

1 THE LAW OFFICES OF GARY W. GORSKI  
Gary W. Gorski - SBN: 166526  
2 1207 Front St., Suite 15  
Sacramento, CA 95814  
3 Tel. (916) 965-6800  
Fax (916) 965-6801  
4 usrugby@gmail.com

5 Attorney for Plaintiff

6 THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

7 IN AND FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

8 THERESE MARIE PIZZO, )

Case No. 09-cv-04493-CW

9 Plaintiff, )

10 vs. )

ERRATA TO PLAINTIFF’S REPLY AND  
OPPOSITION RE: MOTION FOR  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND/OR  
ADJUDICATION OF ISSUES, AND  
MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND  
AUTHORITIES (Federal Rule of Civil  
Procedure Rule 56)

11 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO )  
MAYOR GAVIN NEWSOM, in both his )  
12 individual and official capacities; FORMER )  
SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT; )  
13 CHIEF OF POLICE HEATHER FONG, in both )  
her individual and official capacities; SAN )  
14 FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT CHIEF )  
OF POLICE GEORGE GASCON, in his official )  
15 capacity; SAN FRANCISCO SHERIFF )  
MICHAEL HENNESSEY, in both his )  
16 individual and official capacities; CITY AND )  
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; and STATE )  
17 OF CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL )  
EDMUND G. BROWN, in his official capacity, )

Hearing Date: July 26, 2012  
Time: 2:00 p.m.  
Place:  
Oakland Courthouse, Courtroom 2 - 4th Floor  
1301 Clay Street, Oakland, CA 94612  
Judge: Hon. Claudia Wilken

18 Defendants. )  
19 \_\_\_\_\_ )

20  
21 TABLE OF CONTENTS AND AUTHORITIES  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**Table of Contents**

**A. INTRODUCTION..... 1**

**EXPERT WITNESS DAVID ORSAY..... 4**

**I.**

**OPPOSITION AND RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT KAMALA D. HARRIS, AS CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY GENERAL, MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT..... 5**

**A. Plaintiff Has Standing to Sue the Attorney General Because Plaintiff’s Injuries Are Traceable to State Law, and thus, ultimately, State Action and pre-enforcement decisions of law are always proper..... 6**

**B. Defendant Attorney General’s Joinder to Motion for Summary Judgment Filed by the San Francisco Defendants is addressed under the Below Opposition to those Defendants..... 7**

**II.**

**A. California Penal Code Sections 26150 and 26155, Which Govern The Issuance of CCW Licenses, Are the Root of the of the Constitutional Deprivation of Rights under the Second Amendment and the Due Process and Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment. .... 7**

**1. The Supreme has not Ruled what Level of Scrutiny applies, but it has ruled out a Rational Basis Test.. .... 7**

**2. California’s CCW Laws Cannot Withstand Even Rational Basis Scrutiny..... 8**

**3. Under Intermediate Scrutiny or Strict Scrutiny, the State of California’s CCW Laws have no support in fact..... 9**

**B. Penal Code Sections 25450 and 25900 – Which Creates a Separate Privileged Class for Retired Peace Officers – Offends the Equal Protection Clause Because Retired Peace Officers Are No Longer Acting in an Official Governmental Capacity and They Are Simply Members of the Public at Large.. .... 10**

**III.**

**Plaintiff Has Withdrawn the Fourth and Ninth Claims as to the State..... 21**

**OPPOSITION AND RESPONSE TO SAN FRANCISCO’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT..... 21**

**I. THE COURT SHOULD DENY SAN FRANCISCO’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND GRANT PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT AS TO SAN FRANCISCO ON PLAINTIFF'S STORAGE ORDINANCE CLAIMS.. .... 21**

**A. Plaintiff has Standing To Challenge The Storage Ordinance. .... 22**

B.	<b>The Storage Ordinance Is Unconstitutional.</b> . . . . .	22
1.	<b>Standard Of Review For Second Amendment Claims has been addressed above.</b> . . . . .	22
2.	<b>Heller mandates an accessible hand gun for immediate self-defense.</b> ..22	
3.	<b>The Storage Ordinance Does Not Reasonably Advance San Francisco's Compelling Interest In Public Safety.</b> . . . . .	23
II.	<b>THE COURT SHOULD DENY SAN FRANCISCO’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND GRANT PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT AS TO SAN FRANCISCO ON PLAINTIFF'S STORAGE ORDINANCE CLAIMS TO SAN FRANCISCO ON PLAINTIFF'S AMMUNITION ORDINANCE CLAIMS.</b> . . . . .	23
A.	<b>Plaintiffs Has Standing To Challenge The Ammunition Ordinance.</b> .. 23	
B.	<b>The Ammunition Ordinance impedes Fails Plaintiff's Right to Adequate Self Defenses under the Second Amendment Challenge.</b> . . 24	
1.	<b>The Ammunition Ordinance Burdens Plaintiff's Second Amendment Rights.</b> . . . . .	24
2.	<b>There is no Legitimate Interest because there is no evidence it saves lives.</b> . . . . .	24
C.	<b>The Ammunition Ordinance Is Unconstitutionally Vague.</b> . . . . .	25
IV.	<b>THE COURT SHOULD DENY SAN FRANCISCO’S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND GRANT PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGEMENT AS SAN FRANCISCO'S DENIAL OF CONCEALED WEAPONS LICENSES VIOLATED PLAINTIFF'S RIGHTS.</b> . . . . .	25
A.	<b>Plaintiff Has Standing To Challenge The Concealed Weapons Statutes Or San Francisco's Administration Of Concealed Weapons Licenses.</b> . . . . .	25
B.	<b>Plaintiff's CCW-Related Claims are actionable because, 1) Plaintiff Has Proven That The City Denied Her Federal Rights, 2) Pursuant To A Custom Or Policy.</b> . . . . .	26
2.	<b>Plaintiff Has a right to self-defense, which means government has to provide the method, open carry or concealed.</b>	
And		
3.	<b>Plaintiff's Fourteenth Amendment Rights Were Violated.</b>	
	. . . . .	27
	STATES AND CITY’S OBJECTIONS TO DECLARATION OF DAVID ORSAY. . . . .	28
	OBJECTION TO AGENT CHINN’S DECLARATION. . . . .	29

CONCLUSION. .... 29

CASES

*District of Columbia v. Heller*, 554 U.S. 570 (2008)..... *in passam*

*Gratz v. Bollinger*, 539 U.S. 244 (2003). .... 6

*Headwaters Forest Defense v. County of Humboldt*, 211 F.3d 1121(9th Cir.2000). .... 6

*LaLonde v. County of Riverside*, 204 F.3d 947 (9th Cir.2000). .... .6

*Madsen v. Boise State Univ.*, 976 F.2d 1219 (9th Cir. 1992). .... 6

*McDonald v. City of Chicago*, — U.S. —, 130 S.Ct. 3020 (2010). .... *in passam*

*Planned Parenthood v. Casey*, 505 U.S. 833 (1992). .... 4

*Roe v. Wade*, 410 U.S. 113, 93 S. Ct. 705, 35 L. Ed. 2d 147 (1973). .... 3

*Scott v. Sandford*, 60 U.S. (19 Howard) 393 (1856). .... 10

*Thompson v. Western States Medical Center*, 535 U.S. 357(2002). .... 6

*United States v. Emerson*, 270 F.3d 203, 261 (5th Cir. 2001). .... 8

*West Virginia State Board of Education v. Barnette*, 319 U.S. 624 (1943). .... 4

*Whitney v. California*, 274 U.S. 357,(1927). .... 4

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

It is requested that this Table of Contents be Attached to the concurrently filed brief.

Date: July 17, 2012

Respectfully submitted,  
LAW OFFICES OF GARY W. GORSKI  
/s/ Gary W. Gorski  
GARY W. GORSKI  
Attorney for plaintiff