

1 Alan E. Wisotsky – State Bar No. 68051  
James N. Procter II – State Bar No. 96589  
2 Jeffrey Held – State Bar No. 106991  
WISOTSKY, PROCTER & SHYER  
3 300 Esplanade Drive, Suite 1500  
Oxnard, California 93036  
4 Phone: (805) 278-0920  
Facsimile: (805) 278-0289  
5 Email: jheld@wps-law.net

6 Attorneys for Defendant,  
VENTURA COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE  
7 (*erroneously sued as Ventura County Sheriffs*  
*Department*)  
8

9 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
10 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11  
12 SIGITAS RAULINAITIS,

13 Plaintiff,

14 v.

15 VENTURA COUNTY SHERIFFS  
16 DEPARTMENT,

17 Defendant.  
18  
19

CASE NO. CV13-02605-MAN

**DEFENDANT’S STATEMENT  
OF GENUINE DISPUTES**

[Filed concurrently with Memorandum  
of Points and Authorities in Opposition  
to Plaintiff’s Motion for Summary  
Judgment]

Date: September 2, 2014  
Time: 1:00 p.m.  
Ctzm: 580 Roybal Building

20  
21 Defendant, VENTURA COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE (erroneously sued and  
22 served as Ventura County Sheriffs Department), presents this statement of genuine  
23 disputes in opposition to plaintiff’s summary judgment motion.

24 **DEFENDANT’S RESPONSE TO PLAINTIFF’S FACTS**

25 1. Defendant twice denied Plaintiffs’ application for a license to carry a  
26 concealed weapon on the grounds that Plaintiff was not a resident of Ventura.

27 [Admit.]

28 2. Plaintiff is a resident of Ventura.

1 [Defendant objects to this “fact” as not containing any source authority  
2 or citation to any record evidence. It is also vague, ambiguous, and conclusory.  
3 Furthermore, defendant relies upon its own statement of uncontroverted facts to  
4 contradict this assertion.]

5 **DEFENDANT’S FACTS IN OPPOSITION**  
6 **TO PLAINTIFF’S SUMMARY JUDGMENT MOTION**

7 For the convenience of Court and counsel, the contents of this document are  
8 identical to the defendant’s statement of uncontroverted facts and conclusions of law  
9 filed in support of its own summary judgment motion or, in the alternative, for partial  
10 summary judgment, from page 3, line 7, through page 14, line 4.

11 **A. Facts Relating to the Initial Application of January 15, 2013**

12 1. Plaintiff considers his Oxnard residence to be one of his permanent  
13 homes.

14 [Raulinaitis Declaration, Exhibit D, p. 2, ¶4, l. 5½.]

15 2. Plaintiff owns other homes in two other counties.

16 [Raulinaitis Declaration, Exhibit D, p. 2, ¶5, l. 8½.]

17 3. Plaintiff frequently travels for both business and pleasure.

18 [Raulinaitis Declaration, Exhibit D, p. 2, ¶5, ll. 8½ - 10.]

19 4. It is impossible for plaintiff to pick a California county in which he spends  
20 the majority of his time, due to the variable nature of his personal and professional  
21 life.

22 [Raulinaitis Declaration, Exhibit D, p. 2, ¶6, ll. 11½ - 13.]

23 5. Daniel Gonzales is a deputy sheriff employed by the Ventura County  
24 Sheriff’s Office whose assignment is concealed weapons investigation. On  
25 January 15, 2013, he received plaintiff’s initial application for a license to carry a  
26 concealed weapon, and it was his responsibility to investigate it.

27 [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶¶2-4.]

28 ///

WISOTSKY, PROCTER & SHYER  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 1500  
OXNARD, CALIFORNIA 93036  
TELEPHONE (805) 278-0920

1           6. Deputy Gonzales was aware of and directed his investigation toward the  
2 Penal Code §26150(a)(3) residency requirement for a concealed weapons permit  
3 applicant. The Sheriff’s Office also makes it mandatory that the applicant must be a  
4 resident of Ventura County.

5                   [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶¶5, 6.]

6           7. Deputy Gonzales’s investigation revealed that Mr. Raulinaitis was not a  
7 Ventura County resident.

8                   [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶7.]

9           8. Mr. Raulinaitis frankly conceded in the February 20, 2013, interview with  
10 Deputy Gonzales that he had been living at his home in Santa Clarita for the past four  
11 months almost all of the time. Santa Clarita is a city in Los Angeles County.

12                   [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶8.]

13           9. Deputy Gonzales learned that Mr. Raulinaitis’s driver’s license showed  
14 that his address was in Burbank, a city in Los Angeles County, which turned out to be  
15 his place of business. Mr. Raulinaitis submitted his California driver’s license along  
16 with his application for a concealed weapons permit, demonstrating that his address  
17 was in Burbank.

18                   [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶9.]

19           10. The California Department of Motor Vehicles registration check which  
20 Deputy Gonzales requested that Ventura County Sheriff’s Office’s records techni-  
21 cians perform revealed that two of Mr. Raulinaitis’s vehicles were registered to his  
22 residence address in Santa Clarita, a city in Los Angeles County, and that the other  
23 two were registered to his work address in Burbank, also in Los Angeles County.

24                   [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶10.]

25           11. Mr. Raulinaitis’s concealed weapons permit application listed his business  
26 address as being in Burbank.

27                   [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶11.]

28 ///

WISOTSKY, PROCTER & SHYER  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 1500  
OXNARD, CALIFORNIA 93036  
TELEPHONE (805) 278-0920

1           12. Mr. Raulinaitis’s concealed weapons application listed his wife’s  
2 residence address as being in Santa Clarita, in Los Angeles County. While not  
3 determinative of the applicant’s residence address in itself, the fact that the  
4 applicant’s spouse resided in another county suggested a connection with spending  
5 time in that other county, i.e., Los Angeles County.

6                   [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶12.]

7           13. During the course of the investigation, Deputy Gonzales learned that  
8 Mr. Raulinaitis had sued Los Angeles County for denying him a concealed weapons  
9 permit about a year and a half earlier. He would have needed to have claimed Los  
10 Angeles County residency in order to qualify for a concealed weapons permit in that  
11 county.

12                   [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶13.]

13           14. In order to further ascertain Mr. Raulinaitis’s residency, Deputy Gonzales  
14 conducted surveillance of the Santa Clarita address which plaintiff listed in his  
15 concealed weapons permit application. On January 28, 2013, Deputy Gonzales  
16 parked his unmarked police vehicle at the end of the cul-de-sac near the Santa Clarita  
17 address listed by Mr. Raulinaitis in his concealed weapons permit application as  
18 belonging to his wife. From that vantage point, Deputy Gonzales had a clear view of  
19 the home listed by the plaintiff as his wife’s residence.

20                   [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶¶14, 15.]

21           15. Deputy Gonzales arrived on that date at 6:15 in the morning. At  
22 6:43 a.m., Deputy Gonzales saw Mr. Raulinaitis leave from that house. Deputy  
23 Gonzales recognized Mr. Raulinaitis from his DMV photo, which he had obtained  
24 from a statewide database called Cal Photo.

25                   [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶16.]

26           16. Deputy Gonzales then saw Mr. Raulinaitis enter his silver Infiniti, with  
27 customized California plates reading “SIG ESQ.” The vehicle was parked backed  
28 into the driveway.

WISOTSKY, PROCTER & SHYER  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 1500  
OXNARD, CALIFORNIA 93036  
TELEPHONE (805) 278-0920

1 [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶17.]

2 17. The silver Infiniti was parked adjacent to Mr. Raulinaitis's wife's Toyota  
3 SUV in the driveway.

4 [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶18.]

5 18. Mr. Raulinaitis loaded a blue cooler onto the passenger seat of his vehicle,  
6 entered the car, and drove away.

7 [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶¶19, 20.]

8 19. Deputy Gonzales followed Mr. Raulinaitis to an address in Burbank,  
9 which Mr. Raulinaitis had listed in the concealed weapons permit application as his  
10 business address and which his driver's license listed as his address.

11 [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶21.]

12 20. Deputy Gonzales instructed his fellow investigator to conduct a follow-up  
13 surveillance and to report the results. Reserve Deputy Ed Jones reported to Deputy  
14 Gonzales that he saw Mr. Raulinaitis leave the home in Santa Clarita, the same  
15 address which the application listed as his wife's residence. Detective Jones stated  
16 that he saw Mr. Raulinaitis walk to the silver Infiniti, same license plate, and that he  
17 recognized Mr. Raulinaitis from his DMV photo and from the prior surveillance.

18 [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶¶22-24.]

19 21. Detective Jones's observations, relayed to lead investigator Gonzales,  
20 were made on February 1, 2013, at 6:42 a.m.

21 [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶25.]

22 22. Deputy Gonzales's personal surveillance of the address provided by  
23 Mr. Raulinaitis as his wife's, combined with the report of his partner, Detective  
24 Jones, confirmed that Mr. Raulinaitis stayed at the Santa Clarita residence from  
25 which he departed for work on the two mornings they conducted surveillance of him  
26 at that residence.

27 [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶26.]

28 ///

1 23. Mr. Raulinaitis's claim to Ventura County residency was ownership of a  
2 condominium in Oxnard. When Deputy Gonzales spoke with the property manager,  
3 he was informed that she had spoken with Mr. Raulinaitis's wife, who said that they  
4 were renting the condominium to their son.

5 [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶28.]

6 24. On the same day as Deputy Gonzales interviewed Mr. Raulinaitis,  
7 February 20, 2013, Mr. Raulinaitis registered to vote in Ventura County.

8 [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶29.]

9 25. From his investigation, Deputy Gonzales determined that it was not  
10 reasonable to conclude that Mr. Raulinaitis was a Ventura County resident, and on  
11 that basis his application was denied.

12 [Gonzales Declaration 1, Exhibit A, ¶30.]

13 **B. Investigation of Plaintiff's Second Concealed Weapons Permit Application**  
14 **Submitted on March 26, 2014**

15 26. Still assigned to investigate applications for concealed weapons permits,  
16 Deputy Gonzales investigated the March 26, 2014, new concealed weapons permit  
17 application from Mr. Raulinaitis.

18 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶¶2-5.]

19 27. Following the *Peruta* decision, there are only two conditions precedent for  
20 issuance of a concealed weapons permit, these being moral character and Ventura  
21 County residency. The third requirement, successful completion of a firearms  
22 training course, is a condition subsequent following permit issuance.

23 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶6.]

24 28. On April 16, 2014, Deputy Gonzales began surveillance of  
25 Mr. Raulinaitis's address which he gave in his application as being in the city of  
26 Oxnard.

27 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶7.]

28 ///

WISOTSKY, PROCTER & SHYER  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 1500  
OXNARD, CALIFORNIA 93036  
TELEPHONE (805) 278-0920

1 29. At 5:30 a.m., Deputy Gonzales went to the condominium complex in  
2 Oxnard which Mr. Raulinaitis provided in the concealed weapons permit application  
3 as being his home. Driving through the outer parking lot, Deputy Gonzales did not  
4 see any vehicle registered to Mr. Raulinaitis parked in that parking lot.

5 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶8.]

6 30. Deputy Gonzales then began his surveillance, which lasted continuously  
7 from 5:30 a.m. to 7:30 a.m. He did not see Mr. Raulinaitis or any of the vehicles  
8 registered to him or to his wife.

9 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶9.]

10 31. On April 17, 2014, Deputy Gonzales again arrived at the Oxnard  
11 condominium complex at 5:24 a.m., drove through the parking lot as he had on  
12 the previous day, and again he did not see any of the vehicles registered to  
13 Mr. Raulinaitis parked in the lot or on the adjacent street.

14 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶¶10, 11.]

15 32. Deputy Gonzales parked his vehicle and began surveillance at 5:25 a.m.,  
16 which he continuously maintained to 7:30 a.m. on April 17, 2014, during which time  
17 he did not see Mr. Raulinaitis or any of the vehicles registered to him.

18 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶¶12, 13.]

19 33. On April 18, 2014, at 5:27 a.m., Deputy Gonzales arrived at the  
20 Oxnard address listed in the concealed weapons permit application submitted by  
21 Mr. Raulinaitis, drove through the parking lot, and again did not see any of the  
22 vehicles registered to Mr. Raulinaitis.

23 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶14.]

24 34. At 5:37 a.m., Deputy Gonzales gained access to the secured parking  
25 structure beneath the Oxnard condominium complex which Mr. Raulinaitis listed as  
26 his residence in the concealed weapons permit application. Searching through the  
27 structure, including the numbered space assigned to Mr. Raulinaitis, Deputy Gonzales

28 ///

WISOTSKY, PROCTER & SHYER  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 1500  
OXNARD, CALIFORNIA 93036  
TELEPHONE (805) 278-0920

1 did not find any vehicles registered to Mr. Raulinaitis either in the assigned space or  
2 in the entire underground parking structure.

3 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶15.]

4 35. Continuing his surveillance until 7:00 a.m., Deputy Gonzales did not see  
5 Mr. Raulinaitis or any of the vehicles registered to him or to his wife.

6 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶16.]

7 36. On April 21, 2014, Deputy Gonzales and his partner, Detective Jones,  
8 began surveillance of the Santa Clarita address which Mr. Raulinaitis listed for his  
9 wife’s residence in the concealed weapons permit application. Arriving at 5:40 a.m.,  
10 Deputy Gonzales saw two vehicles parked in the driveway of the house in Santa  
11 Clarita. One was the Toyota Sequoia belonging to Mr. Raulinaitis’s wife. The other  
12 was the silver Infiniti with the license plate “SIG ESQ” belonging to Mr. Raulinaitis.

13 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶¶17, 18.]

14 37. At 7:15 a.m., Deputy Gonzales and Deputy Jones saw the silver Infiniti  
15 belonging to Mr. Raulinaitis leave the cul-de-sac containing the residence where his  
16 concealed weapons permit application claimed that his wife lived.

17 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶19.]

18 38. Deputy Gonzales and Detective Jones followed Mr. Raulinaitis’s silver  
19 Infiniti and were able to positively identify Mr. Raulinaitis as the silver Infiniti’s  
20 driver.

21 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶20.]

22 39. On the following day, April 22, 2014, Deputy Gonzales and Detective  
23 Jones again conducted surveillance at the Santa Clarita address. There again were the  
24 two vehicles parked in the driveway, one being the Toyota Sequoia belonging to  
25 plaintiff’s wife and the other being Mr. Raulinaitis’s silver Infiniti, license plate  
26 “SIG ESQ.”

27 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶21.]

28 ///

WISOTSKY, PROCTER & SHYER  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 1500  
OXNARD, CALIFORNIA 93036  
TELEPHONE (805) 278-0920



WISOTSKY, PROCTER & SHYER  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 1500  
OXNARD, CALIFORNIA 93036  
TELEPHONE (805) 278-0920

1           40. Deputy Gonzales and Detective Jones began their surveillance at 6:51 a.m.  
2 Deputy Gonzales saw Mr. Raulinaitis driving his silver Infiniti. Deputy Gonzales  
3 recognized the plaintiff from his interview of him in connection with his initial  
4 concealed weapons permit application and from his DMV photo.

5                   [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶22.]

6           41. On April 23, 2014, Detective Jones and Deputy Gonzales went to the  
7 Santa Clarita address, where they saw the same two vehicles parked in the driveway  
8 as they had seen on the two previous days.

9                   [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶23.]

10          42. At 6:51 a.m., Deputy Gonzales saw Mr. Raulinaitis driving his silver  
11 Infiniti, recognizing him as previously explained.

12                   [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶24.]

13          43. On April 23, 2014, Mr. Raulinaitis drove at a very slow rate of speed,  
14 atypical of his driving behavior. He looked at Detective Jones and Deputy Gonzales,  
15 leading Deputy Gonzales to believe that Mr. Raulinaitis had become aware of  
16 their surveillance. The next day, when they arrived to conduct surveillance,  
17 Mr. Raulinaitis was not there at the Santa Clarita address.

18                   [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶25.]

19          44. On May 15, 2014, Deputy Gonzales and Detective Jones knocked on  
20 doors at the Oxnard condominium complex, hoping to interview neighbors, but no  
21 one answered.

22                   [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶26.]

23          45. While there, at about 4:00 p.m. that same day, Deputy Gonzales and  
24 Detective Jones checked the parking structure, but none of Mr. Raulinaitis's vehicles  
25 nor his wife's vehicle were present.

26                   [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶27.]

27          46. Deputy Gonzales and Detective Jones drove to the Santa Clarita address to  
28 contact neighbors on May 15, 2014. Upon arrival, they saw the silver Infiniti, license

1 plate “SIG ESQ,” parked in the driveway of the home he listed as belonging to his  
2 wife.

3 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶28.]

4 47. Deputy Gonzales attaches a photograph to his declaration as Exhibit C  
5 which he took on that date, May 15, 2014, at the stated time, depicting  
6 Mr. Raulinaitis’s silver Infiniti with the personalized plates backed into the driveway  
7 of the Santa Clarita residence.

8 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶30; Exhibit C thereto.]

9 48. Deputy Gonzales showed the first neighbor that he and Detective Jones  
10 contacted the DMV photograph of the plaintiff. The neighbor immediately recog-  
11 nized Mr. Raulinaitis as being his neighbor, stating that they had been neighbors for  
12 14 years. He stated that he saw Mr. Raulinaitis on a regular basis. When asked by  
13 Deputy Gonzales if he knew what type of vehicle Mr. Raulinaitis drove, he correctly  
14 identified it as a silver Infiniti with a custom license plate, “SIG something.”

15 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶31.]

16 49. The next neighbor Deputy Gonzales and Detective Jones contacted was  
17 also shown the DMV photograph of the plaintiff. She stated that she did not know  
18 the man but did recognize his photograph. Deputy Gonzales asked her if she knew  
19 where he lived. She stepped into her front yard and pointed at Mr. Raulinaitis’s  
20 house. She then called her son to the front door and asked him if he recognized the  
21 photograph, which Deputy Gonzales showed him. He identified it as being their  
22 neighbor. When asked if he knew where the man lived, he also stepped into the front  
23 yard and pointed at Mr. Raulinaitis’s home.

24 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶32.]

25 50. Speaking with a third neighbor, to whom Deputy Gonzales showed the  
26 DMV photograph of the plaintiff, the neighbor identified the man as “Sig.” Deputy  
27 Gonzales then asked when he last saw Sig. The third neighbor said he saw Sig two  
28 days earlier coming home from work. Deputy Gonzales asked the third neighbor if

WISOTSKY, PROCTER & SHYER  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 1500  
OXNARD, CALIFORNIA 93036  
TELEPHONE (805) 278-0920

1 he saw Sig on a regular basis. The neighbor replied that he saw Sig about every other  
2 day, waving to him in greeting. This third neighbor also explained that he was good  
3 friends with Sig's son and that they grew up together.

4 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶33.]

5 51. As Deputy Gonzales and Detective Jones were walking away, this  
6 neighbor's mother drove into the driveway. The two sheriff's investigators spoke  
7 with her, showing her the plaintiff's DMV photograph. She positively identified the  
8 man shown in the photograph as being "Sig." She said she often saw Sig. She last  
9 socialized with him in March or April of 2014 at a neighborhood function. Deputy  
10 Gonzales asked her if the silver Infiniti parked in the driveway belonged to Sig, to  
11 which she responded, "Yes."

12 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶34.]

13 52. Detective Jones and Deputy Gonzales then went to a fourth neighbor's  
14 home, a wife and husband who lived in a home in the same neighborhood. They did  
15 not recognize Mr. Raulinaitis's DMV photograph but added that they don't socialize  
16 with any of their neighbors. While speaking with them, Deputy Gonzales noticed a  
17 vehicle in his peripheral vision. Turning around, he saw the silver Infiniti,  
18 license plate "SIG ESQ," pulling out of the driveway of the home claimed in  
19 Mr. Raulinaitis's second application for a concealed weapons permit to belong to his  
20 wife. Looking in the driver's compartment of the silver Infiniti, he recognized the  
21 driver as Sigitas Raulinaitis. Deputy Gonzales saw that Mr. Raulinaitis focused his  
22 gaze in his direction.

23 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶35.]

24 53. Detective Jones and Deputy Gonzales went to a fifth home in the  
25 neighborhood. They interviewed a wife and husband who explained that they had  
26 moved into the neighborhood a couple of years earlier but had not yet met any of  
27 their neighbors.

28 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶36.]

WISOTSKY, PROCTER & SHYER  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 1500  
OXNARD, CALIFORNIA 93036  
TELEPHONE (805) 278-0920

WISOTSKY, PROCTER & SHYER  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 1500  
OXNARD, CALIFORNIA 93036  
TELEPHONE (805) 278-0920

1           54. The two interviewers then went to a sixth home in the neighborhood.  
2 They showed the neighbor the DMV photograph of Mr. Raulinaitis. She identified  
3 him as “Sig.” She said she sees Sig once or twice a week. Deputy Gonzales asked  
4 her if she knew the type of vehicle he drove, and she said he drove a silver Infiniti.  
5 Deputy Gonzales asked her how often she saw the silver Infiniti parked in the  
6 driveway, and she said, “Every day.”

7                   [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶37.]

8           55. The seventh and last neighbor interviewed by the two Ventura County  
9 sheriff’s employees was a Los Angeles County sheriff’s deputy. They showed him  
10 Mr. Raulinaitis’s DMV photograph, which he identified as being “Sig.” As he was  
11 saying, “Oh, that’s Sig,” he pointed to the home which Mr. Raulinaitis’s concealed  
12 weapons permit application identified as belonging to his wife. The neighbor said he  
13 saw Sig on a regular basis.

14                   [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶38.]

15           56. Deputy Gonzales has omitted the identities of the interviewed neighbors  
16 by name because it didn’t seem crucial and he didn’t want to violate their privacy, but  
17 he can identify each of them if the Court thinks it significant.

18                   [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶39.]

19           57. The Thousand Oaks special enforcement unit of the Ventura County  
20 Sheriff’s Office located Mr. Raulinaitis’s Twitter page, which was e-mailed to  
21 Deputy Gonzales. The plaintiff’s Twitter page was identified by his name, Sig  
22 Raulinaitis, at the top. He wrote, “Contractor, Attorney, Broker and gun toting  
23 libertarian!” On the next line, he wrote “Santa Clarita · mtibuilders.com.”

24                   [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶40.]

25           58. Based upon the entirety of his investigation, Deputy Gonzales concluded  
26 that Mr. Raulinaitis’s residence, or, at a minimum, his primary residence, was in the  
27 city of Santa Clarita in Los Angeles County. This determination contradicted

28 ///

1 Mr. Raulinaitis’s representation contained in his application for a concealed weapons  
2 permit that he resided in the city of Oxnard.

3 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶41.]


4 59. Although Mr. Raulinaitis was registered to vote in Ventura County, this  
5 was of extremely minimal significance, because the Registrar of Voters does not  
6 require any proof of residency at all. The individual is simply requested to provide a  
7 residence address. The person is not required to show identification, a utility bill, or  
8 any other evidence that he or she actually resides in Ventura County.

9 [Gonzales Declaration 2, Exhibit B, ¶42.]

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

DATED: June 3, 2014

WISOTSKY, PROCTER & SHYER

By:   
\_\_\_\_\_  
Jeffrey Feld  
Attorneys for Defendant,  
VENTURA COUNTY SHERIFF’S OFFICE

WISOTSKY, PROCTER & SHYER  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
300 ESPLANADE DRIVE, SUITE 1500  
OXNARD, CALIFORNIA 93036  
TELEPHONE (805) 278-0920