; and LUIS LOPEZ, in his
9 official capacity as Director of the
10 Department of Justice Bureau of
Firearms,

11 Defendants.

12
13
14 Pursuant to Local Rule 40.1(f), Plaintiffs Lana Rae Renna, Danielle Jaymes,
15 Hannah Spousta, Laura Schwartz, Michael Schwartz, Richard Bailey, John Klier,
16 Justin Smith, John Phillips, PWGG, L.P., Cheryl Prince, Darin Prince, North County
17 Shooting Center, Inc., Ryan Peterson, Gunfighter Tactical, LLC, Firearms Policy
18 Coalition, Inc., San Diego County Gun Owners PAC, Citizens Committee for the
19 Right to Keep and Bear Arms, and Second Amendment Foundation (collectively
20 “Plaintiffs”), by and through counsel of record, provide notice of the following
21 matters as potentially related cases: *Duncan v. Becerra*, Case No. 3:17-cv-1017-
22 BEN-JLB, filed in the Southern District of California, on May 17, 2017; *Miller v.*
23 *Becerra*, Case No. 3:19-cv-01537-BEN-JLB, filed in the Southern District of
24 California, on August 15, 2019; and *Fouts v. Becerra*, Case No. 3:19-cv-1662-BEN-

1 JLB, filed in the Southern District of California, on September 1, 2019.

2 The *Duncan* case involves a Second Amendment challenge to California’s
3 categorical prohibition against “large-capacity” magazines, commonly used for self-
4 defense and other lawful purposes as integral parts of otherwise lawfully owned and
5 commonly used firearms. The *Miller* case involves a Second Amendment challenge
6 to California’s categorical prohibition against so-called “assault weapons,” which,
7 despite the menacing label, are commonly used for self-defense and other lawful
8 purposes. Lastly, the *Fouts* case involves a Second Amendment challenge to
9 California’s categorical prohibition against billies/batons which are also are
10 commonly used as bearable arms for self-defense and other lawful purposes. All the
11 challenged laws carry the weight of criminal sanctions, and the plaintiffs in each
12 action are ordinary law-abiding citizens who are and will otherwise remain subject
13 to such sanctions should they attempt to exercise their constitutional rights to bear
14 arms in contravention of the statutes respectively prohibiting these bearable arms.
15
16
17
18
19

20 Thus, all three cases involve Second Amendment challenges to related
21 California laws prohibiting the possession, manufacture, transportation, sale, and
22 transfer of otherwise lawfully owned and commonly used bearable arms.
23 Consequently, they all involve substantially similar legal issues concerning whether
24 and the extent to which the state may constitutionally restrain law-abiding citizens
25 from possessing, manufacturing, transporting, selling, and/or transferring bearable
26
27
28

1 arms in common use for self-defense and other lawful purposes. Additionally, each
2 action seeks substantially the same relief against the offending related statutory
3 schemes—a declaration that the respective scheme is unconstitutional and an
4 injunction against further enforcement of the same on that grounds.
5

6 All the cases involve the Attorney General, Xavier Becerra, as a defendant,
7 and *Miller* includes the Chief of the California Department of Justice, Bureau of
8 Firearms, like here where the defendants include the current Director of the
9 California Department of Justice, Bureau of Firearms. And many of the same
10 plaintiffs in the instant case—Ryan Peterson, San Diego County Gun Owners
11 Political Action Committee, Gunfighter Tactical, LLC, John Phillips, Second
12 Amendment Foundation, and Firearms Policy Coalition—are plaintiffs in *Miller*.
13
14

15 Further, the consideration of this matter alongside these related matters would
16 effect a savings of judicial effort and avoid or minimize the risk of multiple,
17 inconsistent rulings and judgments within the same District. Accordingly, and
18 pursuant to CivLR 40.1.h, the Clerk of the Court is requested to report the related
19 cases to “the judges concerned at the earliest date practicable.”
20
21

22 Date: November 10, 2020

23 /s/Raymond M. DiGuiseppe

24 Raymond M. DiGuiseppe

25 The DiGuiseppe Law Firm, P.C.

26 4320 Southport-Supply Road, Suite 300

27 Southport, NC 28461

28 Tel.: 910-713-8804

Email: law.rmd@gmail.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs