

1 C. D. Michel - S.B.N. 144258
Glenn S. McRoberts - S.B.N. 144852
2 Clinton Monfort - S.B.N. 255609
MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, PC
3 180 E. Ocean Boulevard, Suite 200
Long Beach, CA 90802
4 Telephone: 562-216-4444
Facsimile: 562-216-4445
5 Email: cmichel@michellawyers.com

6
7 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
8

9 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
10 **FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
11 **SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION**

12 ESPANOLA JACKSON, PAUL COLVIN,) **CASE NO.: CV-09-2143-RS**
THOMAS BOYER, LARRY BARSETTI,)
13 DAVID GOLDEN, NOEMI MARGARET) **REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE**
ROBINSON, NATIONAL RIFLE) **IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS'**
14 ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC. SAN) **OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS'**
FRANCISCO VETERAN POLICE) **MOTION TO DISMISS**
15 OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,)

16) Hearing Date: April 14, 2011
Plaintiffs) Time: 9:00 a.m.
17) Place: Courtroom 5

18 vs.)
19 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN)
FRANCISCO, MAYOR GAVIN)
NEWSOM, IN HIS OFFICIAL CAPACITY;))
20 POLICE CHIEF GEORGE GASCÓN, in his)
official capacity, and Does 1-10,)
21)
Defendants.)

22)

23
24
25
26
27
28

1 TO THE CLERK AND ALL PARTIES OF RECORD AND THEIR COUNSEL HEREIN:

2 Plaintiffs, Espanola Jackson, Paul Colvin, Thomas Boyer, Larry Barsetti, David Golden,
3 Noemi Margaret Robinson, National Rifle Association, Inc., and San Francisco Veteran Police
4 Officers Association, by and through their attorneys of record, respectfully request that this Court
5 take judicial notice, pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201, of the following facts and
6 documents:

7 1. On or about March 3, 2011, Defendants' City & County of San Francisco, Gavin
8 Newsom, Heather Fong and George Gascon filed an Answer to the Complaint in *Pizzo v.*
9 *Newsom*. A true and correct copy of Defendant's Answer is attached hereto as Exhibit "A."

10 2. A copy of the *Pizzo v. Newsom* case docket sheet is attached as Exhibit "B."

11 Dated: March 23, 2011

MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P. C.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

/S/
C. D. Michel
Attorney for Plaintiffs

EXHIBIT "A"
REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE
CASE NO. CO9-2143 PJH

1 DENNIS J. HERRERA, State Bar #139669
 City Attorney
 2 WAYNE SNODGRASS, State Bar #148137
 SHERRI KAISER, State Bar #197986
 3 Deputy City Attorneys
 1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
 4 City Hall, Room 234
 San Francisco, California 94102-4682
 5 Telephone: (415) 554-4691
 Facsimile: (415) 554-4747
 6 E-Mail: sherri.kaiser@sfgov.org

7 Attorneys for Defendants
 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
 8 GAVIN NEWSOM, HEATHER FONG,
 GEORGE GASCÓN, and MICHAEL HENNESSEY
 9

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 11 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 12

13 THERESE MARIE PIZZO,
 14 Plaintiff,
 15 vs.

Case No. C09-4493 CW

**DEFENDANTS CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
 FRANCISCO, GAVIN NEWSOM, HEATHER
 FONG, GEORGE GASCÓN, and MICHAEL
 HENNESSEY'S ANSWER TO COMPLAINT**

16 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
 MAYOR GAVIN NEWSOM, in both his
 17 individual and official capacities; FORMER
 SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT
 18 CHIEF OF POLICE HEATHER FONG, in
 both her individual and official capacities;
 19 SAN FRANCISCO POLICE DEPARTMENT
 CHIEF OF POLICE GEORGE GASCÓN, in
 20 his official capacity; SAN FRANCISCO
 SHERIFF MICHAEL HENNESSEY, in both
 21 his individual and official capacities; CITY
 AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO; and
 22 STATE OF CALIFORNIA ATTORNEY
 GENERAL EDMUND G. BROWN, in his
 23 official capacity,

Trial Date: 10/9/2012

24 Defendants.
 25
 26
 27
 28

1 Defendants City and County of San Francisco; former San Francisco Mayor Gavin Newsom;
2 former San Francisco Police Department Chief Of Police Heather Fong; former San Francisco Police
3 Department Chief Of Police George Gascón; and San Francisco Sheriff Michael Hennessey
4 (collectively, the "City" or "Defendants") hereby respond to the Complaint for Monetary Damages,
5 and Declaratory and Injunctive Relief ("Complaint") filed on or about September 23, 2009 by Plaintiff
6 Therese Marie Pizzo ("Plaintiff"). Except as specifically admitted, each and every allegation or
7 portion of an allegation is denied.

8 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

9 1. Responding to Paragraph 1, Paragraph 1 consists of legal assertions regarding
10 jurisdiction to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny
11 the allegations therein.

12 2. Responding to Paragraph 2, Paragraph 2 consists of legal assertions regarding
13 jurisdiction to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny
14 the allegations therein.

15 3. Responding to Paragraph 3, Paragraph 3 consists of legal assertions regarding
16 declaratory and injunctive relief to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required,
17 Defendants deny the allegations therein.

18 4. Responding to Paragraph 4, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

19 INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT

20 5. Responding to Paragraph 5, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

21 6. Responding to Paragraph 6, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

22 THE PARTIES

23 7. Responding to Paragraph 7, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
24 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

25 8. Responding to Paragraph 8, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
26 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

27 9. Responding to Paragraph 9, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
28 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

1 10. Responding to Paragraph 10, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
2 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

3 11. Responding to Paragraph 11, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
4 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

5 12. Responding to Paragraph 12, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
6 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

7 13. Responding to Paragraph 13, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
8 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

9 14. Responding to Paragraph 14, Paragraph 14 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
10 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

11 15. Responding to Paragraph 15, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
12 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

13 16. Responding to Paragraph 16, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
14 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

15 17. Responding to Paragraph 17, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

16 18. Responding to Paragraph 18, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

17 19. Responding to Paragraph 19, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
18 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

19 20. Responding to Paragraph 20, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
20 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

21 21. Responding to Paragraph 21, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
22 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

23 22. Responding to Paragraph 22, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
24 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

25 23. Responding to Paragraph 23, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
26 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

27 24. Responding to Paragraph 24, no response is required because the document speaks for
28 itself. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny that they are bound by its contents.

1 25. Responding to Paragraph 25, no response is required because the document speaks for
2 itself. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny that they are bound by its contents.

3 26. Responding to Paragraph 26, no response is required because the document speaks for
4 itself. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny that the City is bound by its contents.

5 27. Responding to Paragraph 27, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

6 28. Responding to Paragraph 28, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

7 29. Responding to Paragraph 29, no response is required because the document speaks for
8 itself. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny that the City is bound by its contents.

9 30. Responding to Paragraph 30, no response is required because the document speaks for
10 itself. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny that the City is bound by its contents.

11 31. Responding to Paragraph 31, no response is required because the document speaks for
12 itself. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny that the City is bound by its contents.

13 32. Responding to Paragraph 32, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

14 33. Responding to Paragraph 33, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
15 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

16 34. Responding to Paragraph 34, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
17 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

18 35. Responding to Paragraph 35, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
19 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

20 36. Responding to Paragraph 36, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
21 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

22 37. Responding to Paragraph 37, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
23 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

24 38. Responding to Paragraph 38, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
25 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

26 39. Responding to Paragraph 39, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
27 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

28

1 40. Responding to Paragraph 40, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
2 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

3 41. Responding to Paragraph 41, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
4 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

5 42. Responding to Paragraph 42, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

6 43. Responding to Paragraph 43, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

7 44. Responding to Paragraph 44, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

8 45. Paragraph 45 does not require a response.

9 46. Responding to Paragraph 46, Defendants admit that Heather Fong is a former Chief of
10 the San Francisco Police Department but lack sufficient information to determine the truth of the
11 remaining allegations.

12 47. Responding to Paragraph 47, Defendants admit that Heather Fong was an employee of
13 the City and County of San Francisco but lack sufficient information to determine the truth of the
14 remaining allegations.

15 48. Responding to Paragraph 48, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

16 49. Paragraph 49 does not require a response.

17 50. Responding to Paragraph 50, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

18 51. Responding to Paragraph 51, Defendants admit that George Gascón is an employee of
19 the City and County of San Francisco but lack sufficient information to determine the truth of the
20 remaining allegations.

21 52. Responding to Paragraph 52, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

22 53. Paragraph 53 does not require a response.

23 54. Responding to Paragraph 54, Defendants admit that Michael Hennessey is the Sheriff
24 of San Francisco County but lack sufficient information to determine the truth of the remaining
25 allegations.

26 55. Responding to Paragraph 55, Defendants admit that Michael Hennessey is an employee
27 of the City and County of San Francisco but lack sufficient information to determine the truth of the
28 remaining allegations.

1 56. Paragraph 56 does not require a response.

2 57. Responding to Paragraph 57, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

3 58. Responding to Paragraph 58, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
4 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

5 59. Responding to Paragraph 59, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

6 60. Paragraph 60 does not require a response from the City.

7 61. Paragraph 61 does not require a response from the City.

8 62. Paragraph 62 does not require a response from the City.

9 **INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY OF AVERMENTS**

10 63. Responding to Paragraph 63, Defendants incorporate the above admissions and denials
11 as if set forth fully herein.

12 64. Paragraph 64 does not require a response.

13 65. Paragraph 65 does not require a response.

14 66. Paragraph 66 does not require a response.

15 67. Responding to Paragraph 67, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

16 68. Responding to Paragraph 68, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

17 69. Responding to Paragraph 69, Paragraph 69 consists of legal conclusions to which no
18 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

19 70. Responding to Paragraph 70, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

20 71. Responding to Paragraph 71, Paragraph 71 consists of legal conclusions to which no
21 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

22 72. Responding to Paragraph 72, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

23 73. Responding to Paragraph 73, Defendants incorporate the above admissions and denials
24 as if set forth fully herein.

25 74. Responding to Paragraph 74, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

26 75. Responding to Paragraph 75, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

27 76. Responding to Paragraph 76, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

28

1 77. Responding to Paragraph 77, Defendants incorporate the above admissions and denials
2 as if set forth fully herein.

3 78. Responding to Paragraph 78, Defendants deny the allegations therein. Section 1290 is
4 currently being amended by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

5 79. Responding to Paragraph 79, Defendants incorporate the above admissions and denials
6 as if set forth fully herein.

7 80. Responding to Paragraph 80, Defendants admit that California Penal Code section
8 12050 vests discretion in local law enforcement officials to grant a license to carry a concealed firearm
9 under certain conditions. Defendants deny the remaining allegations set forth therein.

10 81. Responding to Paragraph 81, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

11 82. Responding to Paragraph 82, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

12 83. Responding to Paragraph 83, Defendants incorporate the above admissions and denials
13 as if set forth fully herein.

14 84. Responding to Paragraph 84, Paragraph 84 consists of legal conclusions to which no
15 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

16 85. Responding to Paragraph 85, no response is required because the document speaks for
17 itself. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny that the City is bound by its contents.

18 86. Responding to Paragraph 86, Paragraph 86 consists of legal conclusions to which no
19 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

20 87. Responding to Paragraph 87, Paragraph 87 consists of legal conclusions to which no
21 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

22 88. Responding to Paragraph 88, Paragraph 88 consists of legal conclusions to which no
23 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

24 89. Responding to Paragraph 89, Paragraph 89 consists of legal conclusions to which no
25 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

26 90. Responding to Paragraph 90, Paragraph 90 consists of legal conclusions to which no
27 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

28

1 91. Responding to Paragraph 91, Defendants incorporate the admissions and denials set
2 forth above as if fully set forth herein.

3 92. Responding to Paragraph 92, Paragraph 92 consists of legal conclusions to which no
4 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

5 93. Responding to Paragraph 93, Paragraph 93 consists of legal conclusions to which no
6 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

7 94. Responding to Paragraph 94, Defendants incorporate the above admissions and denials
8 as though set forth fully herein.

9 95. Responding to Paragraph 95, Paragraph 95 consists of legal conclusions to which no
10 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

11 96. Responding to Paragraph 96, Paragraph 96 consists of legal conclusions to which no
12 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

13 97. Responding to Paragraph 97, Paragraph 97 consists of legal conclusions to which no
14 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

15 98. Responding to Paragraph 98, Paragraph 98 consists of legal conclusions to which no
16 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

17 99. Responding to Paragraph 99, Defendants incorporate the admissions and denials set
18 forth above as though fully set forth herein.

19 100. Responding to Paragraph 100, Paragraph 100 consists of legal conclusions to which no
20 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

21 101. Responding to Paragraph 101, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
22 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

23 102. Responding to Paragraph 102, Paragraph 102 consists of legal conclusions to which no
24 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

25 103. Responding to Paragraph 103, Defendants incorporate the admissions and denials set
26 forth above as though fully set forth herein.

27 104. Responding to Paragraph 104, Paragraph 104 consists of legal conclusions to which no
28 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

1 105. Responding to Paragraph 105, Paragraph 105 consists of legal conclusions to which no
2 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

3 106. Responding to Paragraph 106, Defendants incorporate the admissions and denials set
4 forth above as though fully set forth herein.

5 107. Responding to Paragraph 107, Paragraph 107 consists of legal conclusions to which no
6 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

7 108. Responding to Paragraph 108, Paragraph 108 consists of legal conclusions to which no
8 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

9 109. Responding to Paragraph 109, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

10 110. Responding to Paragraph 110, Paragraph 110 consists of legal conclusions to which no
11 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

12 111. Responding to Paragraph 111, Paragraph 111 consists of legal conclusions to which no
13 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

14 112. Responding to Paragraph 112, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

15 113. Responding to Paragraph 113, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

16 114. Responding to Paragraph 114, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

17 115. Responding to Paragraph 115, Paragraph 115 consists of legal conclusions to which no
18 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

19 116. Responding to Paragraph 116, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

20 117. Responding to Paragraph 117, Defendants incorporate the admissions and denials set
21 forth above as though fully set forth herein.

22 118. Responding to Paragraph 118, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
23 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

24 119. Responding to Paragraph 119, Defendants incorporate the admissions and denials set
25 forth above as though fully set forth herein.

26 120. Responding to Paragraph 120, Paragraph 120 consists of legal conclusions to which no
27 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

28 121. Paragraph 121 requires no response.

GENERAL ALLEGATIONS

122. Responding to Paragraph 122, Defendants incorporate the admissions and denials set forth above as though fully set forth herein.

123. Responding to Paragraph 123, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

124. Responding to Paragraph 124, Paragraph 124 consists of a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

125. Responding to Paragraph 125, Paragraph 125 consists of a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

126. Responding to Paragraph 126, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

127. Responding to Paragraph 127, Paragraph 127 consists of a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

128. Responding to Paragraph 128, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

129. Responding to Paragraph 129, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

130. Responding to Paragraph 130, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

131. Responding to Paragraph 131, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

132. Responding to Paragraph 132, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

**FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF:
UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF SECTION 4512
Violation of the Second Amendment Right to Keep and Bear Arms**

133. Responding to Paragraph 133, Defendants incorporate the admissions and denials set forth above as though fully set forth herein.

134. Responding to Paragraph 134, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

135. Responding to Paragraph 135, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

136. Responding to Paragraph 136, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

137. Responding to Paragraph 137, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

138. Responding to Paragraph 138, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

139. Responding to Paragraph 139, Paragraph 139 consists of a legal conclusion to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

140. Responding to Paragraph 140, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

- 1 141. Responding to Paragraph 141, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 2 142. Responding to Paragraph 142, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 3 143. Responding to Paragraph 143, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

**SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF:
UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF SECTION 1290
Violation of the Second Amendment Right to Keep and Bear Arms**

- 4
- 5
- 6 144. Responding to Paragraph 144, Defendants incorporate the admissions and denials set
- 7 forth above as though fully set forth herein.
- 8
- 9 145. Responding to Paragraph 145, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 10 146. Responding to Paragraph 146, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 11 147. Responding to Paragraph 147, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 12 148. Responding to Paragraph 148, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 13 149. Responding to Paragraph 149, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

**THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF:
UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF C.P.C. § 12050, et al.
Violation of the Second Amendment Right to Keep and Bear Arms**

- 14
- 15
- 16 150. Responding to Paragraph 150, Defendants incorporate the admissions and denials set
- 17 forth above as though fully set forth herein.
- 18 151. Responding to Paragraph 151, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 19 152. Responding to Paragraph 152, Paragraph 152 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
- 20 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 21 153. Responding to Paragraph 153, Paragraph 153 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
- 22 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 23 154. Responding to Paragraph 154, Paragraph 154 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
- 24 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 25 155. Responding to Paragraph 155, Defendants admit the allegations therein.
- 26 156. Responding to Paragraph 156, Paragraph 156 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
- 27 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 28 157. Responding to Paragraph 157, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

1 158. Responding to Paragraph 158, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

2 159. Responding to Paragraph 159, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

3 **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF:**
4 **UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF C.P.C. § 12050, et al.**
5 **Violation of the Second Amendment Right to Keep and Bear Arms**

6 160. Responding to Paragraph 160, Defendants incorporate the admissions and denials set
7 forth above as though fully set forth herein.

8 161. Responding to Paragraph 161, Paragraph 161 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
9 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

10 162. Responding to Paragraph 162, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

11 163. Responding to Paragraph 163, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

12 164. Responding to Paragraph 164, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

13 165. Responding to Paragraph 165, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

14 166. Responding to Paragraph 166, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

15 167. Responding to Paragraph 167, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

16 168. Responding to Paragraph 168, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

17 169. Responding to Paragraph 169, Paragraph 169 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
18 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

19 170. Responding to Paragraph 170, Paragraph 170 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
20 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

21 171. Responding to Paragraph 171, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
22 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

23 172. Responding to Paragraph 172, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

24 173. Responding to Paragraph 173, Paragraph 173 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
25 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

26 174. Responding to Paragraph 174, Paragraph 174 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
27 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

28 175. Responding to Paragraph 175, Paragraph 175 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

- 1 176. Responding to Paragraph 176, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 2 177. Responding to Paragraph 177, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 3 178. Responding to Paragraph 178, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 4 179. Responding to Paragraph 179, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 5 180. Responding to Paragraph 180, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

**FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF:
UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF C.P.C. § 12031(b).
Violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment**

- 8 181. Responding to Paragraph 181, Defendants incorporate the admissions and denials set
9 forth above as though fully set forth herein.
- 10 182. Responding to Paragraph 182, Defendants admit the allegations therein.
- 11 183. Responding to Paragraph 183, Defendants admit the allegations therein.
- 12 184. Responding to Paragraph 184, Paragraph 184 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
13 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 14 185. Responding to Paragraph 185, Paragraph 185 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
15 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 16 186. Responding to Paragraph 186, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 17 187. Responding to Paragraph 187, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 18 188. Responding to Paragraph 188, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

**SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF:
UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF LEOSA
Violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment**

- 22 189. Responding to Paragraph 189, Defendants incorporate the admissions and denials set
23 forth above as though fully set forth herein.
- 24 190. Responding to Paragraph 190, Paragraph 190 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
25 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 26 191. Responding to Paragraph 191, Paragraph 191 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
27 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

28

1 192. Responding to Paragraph 192, Paragraph 192 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
2 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

3 193. Responding to Paragraph 193, Paragraph 193 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
4 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

5 194. Responding to Paragraph 194, Paragraph 194 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
6 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

7 195. Responding to Paragraph 195, Paragraph 195 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
8 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

9 196. Responding to Paragraph 196, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

10
11 **SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF:**
12 **UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF SECTION 613.10(g)**
13 **Violation of the Section Amendment Right to Keep and Bear Arms**

14 197. Responding to Paragraph 197, Defendants incorporate the admissions and denials set
15 forth above as though fully set forth herein.

16 198. Responding to Paragraph 198, Paragraph 198 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
17 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

18 199. Responding to Paragraph 199, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

19 200. Responding to Paragraph 200, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

20 201. Responding to Paragraph 201, Defendants admit the allegations therein.

21 202. Responding to Paragraph 202, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

22 203. Responding to Paragraph 203, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
23 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

24 204. Responding to Paragraph 204, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
25 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

26 205. Responding to Paragraph 205, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
27 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

28 206. Responding to Paragraph 206, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.

- 1 207. Responding to Paragraph 207, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 2 208. Responding to Paragraph 208, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 3 209. Responding to Paragraph 209, Defendants admit the allegations therein.
- 4 210. Responding to Paragraph 210, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 5 211. Responding to Paragraph 211, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 6 212. Responding to Paragraph 212, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

**EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF:
UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF SECTION 613.10(g)
Violation of the Fifth Amendment Right to Due Process**

- 7
- 8
- 9 213. Responding to Paragraph 213, Defendants incorporate the admissions and denials set
- 10 forth above as though fully set forth herein.
- 11
- 12 214. Responding to Paragraph 214, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 13 215. Responding to Paragraph 215, Paragraph 215 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
- 14 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 15 216. Responding to Paragraph 216, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 16 217. Responding to Paragraph 217, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 17 218. Responding to Paragraph 218, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 18 219. Responding to Paragraph 219, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 19 220. Responding to Paragraph 220, Defendants lack knowledge or information sufficient to
- 20 form a belief about the truth of this allegation and deny it on that basis.
- 21 221. Responding to Paragraph 221, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 22 222. Responding to Paragraph 222, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 23 223. Responding to Paragraph 223, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

**NINTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF:
INVALIDITY OF SECTIONS 4512, 1290, 613.10(g) and C.P.C. § 12050, et al.
Violation of the Constitution and laws of the State of California**

- 24
- 25
- 26 224. Responding to Paragraph 224, Defendants incorporate the admissions and denials set
- 27 forth above as though fully set forth herein.
- 28 225. Responding to Paragraph 225, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

- 1 226. Responding to Paragraph 226, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 2 227. Responding to Paragraph 227, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 3 228. Responding to Paragraph 228, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 4 229. Responding to Paragraph 229, Paragraph 229 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
- 5 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 6 230. Responding to Paragraph 230, Paragraph 230 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
- 7 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 8 231. Responding to Paragraph 231, Paragraph 231 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
- 9 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 10 232. Responding to Paragraph 232, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 11 233. Responding to Paragraph 233, Paragraph 233 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
- 12 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 13 234. Responding to Paragraph 234, Paragraph 234 consists of a legal conclusion to which no
- 14 response is required. To the extent a response is required, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 15 235. Responding to Paragraph 235, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 16 236. Responding to Paragraph 236, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 17 237. Responding to Paragraph 237, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 18 238. Responding to Paragraph 238, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 19 239. Responding to Paragraph 239, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 20 240. Responding to Paragraph 240, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 21 241. Responding to Paragraph 241, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 22 242. Responding to Paragraph 242, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 23 243. Responding to Paragraph 243, Defendants deny the allegations therein.
- 24 244. Responding to Paragraph 244, Defendants deny the allegations therein.

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28

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

Fourth Affirmative Defense
(Failure to Join An Indispensable Party)

Plaintiff's complaint is barred in whole or in part because she has failed to name the United States as a defendant.

Fifth Affirmative Defense
(Qualified Immunity)

Plaintiff's claims against San Francisco officials are barred in whole or in part by the doctrine of qualified immunity.

Sixth Affirmative Defense
(Failure to State a Claim)

The allegations in the complaint fail to state a claim on which relief can be granted.

PRAYER

WHEREFORE, Defendants pray for judgment as follows:

1. Plaintiff take nothing from Defendants by way of this action;
2. The Complaint be dismissed with prejudice and judgment entered in favor of Defendants; and
3. Defendants be awarded costs of suit and any other relief which the Court deems proper.

Dated: March 3, 2011

DENNIS J. HERRERA
City Attorney
WAYNE SNODGRASS
SHERRI SOKELAND KAISER
Deputy City Attorneys

By: s/Sherry Sokeland Kaiser
SHERRI SOKELAND KAISER

Attorneys for Defendants CITY AND COUNTY OF
SAN FRANCISCO, GAVIN NEWSOM, GEORGE
GASCÓN, HEATHER FONG AND MICHAEL
HENNESSEY

EXHIBIT “B”
REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE
CASE NO. CO9-2143 PJH

**U.S. District Court
California Northern District (Oakland)
CIVIL DOCKET FOR CASE #: 4:09-cv-04493-CW**

Pizzo v. Newsom et al
Assigned to: Hon. Claudia Wilken
Referred to: Magistrate Judge Edward M. Chen (Settlement)
Demand: \$0
Cause: 28:1331 Fed. Question

Date Filed: 09/23/2009
Jury Demand: Plaintiff
Nature of Suit: 950 Constitutional - State Statute
Jurisdiction: Federal Question

Plaintiff

Therese Marie Pizzo

represented by **Gary William Gorski**
Law Offices of Gary W. Gorski
8549 Nephi Way
Fair Oaks, CA 95628
(916)965-6800
Fax: (916)065-6801
Email: usrugby@gmail.com
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Craig Cox Weaver
CC WEAVER & ASSOCIATES
P.O. Box 2275
Folsom, CA 95763
916-941-5184
Fax: 916-404-4867
Email: craigcweaver@ccweaver.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Daniel Michael Karalash ,
Law Ofc Daniel M Karalash
1207 Front St Ste 15
Sacramento, CA 95814
916-787-1234
Fax: 916-787-0267
Email: dankaralash@gmail.com
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

V.

Defendant

Gavin Newsom
*City & County of San Francisco Mayor, in
both his individual & official capacities*

represented by **Sherri Sokeland Kaiser**
Office of the City Attorney
City & County of San Francisco
#1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Place
City Hall, Room 234
San Francisco, CA 94102-4682
(415) 554-4691
Fax: (415) 554-4747
Email: sherri.sokeland.kaiser@sfgov.org
LEAD ATTORNEY

Defendant**Heather Fong**

*Former San Francisco Police Department
Chief of Police, in both her individual &
official capacities*

represented by **Sherri Sokeland Kaiser**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant**George Gascon**

*San Francisco Police Department Chief of
Police, in his official capacity*

represented by **Sherri Sokeland Kaiser**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant**Michael Hennessey**

*San Francisco Sheriff, in both his individual
& official capacities*

represented by **Sherri Sokeland Kaiser**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant**City & County of San Francisco**

represented by **Sherri Sokeland Kaiser**
(See above for address)
LEAD ATTORNEY
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Defendant**Edmund G. Brown**

*State of California Attorney General, in his
official capacity*

represented by **Geoffrey Lloyd Graybill**
California Attorney General's Office
1300 I Street
P.O. Box 944255
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550
(916) 324-5465
Fax: (916) 324-8835
Email: geoffrey.graybill@doj.ca.gov
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Miscellaneous**Thomas Jacobs**

represented by **Craig Cox Weaver**
(See above for address)
ATTORNEY TO BE NOTICED

Date Filed	#	Docket Text
09/23/2009	<u>1</u>	COMPLAINT for Monetary Damages, Declaratory & Injunctive Relief & Demand for Jury Trial & Notice of Unconstitutionality of Federal & State Statutes - [Summons Issued] against Edmund G. Brown, City & County of San Francisco, Heather Fong, George Gascon, Michael Hennessey & Gavin Newsom, [Filing Fee:\$350.00, Receipt Number 34611036982] Filed by Plaintiff Therese Marie Pizzo. (tn, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 9/23/2009) (tn, COURT STAFF). (Additional attachment(s) added on 9/24/2009: # <u>1</u> Complaint - [Part 1]) (tn, COURT STAFF). (Additional attachment(s) added on 9/24/2009: # <u>2</u> Complaint - [Part 2]) (tn, COURT STAFF). (Entered: 09/24/2009)
09/23/2009	<u>2</u>	SUMMONS Issued as to Defendants Edmund G. Brown, City & County of San Francisco, Heather Fong, George Gascon, Michael Hennessey & Gavin Newsom.(tn, COURT STAFF)

09/23/2009	<u>3</u>	ADR SCHEDULING ORDER: Joint Case Management Statement due 1/4/2010 & Initial Case Management Conference set for 1/11/2010 at 1:30 PM.. (tn, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 9/23/2009) (Entered: 09/24/2009)
09/23/2009		CASE DESIGNATED for Electronic Filing. (tn, COURT STAFF) (Entered: 09/24/2009)
10/01/2009	<u>4</u>	ORDER OF DISQUALIFICATION. Signed by Judge Thelton E. Henderson on 09/30/09. (rbe, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 10/1/2009) (Entered: 10/01/2009)
10/02/2009	<u>5</u>	ORDER REASSIGNING CASE. Case reassigned to Judge Hon. Claudia Wilken for all further proceedings. Judge Hon. Thelton E. Henderson no longer assigned to the case. Signed by Executive Committe on 10/2/09. (mab, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 10/2/2009) (Entered: 10/02/2009)
10/06/2009	<u>6</u>	CASE MANAGEMENT SCHEDULING ORDER FOR REASSIGNED CIVIL CASE: Case Management Conference set for 4/6/2010 02:00 PM.. Signed by Judge Claudia Wilken on 10/6/09. (scc, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 10/6/2009) (Entered: 10/06/2009)
10/08/2009	<u>7</u>	STIPULATION <i>Extending Time to Respond to Complaint</i> by Edmund G. Brown, Therese Marie Pizzo. (Graybill, Geoffrey) (Filed on 10/8/2009) Modified on 10/9/2009 (cp, COURT STAFF). (Entered: 10/08/2009)
10/14/2009	<u>8</u>	STIPULATION <i>Extending Time to Respond to Complaint [L.R. 6-1(a)]</i> by City & County of San Francisco, Heather Fong, George Gascon, Michael Hennessey, Gavin Newsom, Therese Marie Pizzo. (Kaiser, Sherri) (Filed on 10/14/2009) Modified on 10/15/2009 (cp, COURT STAFF). (Entered: 10/14/2009)
11/24/2009	<u>9</u>	Request for Stay of Proceedings pursuant to STIPULATION re <u>1</u> Complaint by Edmund G. Brown. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Exhibit Exhibit A - Other Signatories)(Graybill, Geoffrey) (Filed on 11/24/2009) Modified on 11/25/2009 (kc, COURT STAFF). (Entered: 11/24/2009)
11/24/2009	<u>10</u>	Declaration of Geoffrey L. Graybill in Support of <u>9</u> Stipulation <i>for Request to Stay Proceedings</i> filed by Edmund G. Brown. (Related document(s) <u>9</u>) (Graybill, Geoffrey) (Filed on 11/24/2009) (Entered: 11/24/2009)
11/24/2009	<u>11</u>	Proposed Order re <u>9</u> Stipulation <i>Granting Stay of Proceedings</i> by Edmund G. Brown. (Graybill, Geoffrey) (Filed on 11/24/2009) (Entered: 11/24/2009)
12/10/2009	<u>12</u>	ORDER by Judge Claudia Wilken GRANTING <u>9</u> Request to Stay. Signed by Judge Claudia Wilken, on 12/10/09. (scc, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 12/10/2009) Modified on 12/11/2009 (jlm, COURT STAFF). (Entered: 12/10/2009)
03/22/2010	<u>13</u>	NOTICE by Craig Cox Weaver <i>of Association of Counsel</i> (Weaver, Craig) (Filed on 3/22/2010) Modified on 3/23/2010 (cp, COURT STAFF). (Entered: 03/22/2010)
04/02/2010	<u>14</u>	STIPULATION <i>of the Parties to Continue the Case Management Conference</i> by City & County of San Francisco, Heather Fong, George Gascon, Michael Hennessey, Gavin Newsom, Edmund G. Brown,. (Kaiser, Sherri) (Filed on 4/2/2010) Modified on 4/5/2010 (cp, COURT STAFF). (Entered: 04/02/2010)
04/02/2010	<u>15</u>	STIPULATION by Therese Marie Pizzo. (Gorski, Gary) (Filed on 4/2/2010) (Entered: 04/02/2010)
04/05/2010	<u>16</u>	ORDER re <u>14</u> Granting Stipulation of the Parties to Continue the Case Management Conference. Initial Case Management Conference set for 7/13/2010 02:00 PM. Signed by Judge Claudia Wilken on 04/05/2010. (scc, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 4/5/2010) (Entered: 04/05/2010)
04/05/2010		***Deadlines terminated. <u>6</u> Case Management Scheduling Order. (scc, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 4/5/2010) (Entered: 04/05/2010)

04/16/2010	<u>17</u>	NOTICE by Thomas Jacobs <i>RELATED CASES NOTICE</i> (Weaver, Craig) (Filed on 4/16/2010) (Entered: 04/16/2010)
04/21/2010	<u>18</u>	NOTICE by Thomas Jacobs <i>TO DISREGARD NOTICE OF RELATED CASES</i> (Weaver, Craig) (Filed on 4/21/2010) (Entered: 04/21/2010)
07/13/2010	<u>23</u>	Minute Entry: Initial Case Management Conference held on 7/13/2010 before Claudia Wilken (Date Filed: 7/13/2010). (Court Reporter Sarah Goekler.) (ndr, COURT STAFF) (Date Filed: 7/13/2010) (Entered: 07/16/2010)
07/14/2010	<u>19</u>	ORDER DISMISSING CASE FOR FAILURE TO PROSECUTE. Signed by Judge Claudia Wilken on 7/14/2010. (cwlc2, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 7/14/2010) (Entered: 07/14/2010)
07/15/2010	<u>20</u>	STIPULATION <i>of the Parties to Set Aside Order of July 14, 2010 for Failure to Appear and to Reset the Case Back on the Case Management Conference Calendar; (Proposed) Order</i> by Therese Marie Pizzo, Edmund G. Brown, City & County of San Francisco, Heather Fong, George Cascon, Michael Hennessey, Gavin Newsom, . (Gorski, Gary) (Filed on 7/15/2010) Modified on 7/16/2010 (cp, COURT STAFF). (Entered: 07/15/2010)
07/15/2010	<u>21</u>	Letter from Counsel for Defendants City and County of San Francisco, et al. <i>Objecting to Filing of 7/15/2010 Stipulation to Set Aside Order.</i> (Kaiser, Sherri) (Filed on 7/15/2010) (Entered: 07/15/2010)
07/15/2010	<u>22</u>	NOTICE <i>of Withdraw of Docket Entry 20 Stipulation of the Parties to Set Aside Order of July 14, 2010 for Failure to Appear and to Reset the Case Back on the Case Management Conference Calendar"</i> by Therese Marie Pizzo. (Gorski, Gary) (Filed on 7/15/2010) Modified on 7/16/2010 (cp, COURT STAFF). (Entered: 07/15/2010)
07/20/2010	<u>24</u>	<i>Amended Stipulation of the Parties to Set Aside Order of July 14, 2010 for Failure to Appear and to Reset the Case Back on the Case Management Conference Calendar; (Proposed) Order</i> by Therese Marie Pizzo, Edmund G. Brown, City & County of San Francisco, Heather Fong, George Gascon, Michael Hennessey, Gavin Newsom, . (Gorski, Gary) (Filed on 7/20/2010) Modified on 7/21/2010 (cp, COURT STAFF). (Entered: 07/20/2010)
07/22/2010	<u>25</u>	ORDER re <u>24</u> Granting Stipulation of the Parties to Set Aside Order of July 14, 2010 for Failure to Appear and to Reset the Case Back on the Case Management Conference Calendar. Case Management Conference set for 10/5/2010 02:00 PM. Signed by Judge Claudia Wilken on 7/22/2010. (ndr, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 7/22/2010) (Entered: 07/22/2010)
09/21/2010	<u>26</u>	STATUS REPORT by Therese Marie Pizzo. (Gorski, Gary) (Filed on 9/21/2010) (Entered: 09/21/2010)
09/28/2010	<u>27</u>	SEPARATE FURTHER CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT filed by City & County of San Francisco, Heather Fong, George Gascon, Michael Hennessey, Gavin Newsom. (Kaiser, Sherri) (Filed on 9/28/2010) Modified on 9/29/2010 (kc, COURT STAFF). (Entered: 09/28/2010)
09/28/2010	<u>28</u>	Declaration of Sherri Kaiser in Support of <u>27</u> Case Management Statement filed by City & County of San Francisco, Heather Fong, George Gascon, Michael Hennessey, Gavin Newsom. (Attachments: # <u>1</u> Exhibit A, # <u>2</u> Exhibit B, # <u>3</u> Exhibit C)(Related document(s) <u>27</u>) (Kaiser, Sherri) (Filed on 9/28/2010) (Entered: 09/28/2010)
09/28/2010	<u>29</u>	SUPPLEMENTAL CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT filed by Edmund G. Brown. (Graybill, Geoffrey) (Filed on 9/28/2010) Modified on 9/29/2010 (kc, COURT STAFF). (Entered: 09/28/2010)
10/04/2010	<u>30</u>	CLERKS NOTICE CONTINUING CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE. Initial Case Management Conference set for 1/4/2011 02:00 PM. (ndr, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 10/4/2010) (Entered: 10/04/2010)
12/21/2010	<u>31</u>	JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT filed by Therese Marie Pizzo, Edmund G.

12/30/2010	<u>32</u>	Ex Parte Application filed by Therese Marie Pizzo. (Gorski, Gary) (Filed on 12/30/2010) (Entered: 12/30/2010)
01/03/2011	<u>33</u>	ORDER by Judge Claudia Wilken granting <u>32</u> Ex Parte Application (ndr, COURT STAFF) (Filed on 1/3/2011) (Entered: 01/03/2011)
01/04/2011	<u>34</u>	Minute Entry and Case Management Order: Initial Case Management Conference held on 1/4/2011 before Claudia Wilken (Date Filed: 1/4/2011), CASE REFERRED to Magistrate Judge for Settlement Conference. Case Management Statement due by 7/19/2012. Further Case Management Conference (to be held whether or not motion filed) set for 7/26/2012 02:00 PM. Final Pretrial Conference set for 9/25/2012 02:00 PM. Jury Selection set for 10/9/2012 08:30 AM before Hon. Claudia Wilken. Jury Trial (3 day) set for 10/9/2012 08:30 AM before Hon. Claudia Wilken. (to be filed) Dispositive Motion Hearing set for 7/26/2012 02:00 PM before Hon. Claudia Wilken. (to be filed) Motion to Dismiss Hearing set for 4/7/2011 02:00 PM before Hon. Claudia Wilken. (Court Reporter Raynee Mercado.) (ndr, COURT STAFF) (Date Filed: 1/4/2011) (Entered: 01/05/2011)
03/03/2011	<u>35</u>	ANSWER to Complaint by Edmund G. Brown. (Graybill, Geoffrey) (Filed on 3/3/2011) (Entered: 03/03/2011)
03/03/2011	<u>36</u>	ANSWER to Complaint by City & County of San Francisco, Heather Fong, George Gascon, Michael Hennessey, Gavin Newsom. (Kaiser, Sherri) (Filed on 3/3/2011) (Entered: 03/03/2011)

PACER Service Center			
Transaction Receipt			
03/23/2011 16:43:45			
PACER Login:	tm0137	Client Code:	NRA.JACKSON
Description:	Docket Report	Search Criteria:	4:09-cv-04493-CW
Billable Pages:	5	Cost:	0.40