

1 C. D. Michel - S.B.N. 144258
Clinton B. Monfort - S.B.N. 255609
2 Sean A. Brady - S.B.N. 262007
Anna M. Barvir - S.B.N. 268728
3 MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
180 E. Ocean Boulevard, Suite 200
4 Long Beach, CA 90802
Telephone: (562) 216-4444
5 Facsimile: (562) 216-4445
Email: cmichel@michellawyers.com
6

7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs in *San Francisco Veteran Police*
Officers Association v. City and County of San Francisco
8 and *Fyock v. Sunnyvale*, No. 13-CV 05807

9 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

10 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

12 SAN FRANCISCO VETERAN POLICE)
OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, LARRY)
13 BARSETTI, RAINERIO GRANADOS,)
ARTHUR RITCHIE, and RANDALL)
14 LOW,)

CASE NO: 13-CV-5351 WHA
NOTICE OF FILING OF COURTESY
COPIES

15 Plaintiffs,)

16 v.)

17 THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN)
FRANCISCO, THE MAYOR OF SAN)
18 FRANCISCO, EDWIN LEE, in his official)
capacity, THE CHIEF OF THE SAN)
19 FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT,)
GREG SUHR, in his official capacity, and)
20 DOES 1-10,)

21 Defendants.)

22
23 TO THIS COURT AND ALL ATTORNEYS OF RECORD:

24 Plaintiffs hereby file the attached copies of documents filed this week in *Fyock v.*
25 *Sunnyvale*, Case No. 13-CV-05807. In that case, defendants, the City of Sunnyvale, the Mayor of
26 Sunnyvale, Anthony Spitaleri, in his official capacity, and the Chief of the Sunnyvale Department
27 of Public Services, Frank Grgurina, in his official capacity, (collectively, “the *Fyock*
28 Defendants”) have requested the presiding judge consider whether *Fyock* should be related with

1 this case. The *Fyock* Defendants mistakenly filed that motion in *Fyock*, though it should have
2 been filed in this case. Civil L.R. 3-12(b) (“the party must promptly file in the *earliest-filed case*
3 an Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should be Related”).

4 There is currently no motion pending before this Court. But, because the local rules
5 require that “[a]ny opposition to or support of a Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should be
6 Related must be filed in the earliest filed case,” Civil L.R. 3-12(e), Plaintiffs, together with the
7 *Fyock* Plaintiffs, Leonard Fyock, Scott Hochstetler, William Douglas, David Pearson, Brad
8 Seifers, and Rod Swanson, hereby file this Notice of Filing of Courtesy Copies out of an
9 abundance of caution. The *Fyock* Defendants’ motion to relate cases and Plaintiffs’ opposition to
10 that motion are attached as Exhibits 1 and 2, respectively.

11 This filing is also intended to substantially comply with the requirement that any
12 opposition be lodged in the Chambers of each Judge presiding over the cases sought to be related.
13 Civil L.R. 3-12(e).

14 If this Court wishes to consider whether these cases are related, Plaintiffs’ argument
15 opposing relation for failure to meet the definition of “related cases” can be found on pages 2
16 through 4 of the Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Defendants’ Administrative Motion to Consider
17 Whether Cases Should Be Related (attached hereto as Exhibit 2).

18 Dated: December 27, 2013

MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P. C.

19
20 /s/ C. D. Michel
21 C. D. Michel
22 Attorney for Plaintiffs in *San Francisco*
23 *Veteran Police Officers Association v. City*
and County of San Francisco and Fyock v.
Sunnyvale, No. 13-CV 05807

EXHIBIT 1

1 Roderick M. Thompson (State Bar No. 96192)
 rthompson@fbm.com
 2 Anthony P. Schoenberg (State Bar No. 203714)
 aschoenberg@fbm.com
 3 Evan M. Engstrom (State Bar No. 267300)
 eengstrom@fbm.com
 4 James H. Baker (State Bar No. 291836)
 j baker@fbm.com
 5 Farella Braun + Martel LLP
 235 Montgomery Street, 17th Floor
 6 San Francisco, CA 94104
 Telephone: (415) 954-4400
 7 Facsimile: (415) 954-4480

8 Attorneys for Defendants

9 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT

10 SAN JOSE DIVISION

11
 12 LEONARD FYOCK, SCOTT
 HOCHSTETLER, WILLIAM DOUGLAS,
 13 DAVID PEARSON, BRAD SEIFERS, and
 ROD SWANSON,

14 Plaintiffs,

15 vs.

16 THE CITY OF SUNNYVALE, THE
 17 MAYOR OF SUNNYVALE, ANTHONY
 SPITALERI in his official capacity, THE
 18 CHIEF OF THE SUNNYVALE
 DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,
 19 FRANK GRGURINA, in his official
 capacity, and DOES 1-10,

20 Defendants.
21

Case No. CV13-05807 RMW

**DEFENDANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE
 MOTION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER TO
 CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD
 BE RELATED**

[LOCAL RULE 3-12]

22
 23
 24 Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 3-12, Defendants submit this Administrative Motion to
 25 Consider Whether Cases Should be Related and to have this Court determine whether the case
 26 *San Francisco Veteran Police Officers Association, et al., v. City and County of San Francisco, et*
 27 *al.* No. 4:13-cv-05351-WHA is related to this case. The city ordinance being challenged in this
 28 case is virtually identical to the one at issue in the *San Francisco Veteran Police Officers*

1 *Association, et al., v. City and County of San Francisco, et al.* No. 4:13-cv-05351-WHA case now
2 pending before the Honorable William H. Alsup.

3 Under the definition of related cases provided in Civil L.R. 3-12(a), *San Francisco*
4 *Veteran Police Officers Association, et al., v. City and County of San Francisco, et al.* No. 4:13-
5 cv-05351-WHA may be related to this action. Both cases involve the same, single question of
6 law, specifically whether the city ordinances banning the possession of magazines containing
7 more than 10 rounds violate the Second Amendment. See Civil L.R. 3-12(a)(1) (“The actions
8 concern substantially the same . . . question of law.”) The ordinances in question are essentially
9 identical; the primary difference is that the Sunnyvale code bans the possession and use of these
10 magazines, while the San Francisco ordinance prohibits only their possession. Because an
11 individual cannot use these magazines without possessing them, this distinction appears to be
12 inconsequential. Also the Court may determine that “[i]t appears likely that there will be an
13 unduly burdensome duplication of labor . . . or conflicting results if the cases are conducted
14 before different judges.” Civil L.R. 3-12(a)(2). Both cases require application of the same legal
15 doctrines and many of the same facts will be presented in both cases. This raises concerns about
16 the possibility of conflicting results, as two Judges of this Court would be required to decide the
17 issues of constitutionality and enforceability of essentially identical city codes. It may thus be an
18 inefficient use of judicial resources to litigate these cases separately.

19 For the foregoing reasons, and pursuant to Civil L.R. 3-12, Defendants respectfully
20 request that the Court consider whether the case *San Francisco Veteran Police Officers*

21 ///
22 ///
23 ///
24 ///
25 ///
26 ///
27 ///
28 ///

1 *Association, et al., v. City and County of San Francisco, et al.* No. 4:13-cv-05351-WHA should
2 be related to this case.

3 Dated: December 23, 2013

FARELLA BRAUN + MARTEL LLP

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

By: /s/
Anthony Schoenberg
Attorneys for Defendants

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

[PROPOSED] ORDER

Considering Defendants Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should Be Related (L.R. 3-12);

____ The Court finds that *Leonard Fyock et al. v. City of Sunnyvale et al.* CV13-05807 RMW and the earlier-filed *San Francisco Veteran Police Officers Association, et al. v. City and County of San Francisco, et al.* No. 4:13-cv-05351-WHA are related.

____ The Court finds that *Leonard Fyock et al. v. City of Sunnyvale et al.* CV13-05807 RMW is not related to *San Francisco Veteran Police Officers Association, et al. v. City and County of San Francisco, et al.* No. 4:13-cv-05351-WHA.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Date: _____

HON. RONALD M. WHYTE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

EXHIBIT 2

1 C. D. Michel - S.B.N. 144258
 Clinton B. Monfort - S.B.N. 255609
 2 Sean A. Brady - S.B.N. 262007
 Anna M. Barvir - S.B.N. 268728
 3 MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
 180 E. Ocean Boulevard, Suite 200
 4 Long Beach, CA 90802
 Telephone: (562) 216-4444
 5 Facsimile: (562) 216-4445
 Email: cmichel@michellawyers.com
 6

7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs in *Fyock v. Sunnyvale*
 and *San Francisco Veteran Police Officers Association*
 8 *v. City and County of San Francisco* Case No.: 13-CV-05351

9 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

10 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

11 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**

12 LEONARD FYOCK, SCOTT)
 HOCHSTETLER, WILLIAM DOUGLAS,)
 13 DAVID PEARSON, BRAD SEIFERS, and)
 ROD SWANSON,)

14 Plaintiffs,)

15 v.)

16 THE CITY OF SUNNYVALE, THE)
 17 MAYOR OF SUNNYVALE, ANTHONY)
 SPITALERI, in his official capacity, THE)
 18 CHIEF OF THE SUNNYVALE)
 DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC SAFETY,)
 19 FRANK GRGURINA, in his official)
 capacity, and DOES 1-10,)

20 _____)
 Defendants.)
 21)

CASE NO: 13-CV-05807 RMW

OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER CASES SHOULD BE RELATED; DECLARATION OF ANNA M. BARVIR IN SUPPORT

22 **INTRODUCTION**

23 Defendants' attempt to relate *Fyock v. Sunnyvale*, Case No. 13-CV-05807 RMW, with
 24 *San Francisco Veteran Police Officers Association (SFVPOA) v. City and County of San*
 25 *Francisco*, Case No. 13-CV-05351, fails on two counts. As a threshold matter, Defendants'
 26 motion should not be considered because they failed to comply with basic procedural
 27 requirements for an Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should be Related under
 28 the local rules. But more importantly, Defendants failed to show that the two cases meet the

1 requirements set forth in Civil Local Rule 3-12 for relationship. And relating these cases will
2 invite undue prejudice upon the *Fyock* plaintiffs.

3 **I. Defendants' Motion Is Procedurally Defective and Is Not Properly Before This Court**

4 Whenever a party knows, learns, or believes that an action is or may be "related" to
5 another action pending in this District, Civil Local Rule 3-12(b) requires the party to "promptly
6 file *in the earliest-filed case* an Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Cases Should be
7 Related, . . ." Civil L.R. 3-12(b) (emphasis added). A copy of the motion, together with proof of
8 service, "must be served on all known parties to each apparently related action." *Id.*

9 Most significantly, Defendants filed their motion in the later- rather than earlier-filed case.
10 Declaration of Anna Barvir ¶¶ 2, 4; *SFVPOA* Dkt. (attached to Barvir Decl. at Exhibit A). *Fyock*
11 was filed on December 16, 2013, some 27 days *after SFVPOA* was filed. Barvir Decl. ¶¶ 2, 4; Ex.
12 A. Defendants' request is thus not properly before this Court, as it is for the judge presiding over
13 *SFVPOA* to decide whether these cases should be related. *See* Civil L.R. 3-12(b); *see also* Civil
14 L.R. 3-12(c) (if a court believes cases are related, it may in its discretion "refer the case to the
15 Judge assigned to the earliest-filed case with a request that the Judge assigned to [that] case
16 consider whether the cases are related").

17 Defendants also failed to serve the *SFVPOA* plaintiffs with a copy of their motion or proof
18 of service as required by Civil Local Rule 3-12(b).¹ Barvir Decl. ¶¶ 5-6.

19 Even if this Court were to overlook these glaring procedural defects, the facts support
20 Plaintiffs' contention and preference that these matters remain separate.

21 **II. The Cases Do Not Meet the Requirements to Be Considered "Related"**

22 Civil Local Rule 12-3(a) states that an action is related to another when (1) "[t]he actions
23 concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction or event";² and (2) "[i]t appears

24 _____
25 ¹ Plaintiffs' attorneys note here that they also serve as counsel for the plaintiffs in
26 *SFVPOA*, so the failure to serve plaintiffs in that case is of little consequence. Barvir Decl. ¶ 1.
27 Surely, Plaintiffs' counsel would have been willing to waive service, but they were not asked to
28 do so by Defendants. Barvir Decl. ¶ 6.

² Defendants misquote the rule for relation of cases, suggesting that they should be
related if they "concern substantially the same . . . *question of law.*" Defs.' Admin. Mot. to Rel.

1 likely that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting
2 results if the cases are conducted before different Judges.” These cases meet neither prong.

3 As regards the first requirement, it is clear this case concerns neither the same parties nor
4 the same property. No “transaction” is at issue in either case. And the “events” giving rise to this
5 litigation are sufficiently dissimilar to require separate consideration of the two cases. While it is
6 true the events surrounding these cases are similar in one respect – i.e, each case challenges the
7 recent adoption of a local law banning the possession of ammunition magazines capable of
8 accepting more than ten rounds – Sunnyvale adopted its ban by way of ballot measure, whereas
9 San Francisco adopted its ban through legislative enactment. Under no circumstances could the
10 adoption of these two laws be considered the “same event.” They occurred on different dates,
11 through different procedures, using different language, and different justifications.

12 Even if it could be said that these cases involve “substantially the same parties, property,
13 transaction or event,” the Defendants must *also* show it is “*likely* that there will be an unduly
14 burdensome duplication of labor and expense or conflicting results if the cases” are not related.
15 Civil L.R. 12-3(a) (emphasis added). They have shown no such likelihood. If there is any
16 duplication of labor and expense, that burden will fall on Plaintiffs’ attorneys. Not one defendant
17 is a party to both cases and not one of the attorneys representing the various defendants is counsel
18 of record for both cases. Ex. A. And Plaintiffs’ counsel hardly consider any duplication of efforts
19 to be “undue” considering the significance of the constitutional questions raised in each case and
20 the different impact the laws have on their respective challengers.

21 Further, while it is *possible* that conflicting results may be had if these cases are not heard
22 together, such is not “*likely*.” See Civil L.R. 12-3(a)(2). In each case, the court is asked to
23 consider the Second Amendment implications of bans on constitutionally protected items. But the
24 challenged laws are different in significant ways, and they have different impacts on the rights of
25 the respective plaintiffs. For instance, the exceptions to the magazine bans are materially different

26 _____
27 Cases at 2:7-8 (emphasis added). This is not part of the definition of “related cases,” and seems
28 to have been included in the place of “parties, property, transaction or event.” Civil L.R. 3-
12(a). Defendants thus provide no argument as to why they meet the first prong of Local Rule
3-12(a).

1 in each case. *Compare* Sunnyvale, Cal., Muni. Code § 9.44.050(c), *with* S.F., Cal., Police Code §
2 619(d). And the city defendants put forth very different justifications for their attempts to abridge
3 Second Amendment rights. *Compare* Sunnyvale, Cal., Measure C, at 1 (2013) (attached to
4 Compl. as Exhibit A), *with* S.F., Cal., Police Code § 619(a). Perhaps most important, however, is
5 the fact that, as a voter-approved ballot measure, Sunnyvale's magazine ban *cannot* be legislated
6 away in response to this lawsuit. Cal. Elec. Code § 9217. For instance, where San Francisco may,
7 at any time, choose to strike, amend, or stay enforcement of its law as a result of ongoing
8 litigation, Sunnyvale is unable to take such action without a full vote of the people who adopted
9 the challenged law.

10 Because Defendants must show that *both* prongs of Rule 3-12 are met and because they
11 have shown neither, their motion to relate this case with *SFVPOA* should be denied.

12 **III. Relating These Cases Is Likely to Unduly Prejudice the *Fyock* Plaintiffs**

13 The final date by which Sunnyvale residents must dispossess themselves of magazines
14 prohibited by Sunnyvale Municipal Code section 9.44.050 (i.e., March 6, 2014) is quickly
15 approaching. And, because the law was enacted by the people, *it cannot be changed*. Cal. Elec.
16 Code § 9217. Relation of these two cases is thus likely to unduly prejudice the plaintiffs in *Fyock*,
17 who could be tied to a timeline dictated by *SFVPOA* defendants who can alleviate the burden of
18 protracted litigation on the *SFVPOA* plaintiffs by deferring enforcement of their ban.³ All the
19 while, the *Fyock* plaintiffs will be deprived of their constitutionally protected property (possibly
20 indefinitely) and subject to an unconstitutional law, the enforcement of which cannot be deferred
21 without voter approval.

22 For this further reason, the Court should find these cases are unrelated. Should the Court
23 find these cases are related, however, it should order that the timeline driving the challenge in
24 *Fyock* should control this litigation to prevent undue prejudice to Plaintiffs.

26 ³ In fact, the *SFVPOA* defendants have already done just that. To accommodate an
27 extended and appropriate briefing and hearing schedule for plaintiffs' motion for preliminary
28 injunction, defendants agreed to defer enforcement of their magazine ban by 30 days. Barvir
Decl. ¶ 3.

CONCLUSION

Defendants' request to have this case related to *SFVPOA* should be denied because this Court, presiding over the later-filed case, lacks authority to determine relationship under the applicable Civil Local Rules. Should the Court overlook the procedural defects of Defendants' request, the Court should find that these cases are not related because they do not concern the same "parties, property, transaction or event" and are unlikely to result in undue duplication of efforts or conflicting results. Defendants' motion should be denied.

Dated: December 27, 2013

MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P. C.

/s/ C. D. Michel
C. D. Michel
Attorney for Plaintiffs

EXHIBIT A

ADRMOP

**U.S. District Court
California Northern District (San Francisco)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 3:13-cv-05351-WHA**

San Francisco Veteran Police Officers Association et al v. City and County of San Francisco et al
Assigned to: Hon. William Alsup
Cause: 42:1983 Civil Rights Act
Date Filed: 11/19/2013
Jury Demand: None
Nature of Suit: 950 Constitutional - State Statute
Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Plaintiff

**San Francisco Veteran Police Officers
Association**

represented by **Anna Marie Barvir**
Michel and Associates, P.C.
180 E. Ocean Blvd
Suite 200
Long Beach, CA 90802
562-216-4444
Email: abarvir@michellawyers.com
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Carl Dawson Michel
Michel & Associates, P.C.
180 East Ocean Blvd.
Suite 200
Long Beach, CA 90802
562-216-4444
Fax: 562-216-4445
Email: cmichel@michellawyers.com
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Clinton Barnwell Monfort
Michel and Associates, P.C.
180 East Ocean Blvd., Suite 200
Long Beach, CA 90802
562-216-4444
Fax: 562-216-4445
Email: CMonfort@michellawyers.com
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Sean Anthony Brady
Michel Associates, P.C.
180 E Ocean Blvd.
Suite 200
Long Beach, CA 90802
562-216-4444
Fax: 562-216-4445
Email: sbrady@michellawyers.com
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Plaintiff

Larry Barsetti

represented by **Anna Marie Barvir**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Carl Dawson Michel
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Clinton Barnwell Monfort
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Sean Anthony Brady
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Plaintiff

Rainerio Granados

represented by **Anna Marie Barvir**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Carl Dawson Michel
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Clinton Barnwell Monfort
(See above for address)

LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Sean Anthony Brady
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Plaintiff

Arthur Ritchie

represented by **Anna Marie Barvir**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Carl Dawson Michel
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Clinton Barnwell Monfort
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Sean Anthony Brady
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Plaintiff

Randall Low

represented by **Anna Marie Barvir**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Carl Dawson Michel
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Clinton Barnwell Monfort
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Sean Anthony Brady
 (See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

V.

Defendant

City and County of San Francisco

represented by **Christine Van Aken**
 Office of the City Attorney
 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
 City Hall, Room 234
 San Francisco, CA 94102
 415-554-4633
 Fax: 415-554-4699
 Email: christine.van.aken@sfgov.org
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

Edwin Lee

represented by **Christine Van Aken**
 (See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant

Greg Suhr

represented by **Christine Van Aken**
 (See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
11/19/2013	<u>1</u>	COMPLAINT against City and County of San Francisco, Edwin Lee, Greg Suhr (Filing fee \$ 400.). Filed by Larry Barsetti, Rainerio Granados, Randall Low, San Francisco Veteran Police Officers Association, Arthur Ritchie. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Civil Cover Sheet) (vlkS, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 11/19/2013) (Entered: 11/21/2013)
11/19/2013	<u>2</u>	Summons Issued as to City and County of San Francisco, Edwin Lee, Greg Suhr. (vlkS, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 11/19/2013) (Entered: 11/21/2013)
11/19/2013	<u>3</u>	Certificate of Interested Entities by Larry Barsetti, Rainerio Granados, Randall Low, Arthur Ritchie, San Francisco Veteran Police Officers Association (vlkS, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 11/19/2013) (Entered: 11/21/2013)
11/19/2013	<u>5</u>	ADR SCHEDULING ORDER: Case Management Statement due by 2/12/2014.

		Case Management Conference set for 2/19/2014 01:30 PM. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Standing Order)(vlkS, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 11/19/2013) (Entered: 11/21/2013)
11/20/2013	<u>4</u>	CONSENT/DECLINATION to Proceed Before a US Magistrate Judge by Larry Barsetti, Rainerio Granados, Randall Low, Arthur Ritchie, San Francisco Veteran Police Officers Association.. (vlkS, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 11/20/2013) (Entered: 11/21/2013)
11/21/2013	<u>6</u>	CLERK'S NOTICE of Impending Reassignment to U.S. District Judge (ig, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 11/21/2013) (Entered: 11/21/2013)
11/22/2013	<u>7</u>	ORDER REASSIGNING CASE. Case reassigned to Judge Hon. William Alsup for all further proceedings. Magistrate Judge Donna M. Ryu no longer assigned to the case. Signed by the Executive Committee on November 22, 2013. (cjlS, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 11/22/2013) (Entered: 11/22/2013)
12/11/2013	<u>8</u>	Error, Disregard STIPULATION WITH PROPOSED ORDER <i>EXTENDING BRIEFING SCHEDULE ON PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AND EXTENDING TIME FOR DEFENDANTS TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT</i> filed by City and County of San Francisco, Edwin Lee, Greg Suhr. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Declaration of Christine Van Aken)(Van Aken, Christine) (Filed on 12/11/2013) Modified on 12/11/2013 (fff, COURT STAFF). Modified on 12/12/2013 (dtmS, COURT STAFF). (Entered: 12/11/2013)
12/11/2013	<u>9</u>	STIPULATION WITH PROPOSED ORDER <i>EXTENDING BRIEFING SCHEDULE ON PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AND EXTENDING TIME FOR DEFENDANTS TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT -- CORRECTION OF DOCKET # <u>8</u></i> filed by City and County of San Francisco, Edwin Lee, Greg Suhr. (Van Aken, Christine) (Filed on 12/11/2013) (Entered: 12/11/2013)
12/13/2013	<u>10</u>	STIPULATION WITH PROPOSED ORDER <i>EXTENDING BRIEFING SCHEDULE ON PLAINTIFFS MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION AND EXTENDING TIME FOR DEFENDANTS TO RESPOND TO COMPLAINT [CORRECTED]</i> filed by City and County of San Francisco, Edwin Lee, Greg Suhr. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Declaration of Christine Van Aken)(Van Aken, Christine) (Filed on 12/13/2013) (Entered: 12/13/2013)
12/13/2013	<u>11</u>	Order by Hon. William Alsup granting <u>10</u> Stipulation.(whalc3, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 12/13/2013) (Entered: 12/13/2013)

PACER Service Center			
Transaction Receipt			
12/27/2013 11:38:12			
PACER Login:	tm0137	Client Code:	nra-1735

Description:	Docket Report	Search Criteria:	3:13-cv-05351-WHA
Billable Pages:	5	Cost:	0.50

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

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

SAN FRANCISCO VETERAN POLICE OFFICERS ASSOCIATION, LARRY BARSETTI, RAINERIO GRANADOS, ARTHUR RITCHIE, and RANDALL LOW,)	CASE NO: 13-CV-5351 WHA
)	
)	CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
)	
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.) \	
)	
THE CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, THE MAYOR OF SAN FRANCISCO, EDWIN LEE, in his official capacity, THE CHIEF OF THE SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT, GREG SUHR, in his official capacity, and DOES 1-10,)	
)	
)	
Defendants.)	

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED THAT:

I, the undersigned, am a citizen of the United States and am at least eighteen years of age. My business address is 180 E. Ocean Blvd., Suite 200, Long Beach, California, 90802.

I am not a party to the above-entitled action. I have caused service of:

NOTICE OF FILING OF COURTESY COPIES

on the following party by electronically filing the foregoing with the Clerk of the District Court using its ECF System, which electronically notifies them.

Wayne Snodgrass, Deputy City Attorney Christine Van Aken, Deputy City Attorney Office of the City Attorney 1 Drive Carlton B. Goodlett Place City Hall, Room 234 San Francisco, CA 94102 (SERVICE VIA ECF)	Roderick M. Thompson Anthony P. Schoenberg Farella Braun + Martel, LLP 235 Montgomery Street, 17 TH Floor San Francisco, CA 94104 (SERVICE VIA U.S. MAIL)
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on December 27, 2013.

/s/ C. D. Michel
C. D. Michel
Attorney for Plaintiffs