

SENIOR COUNSEL:
C. D. MICHEL

SPECIAL COUNSEL:
JOSHUA R. DALE
W. LEE SMITH

ASSOCIATE COUNSEL:
SEAN A. BRADY
SCOTT M. FRANKLIN
HILLARY J. GREEN
THOMAS E. MACIEJEWSKI
CLINT B. MONFORT
TAMARA M. RIDER
JOSEPH A. SILVOSO, III
LOS ANGELES, CA



OF COUNSEL:
DON B. KATES
SAN FRANCISCO, CA

RUTH P. HARING
LOS ANGELES, CA

GLENN S. MCROBERTS
SAN DIEGO, CA

AFFILIATE COUNSEL:
JOHN F. MACTINGER
JEFFREY M. COHON
LOS ANGELES, CA

DAVID T. HARDY
TUCSON, AZ

MEMORANDUM FROM THE DESK OF
C. D. MICHEL

Re: "WILLFUL" VIOLATIONS OF FEDERAL REGULATIONS
GOVERNING GUN SALES
How Licensed Gun Dealers Can Lose Their Licenses
For "Willful" Violations of the Gun Control Act

Date: April 19, 2011

I. INTRODUCTION

"Willful" acts in violation of law by a firearm dealer can carry dire consequences, such as criminal prosecution or license revocation by administrative agency action. And under federal law (18 U.S.C. § 923(e)), a single "willful" violation of the Gun Control Act can result in revoking a dealer's Federal Firearm License (FFL).¹

As commonly used, "willful" means deliberate, voluntary, or intentional. But words can have a different meaning in the legal world than they do in normal use. "Willful" is an example and has a unique meaning in the legal context.

Originally, the Gun Control Act ("GCA") did not have a "willfulness" requirement, and

¹ 18 U.S.C. § 923(e) provides: "The Attorney General may, after notice and opportunity for hearing, revoke any license issued under this section if the holder of such license has willfully violated any provision of this chapter or any rule or regulation prescribed by the Attorney General under this chapter or fails to have secure gun storage or safety devices available at any place in which firearms are sold under the license to persons who are not licensees (except that in any case in which a secure gun storage or safety device is temporarily unavailable because of theft, casualty loss, consumer sales, back orders from a manufacturer, or any other similar reason beyond the control of the licensee, the dealer shall not be considered to be in violation of the requirement to make available such a device). The Attorney General may, after notice and opportunity for hearing, revoke the license of a dealer who willfully transfers armor piercing ammunition. The Secretary's action under this subsection may be reviewed only as provided in subsection (f) of this section."

FFLs could be revoked by ATF for even innocent violations. In 1986, Congress amended the GCA (18 U.S.C. § 923(e)) “to ensure that licenses are not revoked for inadvertent errors or technical mistakes,” as stated in the Senate Report on the issue.

In doing so, the Senate adopted the view of the court in *Rich v. United States*, (383 F. Supp. 797 (SD Ohio 1974)), which rejected mere negligence as a standard for revoking an FFL license. Instead the position that “willful” means “purposeful, intentional behavior” was endorsed. Although a more limited standard, courts continually struggle to articulate a definitive standard for “willful,” resulting in many distinct definitions thereof.

Court decisions (discussed below) show, a dealer’s acts can be considered “willful” when done repeatedly, after prior warnings, and even without any deliberate intent to violate the law. Thus, in the legal realm, “willful” may include reckless or indifferent acts. Consequently, repeated mistakes and oversights can be considered “willful” even without intent to violate the law involved, especially if they are committed after warning and instruction from ATF. And when courts determine whether a dealer’s acts are “reckless” or “indifferent;” the dealer is at the mercy of the court. Because even those terms are not expressly defined.

II. COURT RULINGS

A. *ARTICLE II GUN SHOP, INC. V. GONZALES* (March 20, 2006)

In this case out of the Seventh Circuit the dealer repeatedly violated the GCA. But, as the dissent pointed out, the dealer was responsible for some 51,240 pieces of information on the forms, and omitted only 19 of them. The dealer’s defense was that omitting the information was not material because the required information was attached to the ATF form. The court rejected that argument and held that making mistakes after being aware of the record keeping requirements, together with having previously made those mistakes, suffices for revocation. *Article II Gun Shop, Inc. v Gonzales*, 441 F.3d 492, 494 (7th Cir. Ill. 2006).

B. *JIM’S PAWN SHOP, INC. V. BOWERS* (September 16, 2008)

In this 4th Circuit District Court case, the District Court found that although the licensee repeatedly violated the GCA, the licensee’s conduct was *not* “willful.” *Jim’s Pawn Shop v. Bowers* (2008 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 97199 (E.D. N.C. 2008))

The FFL licensee was a retailer and pawnbroker of two businesses (Jim’s of Fayetteville and Jim’s of Wilmington) in North Carolina. Jim’s of Fayetteville is the largest firearms dealer in the two-state ATF Region of North Carolina and South Carolina. As of 1996, Jim’s of Fayetteville had acquired over of 100,000 firearms, and as of 1997, Jim’s of Wilmington had acquired about 40,000.

Beginning in 1996 and continuing through 2005, ATF inspectors found multiple clerical and bookkeeping errors, which can be considered violations of the GCA. Finally, on June 6, 2005, ATF issued a Final Notice of Revocation of Firearms License to both businesses, asserting that the various violations of the GCA were “willful.” ATF relied primarily on the petitioner’s repeated violations to establish willfulness.

The Fourth Circuit court found that petitioner repeatedly violated the GCA, and thus had to determine whether those violations were “willful.” The court, quoting *Prino v. Simon*, (606 F.2d 449, 451 (4th Cir. 1979)), defined “willful” as “action taken knowledgeably by one subject to the statutory provisions in disregard of the action’s legality. No showing of malicious intent is necessary. A conscious, intentional, deliberate, voluntary decision properly is described as willful, regardless of venal motive.”

Regarding whether the errors amounted to “willfulness,” the court held that the evidence failed to show the violations were “willful.” The court reasoned that despite the numerous violations of the GCA by the dealer, evidence suggesting “willfulness” may be “countered by evidence of petitioners’ attempts to comply with the GCA and related regulations, and their efforts to be helpful in addressing issues raised during ATF’s inspections.” The court noted that out that both businesses took steps to increase their compliance with the GCA, including “printing an employee manual dedicated to proper cataloging techniques, holding repeated training courses on how to keep proper records, establishing a calendar system to keep up with multiple sales, and designating one staff member at each store to be in charge of the acquisition and disposition books.”

Additionally, the court relied on evidence that both businesses showed a pattern of improvement during the years in which the inspections took place, a conscious effort to comply with the GCA, and had reduced the number of errors compared with the large number transactions at the two businesses. The business’ employees were also very helpful and courteous to ATF inspectors, even pointing out errors and trying to resolve them with ATF.

Although some of the dealers alleged violations were repeat violations, the court found that they did not constitute the type of “conscious, intentional, deliberate, [and] voluntary” actions that are deemed willful and overruled the revocation of the federal firearms licenses. The court further held the dealer was not required to take ATF’s suggestion to install a computer system, and the dealers failure to do so did not constitute “willfulness.”

C. *ARMALITE, INC. V. LAMBERT (October 14, 2008)*

This case, decided October 2008 by the Sixth Circuit U.S. Court of Appeals, involved ArmaLite, Inc., a well-known and reputable Illinois gun manufacturer that also had a FFL for a Ohio location.

ATF revoked the FFL for ArmaLite’s Ohio location due to repeated alleged violations of the GCA. Specifically, in 2004 ArmaLite failed to complete two NICS background checks, omitted identification from three buyers, improperly executed or completed eleven forms, and failed to separate Form 4473 transactions four times. (*Armalite, Inc. v. Lambert*, 544 F.3d 644, 645 (6th Cir. Ohio 2008)).

Despite being notified by ATF of the violations, including being given instruction on how to remedy the violations, and being warned that future violations of the same kind may be considered “willful” violations, ArmaLite continued to improperly complete various 4473 forms, and committed several other new violations, including improperly recording firearms in its inventory.

ArmaLite's Vice President, who personally dealt with the ATF on these matters, attributed the violations to mere human error, and on that basis appealed the revocation of the FFL through the courts. (*Id.* at 645-646).

ArmaLite lost in the trial court and appealed the decision, arguing that the lower court incorrectly applied the GCA's willfulness requirement. The issue on appeal was whether "willfulness" under the GCA includes mere negligent behavior by the FFL, or, as ArmaLite insisted, the FFL must act "knowingly" or "recklessly."

The Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals clarified its previous decisions by agreeing with several other Circuits and adopted the standard urged by ArmaLite, saying that an FFL only commits a "willful" violation when it "intentionally, knowingly or [with plain indifference] recklessly violates known legal requirements." (*Armalite, Inc. v. Lambert*, 544 F.3d at 647).

Unfortunately for ArmaLite, however, the court *also* decided that ArmaLite's violations factually met that higher legal standard and were enough to justify the revoking its FFL in Ohio. The court reasoned that ArmaLite's continued failure to ensure all 4473 Forms were accurately completed by its employees amounted to *indifference* to known legal requirements. (*Id.* at 650.) The court pointed to the fact that ATF had notified ArmaLite's Vice President of the violations and warned that future violations could result in license revocation as evidence of ArmaLite's indifference.²

In so deciding, the court recognized that a single violation could constitute "willfulness," but in this case it was the continual violations that persuaded them of ArmaLite's "willfulness," citing the legal rule set out by the Fourth Circuit in *RSM v. Herbert* (466 F.3d 316, 322) that "[a]t some point, repeated negligence becomes recklessness." (*Ibid.*)

That court stated: "...a single... inadvertent error[] in failing to complete forms may not amount to "willful" failures, even when the legal requirement to complete the forms was known. Yet at some point, when such errors continue...in the face of repeated warnings...by enforcement officials, accompanied by explanations of the severity of the failures, one may infer as a matter of law the licensee simply does not care about the legal requirements. At that point, the failures show the licensee's plain indifference and therefore become willful." (*RSM v. Herbert*, 466 F.3d 316, 322 (4th Cir. Md. 2006)).

D. THE GENERAL STORE V. RICHARD VAN LOAN (March 31, 2009)

In this Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals decision, the court affirmed the ATF's revocation of The General Store's FFL, citing numerous "willful" violations of the GCA. (*General Store, Inc. v. Van Loan*, 560 F.3d 920, 921-923 (9th Cir. Wash. 2009)).

Over a three years span, The General Store received Reports of Violations, Repeat Violations, and ultimately Notice, and Final Notice, of Revocation of Firearms License from the

² Other courts have deemed repeat violations of the GCA after warnings from the ATF as sufficient to establish "willfulness." See *Breit & Johnson Sporting Goods, Inc. v. Ashcroft*, 320 F. Supp.2d 671.

ATF. During that time, the General Store failed to keep accurate records of when firearms were acquired and disposed, transfer dates, and when firearms were received and returned for repairs.

The General Store argued that while errors were made, they were not “willful” violations of the GCA. (*Id.* at 924). The Court of Appeals disagreed. According to the Court of Appeals, “willful” acts may include a *reckless violation, or even plain indifference*, to the law. The General Store acted “willfully” for purposes of the GCA when it *understood requirements of law but knowingly failed to follow or was consciously indifferent to law.* (*Id.* at 923-924).

For instance, the law requires licensed firearms dealers to “enter into a record each receipt and disposition of firearms.” (27 CFR § 478.125(e)). The General Store was cited twice before their FFL was revoked for failing to keep accurate records. (*Ibid.* at 925)

The continued violations were considered by the court to be a “willful” violation of the GCA.

E. *AM. ARMS INT'L V. HERBERT* (April 20, 2009)

In this case out of the Fourth Circuit, the court looked again at the definition of “willful.” (*Am. Arms Int'l v. Herbert*, 563 F.3d 78 (4th Cir. Md. 2009)).

The dealer had multiple GCA violations over a period of years. The first inspection occurred in 1984. (*Id.* at 79.) Over the next 19 years the dealer had repeated bookkeeping and clerical violations. (*Id.* at 80-81.) Finally, in 2003, when multiple violations were discovered, ATF issued a Notice of Revocation of License. The dealer’s FFL was revoked by ATF for “willfully” engaging in repeat violations of the GCA. (*Id.* at 81.)

ATF’s decision was appealed and the Fourth Circuit discussed the definition of “willful.” The court determined “[A] single, or even a few, inadvertent errors” would not amount to a “willful” violation. (*Am. Arms Int'l v. Herbert*, 563 F.3d 78. citing *Prino v. Simon*, 606 F.2d 449 (4th Cir. 1979)) At some point, however, a repeated failure to comply with known regulations can move a licensee's conduct from inadvertent neglect into reckless or deliberate disregard (and thus willfulness), where the “number and seriousness [of violations] . . . in the face of repeated warnings undoubtedly satisf[ied] the willfulness requirement.” (*Am. Arms Int'l* at 85-87.)

Despite the court’s seeming willingness to forgive innocent mistakes, the dealer’s numerous clerical and bookkeeping errors over time was considered more than mere human error, and the court confirmed the ATF’s revocation of the FFL.

VIII. CONCLUSION

While standing alone they seem insignificant, Acquisition & Disposition log errors and mistakes on 4473's can add up to big trouble for FFLs. As the court in *Am. Arms Int'l* stated, “a single uncontested violation suffices to uphold the ATF’s revocation decision.” (563 F.3d 78 (4th Cir. Md. 2009)) see also *Armalite, Inc. v. Lambert*, 544 F.3d 644, 649 (6th Cir. Ohio 2008))(emphasis added)). In the case of *General Store*, the store owners were cited repeatedly for inadequate Acquisition and Disposition records over a three year period. (560 F.3d 920, 923). Those simple clerical mistakes resulted in the revoking the General Store’s Federal Firearm

License. Identically in *Armalite, Inc.*, the owner of American Arms International and Gilbert Indoor Range, LLC, Charles Gilbert, lost his thirty-year-old federal firearms dealer's license for poor record keeping and inventory practices. (563 F.3d 78, 80-82) Repeat errors or problems complying with the Gun Control Act and the Code of Federal Regulations can result in denial of a license renewal or license revocation for "willful" violations. Bookkeeping, record keeping, and clerical work is important and should not be taken lightly.

These court decisions mean that in future cases around the country, the ATF will have to meet a very low standard to revoke FFLs.

The NRA remains committed to tightening the standard for ATF actions by legislation in Congress, and legislation is pending that may accomplish this. Watch the NRA's website for developments. Those facing problems with ATF should go to www.nraila.org/batfe or call (703) 267-1160 for more information. There are resources available to assist dealers in keeping up-to-date with bookkeeping requirements and making certain 4473 errors do not happen. Another good source of information is FFL Guard which can be located at: <http://www.chiafullogroup.com/fflguard/home.html>. The National Shooting Sports Foundation also has materials available at www.nssf.org.

If you are a dealer in California and face an ATF compliance inspection, or have received Notice of Revocation, feel free to immediately contact the law offices Michel & Associates, P.C. at (562) 216-4444 for a free consultation. Our attorneys will be happy to discuss your concerns and answer your questions.

Disclaimer

All materials have been prepared for general information purposes only to permit you to learn more about our firm, our services and the experience of our attorneys. The information presented is not legal advice, is not to be acted on as such, may not be current and is subject to change without notice.

I. No Attorney-Client Relationship Created Nor Legal Advice Offered or Given

You also should not rely upon the transmission of an e-mail message to an attorney through this Web site to create an attorney-client relationship. The transmission or exchange of information will not do so. Without an attorney-client relationship in the matter, we cannot assure you that your communications will be privileged or (unless we otherwise agree in a specific case) that we will treat them as such. Please do not send us any confidential or sensitive information until you speak with one of our attorneys and obtain prior written authorization to send that information to us.

Communication of information by, in, to or through this Web site and your receipt or use of it (1) is not provided in the course of and does not create or constitute an attorney-client relationship, (2) is not intended as a solicitation, (3) is not intended to convey or constitute legal advice, and (4) is not a substitute for obtaining legal advice from a qualified attorney. You should not act upon any such information without first seeking qualified professional counsel on your specific matter. The hiring of an attorney is an important decision that should not be based solely upon Web site communications or advertisements.

II. Licensing Status

Unless otherwise expressly specified, the attorneys or others listed in this Web site are not certified by, or certified as specialists or experts by, any professional or governmental agency or authority. Designations of our firm's practice areas, or of expertise, practice concentrations or specializations of our attorneys are not intended (1) to suggest or represent the contrary, or (2) to suggest any professional or governmental standard by which such experience is measured, or (3) to denigrate other attorneys or firms in any way.

Although we have offices in several jurisdictions, our attorneys are licensed to practice only in those of such jurisdictions designated in their respective biographies. Unless otherwise stated, attorneys in our offices in countries outside the United States are not solicitors or barristers and are not licensed as local attorneys in the jurisdiction in which their office is located.

This Web site is not intended as advertising or solicitation in any jurisdiction where the site would be so characterized and fail to comply with all applicable laws and ethical rules of that jurisdiction. Michel & Associates, P.C. does not seek to represent anyone based solely upon a visit to this Web site or upon advertising, or where to do so would not comply with applicable local laws and rules.

Copyright © 2010 Michel & Associates, P.C. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

@PFDesktop\.:ODMA/MHODMA/IMANAGE1;Interwoven;137534;4