

1 XAVIER BECERRA, State Bar No. 118517
Attorney General of California
2 MARK R. BECKINGTON, State Bar No. 126009
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
3 JOHN D. ECHEVERRIA, State Bar No. 268843
Deputy Attorney General
4 300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702
Los Angeles, CA 90013
5 Telephone: (213) 269-6249
Fax: (213) 897-5775
6 E-mail: John.Echeverria@doj.ca.gov
Attorneys for Defendants

7
8 George M. Lee, State Bar No. 172982
Douglas A. Applegate, State Bar No. 142000
SEILER EPSTEIN ZIEGLER & APPLGATE LLP
9 601 Montgomery Street, Suite 2000
San Francisco, CA 94111
10 Telephone: (415) 979-0500
Fax: (415) 979-0511

11
12 Raymond M. DiGuiseppe, State Bar No. 228457
LAW OFFICES OF RAYMOND MARK
DIGUISEPPE, PLLC
13 2 North Front Street, Fifth Floor
Wilmington, NC 28401
14 Telephone: (910) 713-8804
Fax: (910) 672-7705
15 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

16 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
17 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
18 SACRAMENTO DIVISION

19
20 **WILLIAM WIESE, et al.,**
21
22 Plaintiff,
23
24 **XAVIER BECERRA, et al.,**
25 Defendant.

2:17-cv-00903-WBS-KJN

SUPPLEMENT TO JOINT STATUS REPORT

Date: September 24, 2018
Time: 1:30 p.m.
Courtroom: 5, 14th Floor
Judge: Hon. William B. Shubb
Trial Date: None Set
Action Filed: April 28, 2017

26
27 //

1 The parties to the above-entitled action hereby supplement their Joint Status Report filed on
2 July 16, 2018 (Docket No. 84) and advise the court as follows:

3 On July 17, 2018, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit issued an unpublished
4 memorandum in *Duncan v. Becerra*, Ninth Circuit Case No. 17-56081, affirming the district
5 court's grant of a preliminary injunction in that case. A true and correct copy of the
6 memorandum is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

7 In the Joint Status Report, the parties requested that the Scheduling Conference be
8 continued, and the stay extended, to allow additional time until the Ninth Circuit issued its
9 decision in *Duncan*. In light of the Ninth Circuit's decision, the parties advise the Court that they
10 are prepared to attend the Scheduling Conference presently set for September 24, 2018 at
11 1:30 p.m. or at an earlier date and time that is convenient for the Court.

12 Dated: July 25, 2018

XAVIER BECERRA
Attorney General of California
MARK R. BECKINGTON
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

13
14
15 /s/ John D. Echeverria
16

JOHN D. ECHEVERRIA
Deputy Attorney General
17 *Attorneys for Defendants*

18
19 Dated: July 25, 2018

SEILER EPSTEIN ZIEGLER &
APPLEGATE LLP

20 /s/ George M. Lee
21 (as authorized on July 25, 2018)
22

George M. Lee
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

EXHIBIT A

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

FILED

JUL 17 2018

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

<p>VIRGINIA DUNCAN; et al.,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiffs-Appellees,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>XAVIER BECERRA, in his official capacity as Attorney General of the State of California,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendant-Appellant.</p>
--

No. 17-56081

D.C. No.
3:17-cv-01017-BEN-JLB

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Southern District of California
Roger T. Benitez, District Judge, Presiding

Argued and Submitted May 14, 2018
San Francisco, California

Before: WALLACE and N.R. SMITH, Circuit Judges, and BATTS,** District
Judge.

The State of California (“California”), through its Attorney General, Xavier
Becerra, appeals the district court’s grant of a preliminary injunction enjoining

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent
except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The Honorable Deborah A. Batts, United States District Judge for the
Southern District of New York, sitting by designation.

California from enforcing California Penal Code §§ 32310(c) & (d). “We review a district court’s decision to grant or deny a preliminary injunction for abuse of discretion.” *Thalheimer v. City of San Diego*, 645 F.3d 1109, 1115 (9th Cir. 2011). We do not “determine the ultimate merits,” but rather “determine only whether the district court correctly distilled the applicable rules of law and exercised permissible discretion in applying those rules to the facts at hand.” *Fyock v. Sunnyvale*, 779 F.3d 991, 995 (9th Cir. 2015). We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1292(a)(1), and we affirm.¹

I.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by granting a preliminary injunction on Second Amendment grounds. *Thalheimer*, 645 F.3d 1109 at 1115.

¹ “A plaintiff seeking a preliminary injunction must establish that he is likely to succeed on the merits, that he is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of preliminary relief, that the balance of equities tips in his favor, and that an injunction is in the public interest.” *Winter v. Nat. Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 20 (2008). California makes only a cursory argument that the latter three elements are unmet if we find the district court did not abuse its discretion regarding the first element. Because we find the district court did not abuse its discretion, we only address the first element of the preliminary injunction standard for each constitutional question. *Greenwood v. FAA*, 28 F.3d 971, 977 (9th Cir. 1994) (“We review only issues which are argued specifically and distinctly in a party’s opening brief. . . . [A] bare assertion does not preserve a claim, particularly when, as here, a host of other issues are presented for review.” (citation omitted)).

1. The district court did not abuse its discretion by concluding that magazines for a weapon likely fall within the scope of the Second Amendment. First, the district court identified the applicable law, citing *United States v. Miller*, 307 U.S. 174 (1939), *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 554 U.S. 570 (2008), *Caetano v. Massachusetts*, 136 S. Ct. 1027 (2016) (per curiam), and *Jackson v. City and County of San Francisco*, 746 F.3d 953 (9th Cir. 2014). Second, it did not exceed its permissible discretion by concluding, based on those cases, that (1) some part of the Second Amendment right likely includes the right to bear a weapon “that has some reasonable relationship to the preservation or efficiency of a well regulated militia,” *Miller*, 307 U.S. at 178; *see also Heller*, 554 U.S. at 583, 627-28; *Caetano*, 136 S. Ct. at 1028; and (2) the ammunition for a weapon is similar to the magazine for a weapon, *Jackson* 746 F.3d at 967 (“[T]he right to possess firearms for protection implies a corresponding right’ to obtain the bullets necessary to use them.” (quoting *Ezell v. City of Chicago*, 61 F.3d 684, 704 (7th Cir. 2011))).

2. The district court did not abuse its discretion by applying the incorrect level of scrutiny. The district court applied both intermediate scrutiny and what it coined the “simple test” of *Heller*. The district court found Plaintiffs were likely to succeed under either analysis. Although the district court applied two different tests, there is no reversible error if one of those tests follows the applicable legal

principles and the district court ultimately reaches the same conclusion in both analyses.

Here, in its intermediate scrutiny analysis, the district court correctly applied the two-part test outlined in *Jackson*. The district court concluded that a ban on ammunition magazines is not a presumptively lawful regulation and that the prohibition did not have a “historical pedigree.” Next, the district court concluded, citing *Fyock*, that section 32310 infringed on the core of the Second Amendment right, but, citing *Silvester v. Harris*, 843 F.3d 816, 823 (9th Cir. 2016), *Fyock*, 779 F.3d at 999, *Jackson*, 746 F.3d at 965, 968, and *Chovan*, 735 F.3d at 1138, that intermediate scrutiny was the appropriate scrutiny level. The district court concluded that California had identified four “important” interests and reasoned that the proper question was “whether the dispossession and criminalization components of [section] 32310’s ban on firearm magazines holding any more than 10 rounds is a reasonable fit for achieving these important goals.”

3. The district court did not abuse its discretion by concluding that sections 32310(c) and (d) did not survive intermediate scrutiny. The district court’s review of the evidence included numerous judgment calls regarding the quality, type, and reliability of the evidence, as well as repeated credibility determinations.

Ultimately, the district court concluded that section 32310 is “not likely to be a

reasonable fit.” California articulates no actual error made by the district court, but, rather, multiple instances where it disagrees with the district court’s conclusion or analysis regarding certain pieces of evidence. This is insufficient to establish that the district court’s findings of fact and its application of the legal standard to those facts were “illogical, implausible, or without support in inferences that may be drawn from facts in the record.” *United States v. Hinkson*, 585 F.3d 1247, 1251 (9th Cir. 2009) (en banc). In reviewing the district court’s grant of a preliminary injunction, we cannot “re-weigh the evidence and overturn the district court’s

evidentiary determinations—in effect, to substitute our discretion for that of the district court.” *Fyock*, 779 F.3d at 1000.²

II.

The district court did not abuse its discretion by granting a preliminary injunction on Takings Clause grounds. *Thalheimer*, 645 F.3d at 1115. First, the district court, citing *Lingle v. Chevron U.S.A. Inc.*, 544 U.S. 528 (2005), *Horne v. Department of Agriculture*, 135 S. Ct. 2419 (2015), *Loretta v. Teleprompter Manhattan CATV Corp.*, 458 U.S. 419 (1982), *Murr v. Wisconsin*, 137 S. Ct. 1933 (2017), and *Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council*, 505 U.S. 1003 (1992),

² The dissent *does* re-weigh the evidence. It concludes that “California’s evidence . . . was more than sufficient to satisfy intermediate scrutiny” and that the “2013 Mayors Against Illegal Guns (MAIG) Survey . . . easily satisfies the requirement that the evidence upon which the state relies be ‘reasonably believed to be relevant’ and ‘fairly support’ the rationale for the challenged law.” These conclusions mean the dissent *is* “substitut[ing] [its] discretion for that of the district court,” which is impermissible under the applicable standard of review. *Fyock*, 779 F.3d at 1000-01.

Further, disagreeing with another district court regarding a similar record is not necessarily an abuse of discretion. Here, the district court made evidentiary conclusions regarding the record provided by California, specifically noting that it had provided “incomplete studies from unreliable sources upon which experts base speculative explanation and predictions.” These conclusions are not “illogical, implausible, or without support in inferences that may be drawn from facts in the record.” *Hinkson*, 585 F.3d at 1251. As noted above, it is not our role to “re-weigh the evidence and overturn the district court’s evidentiary determinations—in effect, to substitute our discretion for that of the district court.” *Fyock*, 779 F.3d at 1000.

outlined the correct legal principles. Second, the district court did not exceed its discretion by concluding (1) that the three options provided in section 32310(d) (surrender, removal, or sale) fundamentally “deprive Plaintiffs not just of the *use* of their property, but of *possession*, one of the most essential sticks in the bundle of property rights”; and (2) that California could not use the police power to avoid compensation, *Lucas*, 505 U.S. at 1020-29; *Loretto*, 458 U.S. at 426 (holding “a permanent physical occupation authorized by the government is a taking without regard to the public interest it may serve”).³

³ The dissent also “re-weigh[s] the evidence” and the district court’s conclusions on the Takings Clause question. *Fyock*, 779 F.3d at 1000. The district court concluded that the three options available under section 32310(d) constituted either a physical taking (surrender to the government for destruction) or a regulatory taking (forced sale to a firearms dealer or removal out of state). The dissent first takes issue with the district court’s conclusion that storage out of state could be financially prohibitive. It is not “illogical” or “implausible” to conclude that forcing citizens to remove property out of state effectively dispossess the property due to the financial burden of using it again. *Hinkson*, 585 F.3d at 1263. Such removal, as the district court notes, also eliminates use of the Banned Magazines in “self defense.” See *Heller*, 554 U.S. at 592 (“[W]e find that [the text of the Second Amendment] guarantee[s] the individual [a] right to possess and carry weapons in case of confrontation.”). Second, the dissent argues the district court incorrectly weighed the regulatory takings factors in *Murr*. While the cost (\$20 to \$50) of the magazine may seem minimal, the district court also noted that the “character of the governmental action,” *Murr*, 137 S. Ct. at 1943, was such that “California will deprive Plaintiffs not just of the *use* of their property, but of *possession*,” Similarly, this conclusion is not “illogical,” “implausible,” or “without support in inferences that may be drawn from the facts in the record.” *Hinkson*, 585 F.3d at 1263.

AFFIRMED.

FILED

Duncan v. Becerra, No. 17-56081

JUL 17 2018

WALLACE, Circuit Judge, dissenting:

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

I respectfully dissent. For the reasons stated below, I conclude that the district court abused its discretion in preliminarily enjoining California Penal Code §§ 32310(c) & (d).

I.

In this case, we apply intermediate scrutiny because the challenged law “does not implicate a core Second Amendment right, or . . . place a substantial burden on the Second Amendment right.” *Jackson v. City and Cty. of San Francisco*, 746 F.3d 953, 961 (9th Cir. 2014). Under this standard, a challenged law will survive constitutional scrutiny so long as the state establishes a “reasonable fit” between the law and an important government interest. *United States v. Chovan*, 735 F.3d 1127, 1136 (9th Cir. 2013). “When reviewing the reasonable fit between the government’s stated objective and the regulation at issue, the court may consider ‘the legislative history of the enactment as well as studies in the record or cited in pertinent case law.’” *Fyock v. Sunnyvale*, 779 F.3d 991, 1000 (9th Cir. 2015) (quoting *Jackson*, 746 F.3d at 966). California may establish a reasonable fit with “any evidence ‘reasonably believed to be relevant’ to substantiate its important interests.” *Id.*

The majority concludes the district court did not abuse its discretion in concluding California’s large-capacity magazine (LCM) possession ban did not survive intermediate scrutiny on the ground that the district court’s conclusion was based on “numerous judgment calls regarding the quality, type, and reliability of the evidence.” The problem, however, is that the district court’s “judgment calls” presupposed a much too high evidentiary burden for the state. Under intermediate scrutiny, the question is not whether the state’s evidence satisfies the district court’s subjective standard of empiricism, but rather whether the state relies on evidence “reasonably believed to be relevant” to substantiate its important interests. *Fyock*, 779 F.3d at 1000. So long as the state’s evidence “fairly supports” its conclusion that a ban on possession of LCMs would reduce the lethality of gun violence and promote public safety, the ban survives intermediate scrutiny. *Jackson*, 746 F.3d at 969.

California’s evidence—which included statistical studies, expert testimony, and surveys of mass shootings showing that the use of LCMs increases the lethality of gun violence—was more than sufficient to satisfy intermediate scrutiny. For example, the September 2013 Mayors Against Illegal Guns (MAIG) Survey, which the district court writes off as inconclusive and irrelevant, easily satisfies the requirement that the evidence upon which the state relies be “reasonably believed to be relevant” and “fairly support” the rationale for the challenged law. The

MAIG survey shows that assault weapons or LCMs were used in at least 15 percent of the mass shootings reported, and that in those incidents 151 percent more people were shot, and 63 percent more people died, as compared to other mass shootings surveyed. Even if the MAIG survey also shows that most mass shooting incidents did not involve LCMs, California could draw a “reasonable inference” based on the data that prohibiting possession of LCMs would reduce the lethality of gun violence. *Jackson*, 746 F.3d at 966. Other evidence cited by the state similarly supports the conclusion that mass shootings involving LCMs result in a higher number of shots fired, a higher number of injuries, and a higher number of fatalities than other mass shootings. The district court’s characterization of this evidence as insufficient was based either on clearly erroneous findings of fact or an application of intermediate scrutiny that lacked support in inferences that could be drawn from facts in the record. In either case, it was an abuse of discretion.

It is significant that California, in seeking to establish a reasonable fit between §§ 32310(c) & (d) and its interest in reducing the lethality of mass shootings, relied on much of the same evidence presented by the City of Sunnyvale in *Fyock*, a case in which we affirmed the district court’s conclusion that Sunnyvale’s LCM possession ban was likely to survive intermediate scrutiny. The district court attempts to distinguish the two cases, stressing that an “important difference” between this case and *Fyock* is that the court in *Fyock* “had a

sufficiently convincing evidentiary record of a reasonable fit,” which “is not the case here.” But the evidentiary record in *Fyock* included much of the same evidence the district court here found insufficient—including the aforementioned September 2013 MAIG survey, and expert declarations by Lucy Allen and John Donohue, which the district court dismissed as “defective” and “biased.” The district court did not explain why the evidentiary record in *Fyock* was “sufficiently convincing,” while a substantially similar evidentiary record here was insufficient. Given the overlap between the records, and the district court’s failure to identify any material differences, the district court’s contention that the record here is less credible, less reliable, and less relevant than the record in *Fyock* is difficult to accept.

The majority argues in a footnote that in concluding the district court abused its discretion I have impermissibly re-weighed the evidence. That is not so. Our obligation to refrain from re-weighing evidence is meant to ensure we do not overturn a district court’s ruling simply because we would have placed more weight on certain pieces of evidence than others. This obligation to refrain presumes the district court has applied the correct legal standard. Here, by contrast, my argument is that the district court did not evaluate the evidence consistent with the applicable legal standard. This is conceptually distinct from the question whether one piece of evidence should have been given more weight vis-à-vis

another piece of evidence. Here, the district court was required under intermediate scrutiny to credit evidence “reasonably believed to be relevant” to advancing the state’s important interests. *Fyock*, 779 F.3d at 1000. Instead, the district court rejected this standard for a subjective standard of undefined empirical robustness, which it found the state did not satisfy. This it cannot do.

In sum, I conclude the district court abused its discretion in concluding that California had not established a “reasonable fit” between §§ 32310(c) & (d) and the state’s important interests. On the record before the district court, California’s LCM possession ban likely survives intermediate scrutiny. Therefore, Plaintiffs were unlikely to succeed on the merits of their Second Amendment challenge and were not entitled to a preliminary injunction.

II.

The district court also concluded that Plaintiffs were likely to succeed on the merits of their claim under the Takings Clause on the ground that §§ 32310(c) & (d) was both a physical appropriation of property and a regulatory taking. In my view, the district court’s application of relevant takings doctrine was without support in inferences that could be drawn from facts in the record, and therefore constituted an abuse of discretion.

The district court is correct that a physical appropriation of personal property gives rise to a *per se* taking. *Horne v. Department of Agriculture*, 135 S. Ct. 2419,

2427 (2015). But here, LCM owners can comply with § 32310 without the state physically appropriating their magazines. Under § 32310(d)(1), an LCM owner may “[r]emove the large-capacity magazine from the state,” retaining ownership of the LCM, as well as rights to possess and use the magazines out of state. The district court hypothesized that LCM owners may find removal to be more costly than it is worth, but such speculation, while theoretically relevant to the regulatory takings inquiry, does not turn the compulsory removal of LCMs from the state into a “physical appropriation” by the state. *See Tahoe-Sierra Pres. Council v. Tahoe Reg’l Planning Agency*, 535 U.S. 302, 323 (2002) (explaining that it is “inappropriate to treat cases involving physical takings as controlling precedents for the evaluation of a claim that there has been a ‘regulatory taking,’ and vice versa”) (footnote omitted). Given that Plaintiffs do not specify whether they intend to surrender or sell their LCMs, as opposed to remove them from the state and retain ownership, the availability of the removal option means Plaintiffs are unlikely to succeed on their claim that the LCM possession ban is unconstitutional as a physical taking. *See Italian Colors Rest. v. Becerra*, 878 F.3d 1165, 1175 (9th Cir. 2018) (explaining that to succeed on a facial challenge, plaintiffs must show either that “no set of circumstances exists under which the challenged law would be valid,” or that the law lacks any “plainly legitimate sweep”); *cf. Wash. State Grange v. Wash. State Republican Party*, 552 U.S. 442, 450 (2008) (“In

determining whether a law is facially invalid, we must be careful not to go beyond the statute's facial requirements and speculate about 'hypothetical' or 'imaginary' cases.").

Nor was the district court within its discretion to conclude that § 32310 likely constituted a regulatory taking. Under the relevant *Penn Central* balancing test, a regulatory taking may be found based on "a complex of factors," including "(1) the economic impact of the regulation on the claimant; (2) the extent to which the regulation has interfered with distinct investment-backed expectations; and (3) the character of the government action." *Murr v. Wisconsin*, 137 S. Ct. 1933, 1943 (2017); *Penn Central Transp. Co. v. New York City*, 438 U.S. 104, 124 (1978).

Here, the district court speculated that because the typical retail cost of an LCM is "between \$20 and \$50," LCM owners may find "the associated costs of removal and storage and retrieval" to be too high to justify retaining their magazines. In my view, this speculation is insufficient to conclude that plaintiffs are likely to succeed on the merits of their regulatory takings claim. Even accepting the district court's finding on the "typical retail cost" of an LCM, there are no facts in the record from which to draw an inference regarding the overall economic impact of §§ 32310(c) & (d) on Plaintiffs, particularly as it relates to Plaintiffs' "distinct investment-backed expectations" for their LCMs. Without this foundation, the district court could not plausibly draw the inference that requiring the removal of LCMs from

California was “functionally equivalent” to a direct appropriation and thus constituted a regulatory taking. *Lingle v. Chevron USA Inc.*, 544 U.S. 528, 539 (2005).

III.

“Abuse-of-discretion review is highly deferential to the district court.” *Microsoft Corp. v. Motorola, Inc.*, 696 F.3d 872, 881 (9th Cir. 2012). In this case, however, I do not consider it a close call to conclude the district court abused its discretion in finding Plaintiffs were likely to succeed on the merits of their constitutional challenges to California’s LCM ban. As to Plaintiffs’ Second Amendment challenge, the district court clearly misapplied intermediate scrutiny by refusing to credit relevant evidence that fairly supports the state’s rationale for its LCM ban. As to Plaintiffs’ Takings Clause challenge, the district court offered only speculation on the economic impact of the challenged law and did not assess Plaintiffs’ distinct investment-backed expectations for their LCMs. Therefore, I would conclude the district court exceeded the broad range of permissible conclusions it could have drawn from the record. The proper course is to reverse the district court’s order granting the preliminary injunction and remand for further proceedings. Accordingly, I dissent.

As a final note, I realize the end result of the district court’s rulings are temporary. The district court is to be commended for following our constant

admonition not to delay trial preparation awaiting an interim ruling on the preliminary injunction. *See Caribbean Marine Servs. Co., Inc. v. Baldrige*, 844 F.2d 668, 673 (9th Cir. 1988). The district court has properly proceeded with deliberate speed towards a trial, which will allow it to decide this case with a full and complete record and a new review. Thus, although I would reverse the district court's order and remand for further proceedings, I credit the district court for ensuring the case did not stall awaiting disposition of this appeal.

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

Office of the Clerk
95 Seventh Street
San Francisco, CA 94103

Information Regarding Judgment and Post-Judgment Proceedings

Judgment

- This Court has filed and entered the attached judgment in your case. Fed. R. App. P. 36. Please note the filed date on the attached decision because all of the dates described below run from that date, not from the date you receive this notice.

Mandate (Fed. R. App. P. 41; 9th Cir. R. 41-1 & -2)

- The mandate will issue 7 days after the expiration of the time for filing a petition for rehearing or 7 days from the denial of a petition for rehearing, unless the Court directs otherwise. To file a motion to stay the mandate, file it electronically via the appellate ECF system or, if you are a pro se litigant or an attorney with an exemption from using appellate ECF, file one original motion on paper.

Petition for Panel Rehearing (Fed. R. App. P. 40; 9th Cir. R. 40-1)

Petition for Rehearing En Banc (Fed. R. App. P. 35; 9th Cir. R. 35-1 to -3)

(1) A. Purpose (Panel Rehearing):

- A party should seek panel rehearing only if one or more of the following grounds exist:
 - ▶ A material point of fact or law was overlooked in the decision;
 - ▶ A change in the law occurred after the case was submitted which appears to have been overlooked by the panel; or
 - ▶ An apparent conflict with another decision of the Court was not addressed in the opinion.
- Do not file a petition for panel rehearing merely to reargue the case.

B. Purpose (Rehearing En Banc)

- A party should seek en banc rehearing only if one or more of the following grounds exist:

- ▶ Consideration by the full Court is necessary to secure or maintain uniformity of the Court's decisions; or
- ▶ The proceeding involves a question of exceptional importance; or
- ▶ The opinion directly conflicts with an existing opinion by another court of appeals or the Supreme Court and substantially affects a rule of national application in which there is an overriding need for national uniformity.

(2) Deadlines for Filing:

- A petition for rehearing may be filed within 14 days after entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(1).
- If the United States or an agency or officer thereof is a party in a civil case, the time for filing a petition for rehearing is 45 days after entry of judgment. Fed. R. App. P. 40(a)(1).
- If the mandate has issued, the petition for rehearing should be accompanied by a motion to recall the mandate.
- *See* Advisory Note to 9th Cir. R. 40-1 (petitions must be received on the due date).
- An order to publish a previously unpublished memorandum disposition extends the time to file a petition for rehearing to 14 days after the date of the order of publication or, in all civil cases in which the United States or an agency or officer thereof is a party, 45 days after the date of the order of publication. 9th Cir. R. 40-2.

(3) Statement of Counsel

- A petition should contain an introduction stating that, in counsel's judgment, one or more of the situations described in the "purpose" section above exist. The points to be raised must be stated clearly.

(4) Form & Number of Copies (9th Cir. R. 40-1; Fed. R. App. P. 32(c)(2))

- The petition shall not exceed 15 pages unless it complies with the alternative length limitations of 4,200 words or 390 lines of text.
- The petition must be accompanied by a copy of the panel's decision being challenged.
- An answer, when ordered by the Court, shall comply with the same length limitations as the petition.
- If a pro se litigant elects to file a form brief pursuant to Circuit Rule 28-1, a petition for panel rehearing or for rehearing en banc need not comply with Fed. R. App. P. 32.

- The petition or answer must be accompanied by a Certificate of Compliance found at Form 11, available on our website at www.ca9.uscourts.gov under *Forms*.
- You may file a petition electronically via the appellate ECF system. No paper copies are required unless the Court orders otherwise. If you are a pro se litigant or an attorney exempted from using the appellate ECF system, file one original petition on paper. No additional paper copies are required unless the Court orders otherwise.

Bill of Costs (Fed. R. App. P. 39, 9th Cir. R. 39-1)

- The Bill of Costs must be filed within 14 days after entry of judgment.
- See Form 10 for additional information, available on our website at www.ca9.uscourts.gov under *Forms*.

Attorneys Fees

- Ninth Circuit Rule 39-1 describes the content and due dates for attorneys fees applications.
- All relevant forms are available on our website at www.ca9.uscourts.gov under *Forms* or by telephoning (415) 355-7806.

Petition for a Writ of Certiorari

- Please refer to the Rules of the United States Supreme Court at www.supremecourt.gov

Counsel Listing in Published Opinions

- Please check counsel listing on the attached decision.
- If there are any errors in a published opinion, please send a letter **in writing within 10 days** to:
 - ▶ Thomson Reuters; 610 Opperman Drive; PO Box 64526; Eagan, MN 55123 (Attn: Jean Green, Senior Publications Coordinator);
 - ▶ and electronically file a copy of the letter via the appellate ECF system by using “File Correspondence to Court,” or if you are an attorney exempted from using the appellate ECF system, mail the Court one copy of the letter.

United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit

BILL OF COSTS

This form is available as a fillable version at:

<http://cdn.ca9.uscourts.gov/datastore/uploads/forms/Form%2010%20-%20Bill%20of%20Costs.pdf>

Note: If you wish to file a bill of costs, it **MUST** be submitted on this form and filed, with the clerk, with proof of service, within 14 days of the date of entry of judgment, and in accordance with 9th Circuit Rule 39-1. A late bill of costs must be accompanied by a motion showing good cause. Please refer to FRAP 39, 28 U.S.C. § 1920, and 9th Circuit Rule 39-1 when preparing your bill of costs.

v. 9th Cir. No.

The Clerk is requested to tax the following costs against:

Cost Taxable under FRAP 39, 28 U.S.C. § 1920, 9th Cir. R. 39-1	REQUESTED <i>(Each Column Must Be Completed)</i>				ALLOWED <i>(To Be Completed by the Clerk)</i>			
	No. of Docs.	Pages per Doc.	Cost per Page*	TOTAL COST	No. of Docs.	Pages per Doc.	Cost per Page*	TOTAL COST
Excerpt of Record	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>
Opening Brief	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>
Answering Brief	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>
Reply Brief	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>
Other**	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>	\$ <input type="text"/>
TOTAL:				\$ <input type="text"/>	TOTAL: \$ <input type="text"/>			

* *Costs per page:* May not exceed .10 or actual cost, whichever is less. 9th Circuit Rule 39-1.

** *Other:* Any other requests must be accompanied by a statement explaining why the item(s) should be taxed pursuant to 9th Circuit Rule 39-1. Additional items without such supporting statements will not be considered.

Attorneys' fees **cannot** be requested on this form.

Continue to next page

Form 10. Bill of Costs - Continued

I, , swear under penalty of perjury that the services for which costs are taxed were actually and necessarily performed, and that the requested costs were actually expended as listed.

Signature

("s/" plus attorney's name if submitted electronically)

Date

Name of Counsel:

Attorney for:

(To Be Completed by the Clerk)

Date

Costs are taxed in the amount of \$

Clerk of Court

By: , Deputy Clerk

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

Case Name: **Wiese, William, et al. v. Xavier** Case No.: **2:17-cv-00903-WBS-KJN**
Becerra, et al.

I hereby certify that on July 25, 2018, I electronically filed the following documents with the Clerk of the Court by using the CM/ECF system:

SUPPLEMENT TO JOINT STATUS REPORT

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 July 25, 2018, at Los Angeles, California.

Colby Luong
Declarant

/s/ Colby Luong
Signature