	Case 2:17-cv-00903-WBS-KJN Document 4	8-1 Filed 06/23/17 Page 1 of 9
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12		TES DISTRICT COURT STRICT OF CALIFORNIA
	WILLIAM WIESE of al	2:17-cv-00903-WBS-KJN
13	WILLIAM WIESE, et al.,	
14	Plaintiff,	DECLARATION OF JOHN D. ECHEVERRIA IN SUPPORT OF
15 16 17 18	XAVIER BECERRA, et al., Defendant.	DEFENDANTS' SUPPLEMENTAL BRIEF IN FURTHER OPPOSITION TO RENEWED MOTION FOR TEMPORARY RESTRAINING ORDER AND ISSUANCE OF PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION
19		Date: June 29, 2017 Time: 9:00 a.m.
20		Dept: 5, 14th Floor Judge: Hon. William B. Shubb
21		Trial Date: None Set Action Filed: April 28, 2017
22		1 /
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		nts' Supplemental Brief in Further Opposition to Renewed e of Preliminary Injunction (17-cv-00903-WBS-KJN)

Case 2:17-cv-00903-WBS-KJN Document 48-1 Filed 06/23/17 Page 2 of 9 1 I, John D. Echeverria, declare: 2 1. I am a Deputy Attorney General at the California Department of Justice and serve 3 as counsel to Defendants Xavier Becerra and Martha Supernor (together, "Defendants") in the 4 above-titled matter. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth in this declaration, and if 5 called upon as a witness, I could testify competently as those facts. I make this declaration in 6 support of Defendants' Supplemental Brief in Further Opposition to Renewed Motion for 7 Temporary Restraining Order and Issuance of Preliminary Injunction. A true and correct copy of the Order re Demurrers of the State Defendants and the 8 2. 9 Defendant-Intervenors, issued by the Superior Court of the County of San Francisco in Asian 10 American Rights Committee of California v. Brown, No. CGC 12-517723 (Cal. Super. Ct. July 11 20, 2012), is annexed hereto as Exhibit A. 12 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the 13 foregoing is true and correct. 14 Executed on June 23, 2017, at Los Angeles, California. 15 s/ John D. Echeverria John D. Echeverria 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 1

EXHIBIT A

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO

Document Scanning Lead Sheet

Jul-23-2012 3:24 pm

Case Number: CGC-12-517723

Filing Date: Jul-23-2012 3:24

Filed by: LESLEY FISCELLA

Juke Box: 001 Image: 03696237

ORDER

ASIAN AMERICAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE OF CALIFORNIA, AN VS. EDMUND BROWN, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS et al

001C03696237

Instructions:

Please place this sheet on top of the document to be scanned.

1	Prepared by the Court	
2		
3		
4		
5		San Francisco County Superior Co
6		JUL 2 3 2012
7		CLERK OF THE COURT BY: Pesly Tool Tool Tool Tool Tool Tool Tool To
8	SUPERIOR COUR	T OF CALIFORNIA Deputy Clerk
9	County Of San Francisco	
10	Department No. 302	
11		12-517723
12	ASIAN AMERICAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE OF CALIFORNIA,	No. CGC-1 0-501014
13	Plaintiff,	ORDER RE DEMURRERS OF THE STATE DEFENDANTS AND THE DEFENDANT-
14	v.	INTERVENORS
15	EDMUND BROWN, et al,	
16	Defendants	
17	and	
18	THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES, et al,	
19	Defendant-Intervenors.	
20		
21		
22	On May 2, 2012 a hearing was held on t	the demurrers filed by the State Defendants
23	(Governor Brown, Attorney General Harris and the State of California) and the Defendant-	
24		
25		•

Case 2:17-cv-00903-WBS-KJN Document 48-1 Filed 06/23/17 Page 6 of 9

Intervenors to all three causes of action alleged by the plaintiff in its complaint. At the conclusion of the hearing I took the demurrers under submission so that I could more fully consider the parties' oral and written arguments as well as review the large quantity of case law that I was given at the hearing. Having completed my further consideration, I sustain the demurrer without leave to amend as to the defendant State of California, overrule the demurrers as to the first cause of action for declaratory relief for the alleged violation of the Commerce Clause and the third cause of action for injunctive relief, and sustain the demurrers without leave to amend as to the second cause of action for declaratory relief for the alleged violation of the Takings Clause.

Plaintiff does not contest the portion of the State Defendants' demurrer contending that the State of California is not a proper party. This aspect of the State Defendants' demurrer is well-taken.

Defendant-Intervenors' demurrer on ripeness grounds to the first and third causes of action alleging a violation of the Commerce Clause is overruled. Plaintiff's dormant Commerce Clause claims are ripe because the challenged law, California Fish and Game Code sections 2021 and 2021.5 (the "Shark Fin Prohibition"), eliminated the California market for shark fins as of January 1, 2012 by banning the purchase or acquisition of shark fins, and therefore plaintiff's members are currently faced with the dilemma of either violating the Shark Fin Prohibition or standing aside as it diminishes the value of their businesses and property. (*MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc.* (2007) 549 U.S. 118, 129; *Pacific Legal Foundation v.California Coastal Commission* (1982) 33 Cal. 3d 158, 172-73).

The State Defendants' demurrer on the basis of failure to allege a cognizable claim to the first and third causes of action alleging a violation of the Commerce Clause is overruled. Plaintiff alleges that the Shark Fin Prohibition imposes "a burden on interstate commerce that is excessive

Case 2:17-cv-00903-WBS-KJN Document 48-1 Filed 06/23/17 Page 7 of 9 in relation to its putative local benefits." Resolution of this allegation, at least for this case, requires a factual record developed in the context of the balancing test set forth in *Pike v. Bruce Church, Inc.* (1970) 397 US 137, 142. (*Bronco Wine Company v. Jolly* (2005) 129 Cal. App. 4th 988, 1027).

The State Defendants' demurrer on the basis of failure to allege a cognizable claim to the second cause of action alleging a violation of the Takings Clause is sustained without leave to amend. Accepting the truth of plaintiff's allegations that the Shark Fin Prohibition deprives plaintiff's members of all economically beneficial use of any shark fins that they have acquired or will acquire, plaintiff nonetheless fails to state a claim for violation of the Takings Clause. Plaintiff has not cited any case, nor am I aware of any case, that holds that a government violates the Takings Clause when it imposes a complete ban on a product that it determines is harmful. The alcohol prohibition cases discussed in *Andrus v. Allard* (1979) 441 US 51, 67-68 hold that such a ban does not violate the Takings Clause. My determination that the second cause of action fails to state a cognizable claim makes it unnecessary to decide the Intervenor-Defendants' demurrer to that cause of action on ripeness grounds.

The State Defendants and Defendant-Intervenors have fifteen days from entry of this order to file answers to the complaint.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: July 20, 2012

Harold Kahn Superior Court Judge

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA County of San Francisco

ASIAN AMERICAN RIGHTS COMMITTEE OF CALIFORNIA,

Case Number: CGC-12-517723

Plaintiff(s)

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

(CCP 1013a (4))

VS.

EDMUND BROWN, et al

Defendant(s)

And THE HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE UNITED STATES, et al,

Defendant-Intervenor(s)

I, L. FISCELLA, a Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court of the County of San Francisco, certify that I am not a party to the within action.

On JUL-23-2012 I served the attached ORDER RE: DEMURRERS OF THE STATE DEFENDANTS AND THE DEFENDANT-INTERVENORS by placing a copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed as follows:

CHRISTOPHER H. CARR
WILLIAM F.TARANTINO
SUSAN L. LANDSITTEL
MORRISON & FORESTER LLP
425 MARKET STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

JOHN S. WORDEN BRUCE WAGMAN SCHIFF HARDIN LLP ONE MARKET, SPEAR STREET TOWER 32ND FLOOR SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

KAMALA D. HARRIS TAMAR PACHTER ALEXANDRA ROBERT GORDON ATTORNEY GENERAL OF CALIFORNIA 455 GOLDEN GATE AVENUE SUITE 11000 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102

Case 2:17-cv-00903-WBS-KJN Document 48-1 Filed 06/23/17 Page 9 of 9

and, I then placed the sealed envelopes in the outgoing mail at 400 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA. 94102 on the date indicated above for collection, attachment of required prepaid postage, and mailing on that date following standard court practices.

Dated: JUL-23-2012

MICHAEL T. YUEN, Clerk Of The Court

By: (

L. FISCELLA, Deputy Clerk