1	Donald E. J. Kilmer, Jr. [SBN: 179986]		
2	1010 1111011 1011000 100		
3	San Jose, California 95125 Voice: (408) 264-8489		
4	Fax: (408) 264-8487 E-Mail: Don@DKLawOffice.com		
5	Attorney for Plaintiffs		
6	, and the second		
7			
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO / OAKLAND DIVISION		
10	MARK AARON HAYNIE, THE	Case No.: CV 10 1255 SI	
11	CALGUNS FOUNDATION, INC., and THE SECOND AMENDMENT	JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT	
12	FOUNDATION, INC.,	CONFERENCE STATEMENT	
13	Plaintiffs,	Conference Date: March 18, 2011 Conference Time: 2:00 p.m.	
14	ŕ	Conference Place: Courtroom 10 450 Golden Gate Ave	
15	VS.	San Francisco, CA 94102	
16	CITY OF PLEASANTON, CITY OF PLEASANTON POLICE	34102	
17	DEPARTMENT, CALIFORNIA		
18	DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, and DOES 1 TO 20,		
19	Defendants.		
20			
21	1. <u>Jurisdiction & Service</u> – The parties stipulate that the Court has subject		
22	matter jurisdiction over the plaintiffs's claims and there are no issues		
23	regarding personal jurisdiction or venue.		
24	2. <u>Facts</u> – Mark Haynie was arrested and required to post bail for an alleged		
25	violation of California Penal Code § 12280(b) – possession of an unregistered		
26	assault weapon. The Alameda District Attorney's Office declined to file		
27	charges against Mark Haynie and he was found factually innocent. The		
28	remaining dispute in this case is:		

Donald Kilmer Attorney at Law 1645 Willow St. Suite 150 San Jose, CA 95125 Vc: 408/264-8489 Fx: 408/264-8487

JCMC

- a. Does the California Department of Justice have a general duty to issue statewide bulletins/memorandums to prevent similar false arrests.
- b. Does the California Department of Justice have a specific duty to issue a statewide bulletins/memorandums based on the specific technology involved in this case to prevent similar false arrests.
- 3. <u>Legal Issues</u> Can a federal court compel the California Department of Justice to issue bulletins/memorandums to the State's District Attorneys and Law Enforcement agencies based on California Penal Code §§ 12276.5 and 12289?
- 4. <u>Motions</u> Defendants anticipate filing a Rule 12 Motion. After some limited discovery is complete, Plaintiffs anticipate filing a Rule 56 Motion.
- 5. Amendment of Pleadings Plaintiffs anticipate filing a First Amended Complaint to address issues developed during ADR and to address the dismissal of Defendants City of Pleasanton and City of Pleasanton Police Department. The parties stipulated that Plaintiffs' deadline to file the First Amended Complaint is March 18, 2011.
- 6. Evidence Preservation Not applicable in this case.
- 7. <u>Disclosures</u> The parties agree to make their Fed.R.Civ.P. 26(f) disclosures 60 days after filing/service of the First Amended Complaint.
- 8. <u>Discovery</u>
 - a. Plaintiffs will take the following discovery.
 - i. Document Request.
 - ii. Requests for Admission.
 - b. Defendants will take the following discovery.
 - i. Requests for Admission.
- 9. <u>Class Action</u> Not applicable to this case.
- 10. <u>Related Case</u> None known by the parties at this time.
- 11. Relief Plaintiffs seek declaratory and prospective injunctive relief and

25

26

27

28

JCMC

 consented to a magistrate judge. Other References – Not applicable in this case. Narrowing the Issues – The parties would like to discuss procedures for the parties would like to discuss procedu			
 2 12. Settlement & ADR – The parties have already participated in Joint New Evaluation. 4 13. Consent to Magistrate Judge for All Purposes – The parties have no consented to a magistrate judge. 6 14. Other References – Not applicable in this case. 7 15. Narrowing the Issues – The parties would like to discuss procedures for bench trial in this matter in conjunction with (or in lieu of) a cross motion. 			
Evaluation. 13. Consent to Magistrate Judge for All Purposes – The parties have no consented to a magistrate judge. 14. Other References – Not applicable in this case. 15. Narrowing the Issues – The parties would like to discuss procedures for bench trial in this matter in conjunction with (or in lieu of) a cross motion	payment of attorney fees and costs.		
 Consent to Magistrate Judge for All Purposes – The parties have no consented to a magistrate judge. Other References – Not applicable in this case. Narrowing the Issues – The parties would like to discuss procedures for bench trial in this matter in conjunction with (or in lieu of) a cross motion. 	utral		
consented to a magistrate judge. 14. Other References – Not applicable in this case. Narrowing the Issues – The parties would like to discuss procedures for bench trial in this matter in conjunction with (or in lieu of) a cross motion			
6 14. Other References – Not applicable in this case. 7 15. Narrowing the Issues – The parties would like to discuss procedures for bench trial in this matter in conjunction with (or in lieu of) a cross motion	Consent to Magistrate Judge for All Purposes - The parties have not		
7 15. Narrowing the Issues – The parties would like to discuss procedures for bench trial in this matter in conjunction with (or in lieu of) a cross motion			
8 bench trial in this matter in conjunction with (or in lieu of) a cross motio	Other References – Not applicable in this case.		
	Narrowing the Issues – The parties would like to discuss procedures for a		
9 for summary judgment.	bench trial in this matter in conjunction with (or in lieu of) a cross motions		
10 16. Expedited Schedule – Not applicable in this case.	3. <u>Expedited Schedule</u> – Not applicable in this case.		
17. Scheduling – The parties propose deferral of this decision until after the			
court has ruled on Defendant's Rule 12 Motion.	court has ruled on Defendant's Rule 12 Motion.		
13 18. <u>Trial</u> – As noted above, the parties are prepared to discuss a bench trial	in		
conjunction with, or in lieu of, a Rule 56 Motion.			
15 19. <u>Disclosure of Non-Party Interest Entities or Persons</u> – None know	n at		
this time.			
RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED.			
18 Date: March 4, 2011 Date: March 4, 2011			
19 <u>/s/</u>			
20 Ross Moody, Counsel for Defendant Donald Kilmer, Counsel for Plain	tiffs		
ATTESTATION FOR COMPLIANCE WITH GENERAL ORDER 45 AND LOCAL RULE VIII.B.			
I, Donald Kilmer, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of California			
and the United States that I have in my possession e-mail correspondence from Ross Moody that the content of this document is acceptable to all persons requi	L		
to sign the document. I declare that this document was signed in San Jose, CA on March 4, 2011.			
/s/ Donald Kilmer of Law Offices of Donald Kilmer, APC			
for Plaintiffs			
28			

Donald Kilmer Attorney at Law 1645 Willow St. Suite 150 San Jose, CA 95125 Vc: 408/264-8489 Fx: 408/264-8487

JCMC