

09-16852

IN THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

**JAMES ROTHERY and ANDREA HOFFMAN,**

Plaintiffs - Appellants,

**v.**

**COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO, et al.,**

Defendants - Appellees.

On Appeal from the United States District Court  
for the Eastern District of California  
No. 2:08-cv-02064-JAM-KJM  
The Honorable John A. Mendez, Judge

**JOINT MOTION BY DEFENDANTS – APPELLEES  
FOR FURTHER STAY OF  
APPELLATE PROCEEDINGS**

JOHN A. LAVRA

State Bar No. 114533

AMANDA L. McDERMOTT

STATE BAR NO. 253651

LONGYEAR, O'DEA & LAVRA, LLP

3620 American River Drive, Suite 230

Sacramento, CA 95864-5923

Telephone: (916) 974-8500

Fax: (916) 974-8510

*Attorneys for Appellees County of*

*Sacramento, Lou Blanas, John McGinnis,*

*Timothy Sheehan*

KAMALA D. HARRIS

Attorney General of California

DOUGLAS J. WOODS

Senior Assistant Attorney General

MARK R. BECKINGTON

Supervising Deputy Attorney General

GEORGE WATERS

Deputy Attorney General

State Bar No. 88295

1300 I Street, Suite 125

P.O. Box 944255

Sacramento, CA 94244-2550

Telephone: (916) 323-8050

Fax: (916) 324-8835

*Attorneys for Appellee*

*Kamala D. Harris*

## **I. RELIEF SOUGHT**

Appellees, County of Sacramento, Lou Blanas, John McGinnis, Tim Sheehan and Kamala D. Harris, move this Court for an extension of the current stay of proceedings in this matter. At present, appellees' answering briefs are due December 29, 2015. Appellees request that the current stay be extended until ninety (90) days following issuance of the Ninth Circuit's mandate in *Peruta v. County of San Diego*, No. 10-56971.

## **II. POSITIONS OF ALL COUNSEL**

All appellees, through the undersigned counsel, join in this Motion for Further Stay of Appellate Proceedings.

All appellants are represented by Gary W. Gorski. Mr. Gorski has stated to counsel that he does not object to a continued stay of appellate proceedings. (See ¶ 6 of the attached Joint Declaration.)

## **III. NEED FOR EXTENSION OF THE CURRENT STAY**

The present appeal has been stayed several times pending the resolution of other appeals. This Court's present stay order was entered September 17, 2015, and stays proceedings until December 29, 2015. (Dkt. # 71.) As set forth in that order, "At or prior to the expiration of the stay of appellate proceedings, the appellees shall file the answering briefs or file a motion for appropriate relief."

There is good reason to stay the present appeal pending resolution of the *Peruta* appeal. There is considerable overlap between *Peruta* and the present case. Both cases present questions involving the constitutionality of Concealed Carry Weapon (CCW) statutes and policies, and both cases present the underlying issue whether the Second Amendment extends to the right to carry a loaded handgun in public. On February 13, 2014, the *Peruta* panel—by a 2-1 vote—concluded that San Diego County’s CCW permitting requirement impermissibly infringes on the Second Amendment right to bear arms. (*Peruta* Dkt. # 117.) The State of California moved to intervene, the motion was denied, and California filed a petition for rehearing en banc of the order denying the motion to intervene. (*Peruta* Dkt. ## 122, 156, 157.) On March 26, 2015, the Ninth Circuit ordered the case reheard en banc. (*Peruta* Dkt. # 193.) The *Peruta* appeal was consolidated for rehearing en banc with a second CCW case, *Richards v. Prieto*, No. 11-16255. (*Peruta* Dkt. # 200.) Oral argument before the en banc panel was held June 16, 2015. (*Peruta* Dkt. # 325.)

*Peruta*, once it is final, may resolve many of the issues presented in the present appeal. A further stay will allow the parties to better brief the Second Amendment issues presented here, and will allow the Ninth Circuit

to avoid potentially conflicting or inconsistent decisions on the constitutionality of California's CCW licensing regime.

Accordingly, appellees request that the current stay be extended until ninety (90) days following issuance of the Ninth Circuit's mandate in *Peruta v. County of San Diego*, No. 10-56971.

Dated: December 15, 2015      KAMALA D. HARRIS  
Attorney General of California

*/s/ GEORGE WATERS*

GEORGE WATERS  
Deputy Attorney General  
*Attorneys for Appellee  
Kamala D. Harris*

Dated: December 15, 2015      LONGYEAR, O'DEA & LAVRA

*/s/ John A. Lavra*

JOHN A. LAVRA  
*Attorneys for Appellees  
County of Sacramento, Lou Blanas,  
John McGinnis, Timothy Sheehan*

**JOINT DECLARATION OF JOHN A. LAVRA AND  
GEORGE WATERS IN SUPPORT OF APPELLEES'  
MOTION FOR FURTHER STAY**

We, John A Lavra, and George Waters, declare as follows:

1. We are attorneys licensed to practice law before all courts in the State of California and are admitted to practice before this Court. John A. Lavra is a partner in the law firm of Longyear, O'Dea & Lavra, LLP, counsel of record for Defendants/Appellees, County of Sacramento, Lou Blanas, John McGinnis, and Tim Sheehan. George Waters is a Deputy Attorney General for the State of California and counsel of record for Defendant/Appellee Kamala D. Harris, Attorney General of the State of California.

2. In the present *Rothery* appeal, appellants' opening brief was filed on May 6, 2010. (Dkt. # 11.) Thereafter, appellate proceedings, including the filing of appellees' answering briefs, have been stayed by a series of court orders. (Dkt. ## 15, 18, 20, 22, 25, 27, 35, 37, 39, 43, 45, 47, 49, 51, 53, 55, 57, 59, 61, 63, 65, 67, 71.) At present, appellees' answering briefs are due December 29, 2015.

3. The present case (*Rothery*) was stayed several times pending resolution of *Mehl v. Lou Blanas, et al.*, Ninth Circuit No. 08-15773. Both cases involve a constitutional challenge to California's Concealed Carry

Weapon (CCW) statutes. *Mehl* was argued twice to the Ninth Circuit: June 11, 2009 (*Mehl* Dkt. # 26), and December 10, 2012 (*Mehl* Dkt. # 50). On July 8, 2013, *Mehl* was decided without resolving the constitutional issues presented. (*Mehl* Dkt. # 76.)

4. *Peruta v. County of San Diego*, Ninth Circuit No. 10-56971, also presents a constitutional challenge to CCW statutes and policies. On February 13, 2014, the *Peruta* panel—by a 2-1 vote—concluded that San Diego County’s CCW permitting requirement impermissibly infringes on the Second Amendment right to bear arms. (*Peruta* Dkt. # 117.) The State of California moved to intervene, the motion was denied, and California filed a petition for rehearing en banc of the order denying the motion to intervene. (*Peruta* Dkt. ## 122, 156, 157.) On March 26, 2015, the Ninth Circuit ordered the case reheard en banc. (*Peruta* Dkt. # 193.) The *Peruta* appeal was consolidated for rehearing en banc with a second CCW case, *Richards v. Prieto*, No. 11-16255. (*Peruta* Dkt. # 200.) Oral argument before the en banc panel was held June 16, 2015. (*Peruta* Dkt. # 325.) *Peruta* may resolve many of the issues presented in the present appeal.

5. Appellees have exercised diligence in this matter, but will have only one opportunity to address the Second Amendment and related issues

raised by appellants. Because the constitutional and statutory issues presented here are similar to those presented by the *Peruta* appeal (both cases present the underlying issue whether the Second Amendment extends to the right to carry a loaded handgun in public), it is appropriate to await for final resolution of *Peruta* prior to any further briefing in *Rothery*. The requested continuation of the stay to a date until ninety (90) days following issuance of the Ninth Circuit's mandate in *Peruta* is therefore reasonable and will enable appellees' counsel to fulfill their obligations to their clients and to this Court.

6. All Plaintiffs/Appellants in this action are represented by Gary W. Gorski. On December 14, 2015, Mr. Gorski stated by email that he does not object to a continued stay of appellate proceedings.

Declarants declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States and the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

EXECUTED this 15<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2015, at Sacramento, California.

LONGYEAR, O'DEA & LAVRA, LLP

KAMALA D. HARRIS  
Attorney General of California

*/s/ John A. Lavra*

*/s/ George Waters*

JOHN A LAVRA  
*Attorneys for Appellees*  
*County of Sacramento, Lou Blanas,*  
*John McGinnis, Timothy Sheehan*

GEORGE WATERS  
*Attorneys for Appellee*  
*Kamala D. Harris*



## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Case Name: **James Rothery, et al. v. Lou  
Blanas, et al. (on Appeal 9th  
COA)**

---

No. **09-16852**

---

I hereby certify that on December 15, 2015, I electronically filed the following documents with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system:

### **JOINT MOTION BY DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES FOR FURTHER STAY OF APPELLATE PROCEEDINGS**

I certify that **all** participants in the case are registered CM/ECF users and that service will be accomplished by the CM/ECF system.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on December 15, 2015, at Sacramento, California.

---

Tracie L. Campbell

Declarant

---

/s/ Tracie Campbell

Signature