

1 JOHN C BEIERS, COUNTY COUNSEL (SBN 144282)  
By: David A. Silberman, Deputy (SBN 211708)  
2 Hall of Justice and Records  
400 County Center, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
3 Redwood City, CA 94063  
Telephone: (650) 363-4749  
4 Facsimile: (650) 363-4034

**FILED**  
**SAN MATEO COUNTY**

JUL 23 2012

Clerk of the Superior Court  
By Sumner  
DEPUTY CLERK

5 Attorneys for Defendant  
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO  
6  
7

8 **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
9 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO**

10  
11 CALGUNS FOUNDATION, INC., et al.,  
12 Plaintiffs,  
13 vs.  
14 COUNTY OF SAN MATEO,  
15 Defendant.

Case No. 509185

**NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER**

16  
17 **TO: PLAINTIFFS CALGUNS FOUNDATION, INC. AND GENE HOFFMAN:**

18 **NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN** that on July 5, 2012, the above entitled court granted  
19 Defendants' Demurrer. A copy of the Order is attached hereto.

20 Dated: July 23, 2012

JOHN C. BEIERS, COUNTY COUNSEL

21  
22 By: David A. Silberman  
David A. Silberman, Deputy


23  
24 Attorneys for Defendant  
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO  
25  
26  
27  
28

1 JOHN C. BEIERS, COUNTY COUNSEL (SBN 144282)  
By: David A. Silberman, Deputy (SBN 211708)  
2 Hall of Justice and Records  
400 County Center, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
3 Redwood City, CA 94063  
Telephone: (650) 363-4749  
4 Facsimile: (650) 363-4034

5 Attorneys for Defendant  
COUNTY OF SAN MATEO  
6

**FILED**  
SAN MATEO COUNTY

JUL 10 2012

Clerk of the Superior Court  
By   
DEPUTY CLERK

7  
8 **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
9 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO**

10  
11 CALGUNS FOUNDATION, INC., et al.,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 vs.

14 COUNTY OF SAN MATEO,

15 Defendant.  
16

Case No. 509185

**~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER SUSTAINING  
DEMURRER**

Hearing:

Date: July 2, 2012  
Time: 9:00 a.m.  
Dept: Law and Motion

17 The Demurrer and Motion to Strike of Defendant County of San Mateo came on regularly for  
18 hearing on July 2, 2012, at 9:00 a.m., in the Law and Motion Department of the Superior Court of the  
19 County of San Mateo, the Honorable V. Raymond Swope III presiding. The parties did not appear to  
20 contest the tentative issued on June 29, 2012. As indicated by the declaration of David Silberman, filed  
21 with this Order, the County circulated a draft of this Order and the Judgment issued herewith, pursuant to  
22 California Rule of Court 3.1312 on July 2, 2012 and changes were requested, changes which have been  
23 incorporated into this Order with one exception as detailed in the Declaration of David Silberman filed  
24 with this Order and the email from Plaintiff's counsel attached thereto.

25 The Court, having reviewed the Demurrer, the Opposition to the Demurrer, and all papers filed in  
26 connection thereto, the Court, HEREBY ORDERS as follows:

- 27 1. The Court GRANTS Defendant County of San Mateo's request for the Court to  
28 take judicial notice of: (a) Section 3.68.080 of the San Mateo County Ordinance

Case No. 509185

**~~PROPOSED~~ ORDER SUSTAINING DEMURRER**

MA

Code; ~~(b) Santa Clara County Ordinance Section Sec. B14-31.1. Firearms and Weapons;~~ ~~(c) Los Angeles County Ordinance Code 17.04.620 Firearms and other weapons;~~ ~~(d) Daly City Ordinance Code 12.36.050 Prohibited Acts;~~ and ~~San Mateo County Ordinance 415 (1934),~~ each of which is attached to the County's Request for Judicial Notice and filed on December 15, 2011;


2. Defendant's demurrer to the First Cause of Action for Declaratory Relief is **SUSTAINED WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND**. Plaintiffs' complaint does not identify the specific state law which is alleged to preempt the subject ordinance. Even if the court were to construe plaintiff's opposition as an offer to amend to allege that the ordinance is preempted by Government Code §53071, the complaint would still fail to state a cause of action. The language of the statute indicates the legislature intends to occupy the field of regulation of the registration or licensing of commercially manufactured firearms. Nothing on the face of the subject ordinance purports to regulate registration or licensing of any firearm. It merely prohibits the possession of firearms on specified county property. Plaintiffs' reliance on *Fiscal* is misplaced as it is factually distinct. In that case, the finding of preemption was based on the fact that the ordinance imposed a total ban on the possession of handguns within the City and County of San Francisco. As a result, it had the practical effect of revoking or invalidating existing licenses. In this case the ordinance does not have the effect of invalidating any licenses. It merely regulates the possession or use of firearms on county property.
3. Defendant's demurrer to the Second Cause of Action for Injunctive Relief is also **SUSTAINED WITHOUT LEAVE TO AMEND**. Injunctive relief is a remedy, not a cause of action in itself. A cause of action must exist before injunctive relief may be granted. *Shell Oil Co v. Richter* (1942) 52 Cal.App.2d 164, 168.
4. This Action is **DISMISSED**.

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

5. JUDGMENT is hereby entered for Defendant.

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: JUL 05 2012

  
HON. V. RAYMOND SWOPE III  
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 I do hereby declare that I am a citizen of the United States employed in the County of San  
3 Mateo, over 18 years old and that my business address is 400 County Center, Redwood City, California.

4 I am not a party to the within action.

5 On July 23, 2012, I served the following document(s):

6 **NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER**

7 on all other parties to this action by placing a true copy of said document(s) in a sealed envelope in the  
8 following manner:

9  (BY U.S. MAIL) by placing a true copy of said document(s) in a sealed envelope(s) addressed as  
10 shown below for collection and mailing at Redwood City, California following our ordinary  
11 business practices. I am readily familiar with this office's practice for collecting and processing  
12 correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and  
13 mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service in a  
14 sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid.

13  (STATE) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the  
14 foregoing is true and correct.

15   
16 \_\_\_\_\_  
17 MARTA R. HERNANDEZ

18 **Calguns Foundation, Inc., et al. v. County of San Mateo – Case No. CIV 509185**

19 **NAME AND ADDRESS OF EACH PERSON TO WHOM SERVICE WAS MADE**

20 Donald E.J. Kilmer, Jr.  
21 LAW OFFICES OF DONALD KILMER  
22 1645 Willow Street, Suite 150  
23 San Jose, CA 95125

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*