| 1<br>2<br>3<br>4 | JOHN J. SANSONE, County Counsel<br>By JAMES M. CHAPIN, Senior Deputy (SE<br>1600 Pacific Highway, Room 355<br>San Diego, CA 92101<br>Telephone: (619) 531-5244<br>james.chapin@sdcounty.ca.gov | 3N 118530)  |
|------------------|--|---|
| 5                | Attorneys for Defendant William D. Gore  |   |
| 6                |  |   |
| 7                |  |   |
| 8                | UNITED STATES  | DISTRICT COURT  |
| 9                | SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  |   |
| 10               |  |   |
| 11               | EDWARD PERUTA, MICHELLE  | USSD No. <b>09-CV-2371 IEG (BLM)</b>  |
| 12               | LAXSON, JAMES DODD, DR. LESLIE<br>BUNCHER, MARK CLEARY and   | DEFENDANT WILLIAM D. GORE'S   |
| 13               | CALIFORNIA RIFLE AND PISTOL ASSOCIATION FOUNDATION,  | SEPARATE STATEMENT OF UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS                                 |
| 14               | Plaintiffs,  | IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT                                       |
| 15               | v.   |   |
| 16<br>17         | COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO, WILLIAM D. GORE, INDIVIDUALLY AND IN HIS CAPACITY AS SHERIFF,   | Date: November 1, 2010 Time: 10:30 a.m. Courtroom: 1 Honorable Irma E. Gonzalez |
| 18               | Defendants.  |   |
| 19               | Defendant submits this separate statement of undisputed material facts and   |   |
| 20               | supporting evidence in support of his motion for summary judgment.   |   |
| 21               | Undisputed Facts   | Supporting Evidence   |
| 22               | 1. Sheriff William Gore is responsible for   | 1. Penal Code section 12050; Declaration  |
| 23               | administering the program for the licensing of persons to carry concealed weapons in   | of Blanca Pelowitz ("Pelowitz Decl") ¶¶ 1-2.                                    |
| 24               | San Diego County. ("CCW license")  | ۷.  |
| 25               |  |   |
| 26               | 2. State law sets forth the general criteria   | 2. Penal Code section 12050; Pelowitz   |
| 27               | that applicants for concealed weapon   | Decl. ¶ 6.  |
| 28               | licenses must meet. This requires that applicants be of good moral character, a  |   |

1

1 resident of the County they apply in, demonstrate good cause and take a firearms 2 course. 3 3. Pelowitz Decl. ¶¶ 1, 2, 4, 11. 4 3. Blanca Pelowitz has been the licensing manager since 2002, has been delegated the 5 responsibility for CCW licensing by the Sheriff and makes all determinations on 6 initial applications for CCW licenses 7 4. The "residency" requirement is 4. Pelowitz Decl. ¶ 8. 8 generally defined by this County to be 9 any person who maintains a permanent residence or spends more than six months 10 of the taxable year within the County if 11 the applicant claims dual residency. San Diego County uses the term "resident" as 12 outlined in Penal Code section 12050(D), 13 and not "domicile." Part-time residents who spend less than six months in the 14 County are considered on a case-by-case 15 basis, and CCW licenses have been issued in such circumstances. 16 17 5. Pelowitz Decl. ¶ 7. 5. The "good cause" requirement is defined by this County to be a set of 18 circumstances that distinguish the applicant 19 from the mainstream and causes him or her to be placed in harm's way. Simply fearing 20 for one's personal safety alone without 21 documentation of a specific threat is not considered good cause. 22 6. There is no special treatment for 6. Pelowitz Decl. ¶ 22; see also 23 members of the Honorary Deputy Sheriffs Defendant's exhibits 2-18. 24 Association or for Sheriff's campaign donors 25 26 7. In 2006, as a courtesy for applicants, 7. Pelowitz Decl. ¶ 11. the Department initiated an interview 27 process to assist both applicants and line 28 staff in determining pre-eligibility.

1 During this phase applicants will discuss reasons and situations with line staff and 2 staff is trained to make notes of all 3 comments made by the applicant during the interview. Staff assists in determining 4 what documentation may be required of 5 the applicant. If the clerk is able to determine that good cause is questionable, 6 clerks are able to give an educated guess 7 based on the scenarios described by applicants. The next phase involves 8 applicants gathering their documentation, 9 attending the 8-hour firearms course and returning to submit the written 10 application, fees, and documentation. 11 During this process applicants will be fingerprinted, photographed, signatures 12 will be obtained and applicants are 13 instructed to go to Sheriff's Range for a weapons safety checked and to complete 14 a final qualify-shoot. Once this phase is 15 complete, the file and all documents are forwarded to the Background Unit for the 16 comprehensive background and 17 verification process. The investigator will provide a recommendation and forward to 18 the Manager who will make the decision 19 to issue or deny and will include any reasonable restrictions and/or instructions 20 to staff. 21

8. CCW license holders can renew 22 licenses up to 30 days prior to the 23 expiration date. All renewals must 24

27

28

complete a firearms course, a qualifyshoot and firearm safety inspection.

25 Renewals are issued on the spot if absent any negative law enforcement contacts, 26

crime cases, arrests and there no changes

from the initial application as to the

reasons. No review by supervisor or

8. Pelowitz Decl. ¶ 12.

1 managers is needed for the renewal process unless there have been changes to 2 the reason. Applicants still need to provide some form of documentation to 3 support his or her continued need but not 4 to the extent of the initial application. 5 Applicants sign under penalty of perjury that all prior conditions exist. 6 7 9. There is an administrative 9. Pelowitz Decl. ¶ 14. reconsideration process for CCW 8 applicants. When taking administrative 9 action to deny, suspend or revoke a CCW license, an upper command concurrence 10 through the Law Enforcement Service 11 Bureau is required before taking action. All actions require the Manager to 12 prepare a brief synopsis of the proposed 13 action and recommendation. Command will either concur or request additional 14 information. If concurrence is provided, 15 the denial, suspension or revocation letter is mailed out. The individual is given the 16 opportunity to request an appeal of the 17 decision by writing to the Assistant Sheriff of the Law Enforcement Service 18 Bureau. The appeal is heard by the 19 Assistant Sheriff of the Bureau who will make the determination to overturn or 20 uphold decision. 21 10. Edward Peruta was denied a license to 10, Pelowitz Decl. ¶ 17. 22 carry a concealed weapon because he failed to provide any documentation establishing 23 good cause. Residency was not a factor in 24 his denial which was based solely on the lack of good cause. 25 26 11. Michelle Laxson did not apply for a 11. Pelowitz Decl. ¶ 18. CCW license. She was interviewed by staff 27 but declined to complete and application 28 and did not return.

## 

| 1        | 12. James Dodd has submitted an  | 12. Pelowitz Decl. ¶ 19.   |  |
|----------|--|--|--|
| 2        | application which is still pending at the time.  | is   |  |
| 3        | time.  |  |  |
| 4        | 13. Mark Cleary's renewal applicatio   | n was 13. Pelowitz Decl. ¶ 20; Plaintiffs' Exhibit   |  |
| 5        | denied based on lack of supporting documentation relating to his employed  |  |  |
| 6        | in March of 2010. Cleary requested a   |  |  |
| 7        | reconsideration appeal and the decision deny the license was overturned by   | n to   |  |
| 8        | Command after information about his  |  |  |
| 9        | employment was confirmed. He was issued a CCW license for a new term   | in   |  |
| 10       | June of 2010.  |  |  |
| 11       | 14. Leslie Buncher was a physician who held a valid CCW license during the period of 1971 to 2003. In 2008 Dr. Buncher reapplied for a license. It was denied because he was no longer a practicing physician and the reasons he listed related to his former medical practice. Dr. Buncher declined to go through the reconsideration appeal process. |  |  |
| 12       |  |  |  |
| 13       |  |  |  |
| 14       |  |  |  |
| 15       |  |  |  |
| 16       |  |  |  |
| 17       |  |  |  |
| 18       |  |  |  |
| 19<br>20 | DATED: October 4, 2010   | JOHN J. SANSONE, County Counsel  |  |
| 21       |  | By: s/ <u>James M. Chapín</u><br>JAMES M. CHAPIN, Senior Deputy<br>Attorneys for Defendant William D. Gore |  |
| 22       |  | Attorneys for Defendant William D. Gore  |  |
| 23       |  |  |  |
| 24       |  |  |  |
| 25       |  |  |  |
| 26       |  |  |  |
| 27       |  |  |  |
| 28       |  |  |  |
|          |  |  |  |