

1 Timothy A. Bumann  
BUDD LARNER GROSS ROSENBAUM  
2 GREENBERG & SADE  
127 Peachtree Street, N.E.  
3 Atlanta, Georgia 30303  
Telephone No.: 404.688.3000  
4 Fax No.: 404.688.0888

5 Denis J. Moriarty (Bar No. 29526)  
HAIGHT BROWN & BONESTEEL  
6 6080 Center Drive, Suite 800  
Los Angeles, CA 90045-1574  
7 Telephone No.: 310.215.7100  
Fax No.: 310.215.7300

8 Attorneys for Taurus International Manufacturing, Inc. and Forjas Taurus S.A.  
9

10  
11 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
12 FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO  
13

14 Coordination Proceeding  
Special Title (Rule 1550 (b))

15 FIREARMS CASE

16 Including actions:

17 People, et al. v. Arcadia Machine & Tool,  
18 Inc., et al.,

19 People, et al. v. Arcadia Machine & Tool,  
20 Inc., et al.,

21 People, et al. v. Arcadia Machine & Tool,  
22 Inc., et al.,  
23  
24  
25

JUDICIAL COUNCIL COORDINATION  
PROCEEDING NO. 4095

San Francisco Superior Court No. 303753  
Los Angeles Superior Court No. BC210894  
Los Angeles Superior Court No. BC214794

**DECLARATION OF DOROTHY D.  
KNIGHT IN SUPPORT OF CERTAIN  
DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR AN  
ORDER PRECLUDING EVIDENCE  
THAT DEFENDANTS' ALLEGED  
CONDUCT HAS CAUSED ACQUISITION  
OF FIREARMS BY CRIMINALS AND  
OTHER PROHIBITED PERSONS**

DATE: July 19, 2002  
TIME: 8:30 a.m.  
DEPT.: 65  
TRIAL DATE: April 23, 2003

Hon. Vincent P. DiFiglia

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

7/19/2002

1 I, Dorothy D. Knight, declare as follows:

2 1. I am a paralegal with the firm of Budd, Lerner, Gross, Rosenbaum, Greenberg &  
3 Sade and work under the supervision of Timothy A. Bumann, Esq. Mr. Bumann is admitted *pro*  
4 *hac vice* and is counsel for Taurus International Manufacturing, Inc. and Forjas Taurus, S.A.

5 2. Taurus has received documents from plaintiffs in discovery which have been  
6 produced in purported compliance with the Court's March 26, 2001 order. The March 26, 2001  
7 order, titled "Order Compelling Plaintiffs to Disclose Facts and Documents Relating to the  
8 Acquisitional Firearms Recovered by Plaintiffs," required plaintiffs to produce "documents in their  
9 possession" in response to requests for production which reflect:

10 a. how criminals and others acquired the firearms manufactured and/or sold by  
11 defendants and previously identified by plaintiffs and

12 b. whether the manner of acquisition has a factual nexus to defendants'  
13 "alleged conduct."

14 c. In plaintiffs' complaints, they allege that criminals and others who are not  
15 legally permitted to acquire firearms do so through straw purchases, illegal sales by federally  
16 licensed retail dealers, gun show sales, sales by so-called kitchen table dealers and theft. Plaintiffs  
17 also allege that acquisition of Taurus firearms in these ways is attributable to Taurus' business  
18 practices and constitutes a public nuisance.

19  
20 **EVIDENCE OF FIREARM ACQUISITION PRODUCED BY PLAINTIFFS**

21 3. The documents produced by plaintiffs have been reviewed by me. The documents  
22 were reviewed for information which the Court ordered plaintiffs to produce in its March 26, 2001  
23 order.

24 4. The documents and factual evidence plaintiffs' produced in alleged compliance  
25 with this Court's March 26, 2001 that identify Taurus firearms are described below:

26  
27 a) **City of Berkeley.**

28 Plaintiffs did not produce any Berkeley Police Department ("BPD") incident reports

1 referring to Taurus firearms. Plaintiffs did produce a property room database that identified three  
2 (3) Taurus firearms by serial number and report date only.

3 A comprehensive and detailed review of the documents plaintiffs produced under this  
4 Court's March 26, 2001 order reveals the following acquisitional evidence as to identified Taurus  
5 firearms:

6 Straw purchases	None
7 Illegal Sales by Federally Licensed Dealers	None
8 Gun Show Sales	None
9 Licensed Kitchen Table Dealer Sales	None
10 Theft	None

11  
12 Because, plaintiffs did not produce any evidence demonstrating the manner in which any  
13 of the three (3) were acquired by the criminal or person in possession of the firearm, there is no  
14 evidence of a factual nexus between the manner of firearm acquisition in Berkeley and Taurus's  
15 alleged business practices.

16  
17 **b) City of San Francisco.**

18 Plaintiffs produced documents that appear to be San Francisco Police Department  
19 ("SFPD") incident reports that reflect the recovery of seventeen (17) Taurus firearms by the SFPD  
20 from 1996 to 1999. Prior to this production, plaintiffs produced a property room database that  
21 identified sixty-eight (68) additional Taurus firearms by serial number with a corresponding  
22 description of a criminal offense in which the firearm was presumably recovered (i.e. weapons  
23 offense, dangerous drugs, etc.) only.

24 A comprehensive and detailed review of the documents plaintiffs produced under this  
25 Court's March 26, 2001 order reveals the following acquisitional evidence as to identified Taurus  
26 firearms:

27 ///

28 ///

Straw Purchases	None
Illegal Sales by Federally Licensed Dealers	None
Gun Show Sales	None
Licensed Kitchen Table Dealer Sales	None

Theft. There is evidence in the documents produced that one (1) identified Taurus firearm had been reported stolen prior to its recovery by the SFPD. The extent of the information disclosed regarding the theft of this firearm is that the firearm was reported stolen by the Vallejo Police Department (SFC15013 - 16152).

There is no information in those documents suggesting that anything Taurus did or did not do, had any causal relationship to this theft. Therefore, there is no evidence of a factual nexus between the manner of firearm acquisition in San Francisco and Taurus' alleged business practices.

**c) City of Oakland.**

Plaintiffs produced documents that appear to be Oakland Police Department ("OPD") incident reports that reflect the recovery of seventy-one (71) Taurus firearms by the OPD from 1996 to 1999. Prior to this production, plaintiffs produced a property room database that identified 163 additional Taurus firearms by serial number and report date only.

A comprehensive and detailed review of the documents plaintiffs produced under this Court's March 26, 2001 order reveals the following acquisitional evidence as to identified Taurus firearms:

Straw Purchases	None
Illegal Sales by Federally Licensed Dealers	None
Gun Show Sales	None
Licensed Kitchen Table Dealer Sales	None

1        Theft. There is evidence in the documents produced that six (6) the identified Taurus  
2 firearms had been reported stolen prior to their recovery by the OPD. The extent of the  
3 information disclosed regarding the theft of these firearms is minimal. OAK 005900 - 5915  
4 reports that the Taurus firearm was reported stolen by Sacramento County Sheriff's Office. No  
5 other details are reported. During a drug arrest, a firearm is located and reported stolen from  
6 Milpitas Police Dept. (OAK 014924 - 14927). OPD report Bates labeled OAK 019298 - 19317  
7 reports that a check of the serial number on the firearm recovered showed it was stolen in 1993  
8 with the location redacted. OAK 027104 - 027133 provides information only that the suspect's  
9 firearm was found to be stolen with information redacted. In OAK 032830 - 32839, the report  
10 merely indicates the AFS (Automated Firearms System) run shows the firearm registered to a  
11 Santa Rosa resident. OAK 033999 - 34010 is report of an ex-felon in possession of a firearm with  
12 a notation that the firearm was reported stolen from the Oakland Police Department. At most, the  
13 documents reflect where the firearm was stolen from (i.e. stolen from law enforcement authority  
14 (OAK033999-34010). The factual circumstances surrounding the thefts are not disclosed.

15        There is no information in any of the documents produced suggesting that anything Taurus  
16 did or did not do had any causal relationship to those thefts. Therefore, there is no evidence of a  
17 factual nexus between the manner of firearm acquisition in Oakland and Taurus's alleged business  
18 practices.

19  
20        **d)        City of Sacramento.**

21        Plaintiffs produced documents that appear to be Sacramento Police Department ("SPD")  
22 incident reports that reflect the recovery of seventy-five (75) Taurus firearms by the SPD from  
23 1996 to 1999. Prior to this production, plaintiffs produced a property room database that  
24 identified one hundred fifteen (115) additional Taurus firearms by serial number and report date  
25 only.

26        A comprehensive and detailed review of the documents produced by plaintiffs under this  
27 Court's March 26, 2001 order reveals the following acquisitional evidence as to identified Taurus  
28 firearms:

Straw Purchases	None
Illegal Sales by Federally Licensed Dealers	None
Gun Show Sales	None
Licensed Kitchen Table Dealer Sales	None

Theft. There is evidence that fifteen (15) of the Taurus firearms recovered by the SPD were stolen. The circumstances surrounding the thefts of most of these firearms are not disclosed. The documents identifying twelve (12) of the thefts merely state that the firearm was stolen. In one (1) of the incidents involving a Taurus, the firearm used was stolen from the victim. In another, the firearm recovered is reported to have been taken from a business with the information redacted. It was not reported stolen. Finally, SAC 19453 - 19466 produced by the Plaintiffs is a report of a burglary of a residence in which several firearms were taken.

Plaintiffs did not produce any evidence of a factual nexus between the manner of firearm acquisition in Sacramento and Taurus's alleged business practices. The documents plaintiffs produced merely reflect that some of the firearms were reported stolen. None of the documents suggest that anything Taurus did or did not do had any causal relationship to the thefts.

**e) City of East Palo Alto.**

Plaintiffs produced documents that appear to be East Palo Alto Police Department ("EPAPD") incident reports that reflect the recovery of five (5) Taurus firearms by the EPAPD from 1996 to 1999. Prior to this production, plaintiffs produced a property room database that identified four (4) additional Taurus firearms by serial number and report date only.

A comprehensive and detailed review of the documents plaintiffs produced under this Court's March 26, 2001 order reveals the following acquisitional evidence as to identified Taurus firearms:

///

///

///

Straw Purchases	None
Illegal Sales by Federally Licensed Dealers	None
Gun Show Sales	None
Licensed Kitchen Table Dealer Sales	None

Theft. There is evidence that one (1) of the nine (9) identified Taurus firearms recovered by the East Palo Alto Police Department was reported stolen. (EPA 467-479). The extent of the information disclosed regarding the theft is a copy of Pocatello Police Dept. report with names and addresses redacted. The documents produced merely indicate that the firearm may have been stolen by visitors in a residence. Investigation was conducted but the thief was not located.

Plaintiffs did not produce any evidence of a factual nexus between the manner of firearm acquisition in East Palo Alto and Taurus's alleged business practices. The documents produced merely reflect that one (1) of the firearms recovered was reported stolen. None of the documents suggest that anything Taurus did or did not do, had any causal relationship to the theft.

**f) County of San Mateo.**

Plaintiffs produced documents that appear to be San Mateo County Sheriff's Department ("SMCSD") incident reports that reflect the recovery of seven (7) Taurus firearms by the SMCSD from 1996 to 1999. Prior to this production, plaintiffs produced a property room database that identified fourteen (14) additional Taurus firearms by serial number and report date only.

A comprehensive and detailed review of the documents plaintiffs produced under this Court's March 26, 2001 order reveals the following acquisitional evidence as to identified Taurus firearms:

Straw Purchases	None
Illegal Sales by Federally Licensed Dealers	None
Gun Show Sales	None
Licensed Kitchen Table Dealer Sales	None

1        Theft: Plaintiffs produced one (1) incident, SMC 02511-02523, which describes burglary  
2 of a residence in which two (2) firearms were stolen, including a Taurus. There is no information  
3 in these documents suggesting that anything Taurus did or did not do had any causal relationship  
4 to the theft.

5        Plaintiffs did not produce any evidence of a factual nexus between the manner of firearm  
6 acquisition in San Mateo County and Taurus's alleged business practices.

7  
8        g)        County of Alameda.

9        Plaintiffs produced documents that appear to be Alameda County Sheriff's Department  
10 ("ACSD") incident reports that reflect the recovery of four (4) Taurus firearms by the ACSD from  
11 1996 to 1999. Prior to this production, plaintiffs produced a property room database that  
12 identified zero (0) Taurus firearms by serial number and report date only.

13        A comprehensive and detailed review of the documents plaintiffs produced under this  
14 Court's March 26, 2001 order reveals the following acquisitional evidence as to identified Taurus  
15 firearms:

16

Straw Purchases	None
Illegal Sales by Federally Licensed Dealers	None
Gun Show Sales	None
Licensed Kitchen Table Dealer Sales	None
Theft	None

17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22        The above chart illustrates that plaintiffs did not produce any evidence demonstrating the  
23 manner in which any of the identified Taurus firearms recovered by the ACSD were acquired by  
24 the criminal or person in possession of the firearm. Therefore, plaintiffs did not produce any  
25 evidence of a factual nexus between the manner of firearm acquisition in Alameda County and  
26 Taurus's alleged business practices.

27        ///

28        ///

1           **h)     City of Inglewood.**

2           Plaintiffs produced documents that appear to be Inglewood Police Department ("IPD")  
3 incident reports that reflect the recovery four (4) Taurus firearms by the IPD from 1996 to 1999.  
4 Prior to this production, plaintiffs produced a property room database that identified eleven (11)  
5 additional Taurus firearms by serial number and report date only.

6           A comprehensive and detailed review of the documents plaintiffs produced under this  
7 Court's March 26, 2001 order reveals the following acquisitional evidence as to identified Taurus  
8 firearms:

9

Straw Purchases	None
Illegal Sales by Federally Licensed Dealers	None
Gun Show Sales	None
Licensed Kitchen Table Dealer Sales	None
Theft	None

10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15           The above chart illustrates that plaintiffs did not produce any evidence demonstrating the  
16 manner in which any of the identified Taurus firearms recovered by the IPD were acquired by the  
17 criminal or person in possession of the firearm. Therefore, there is no evidence of a factual nexus  
18 between the manner of firearm acquisition in Inglewood and Taurus's alleged business practices.  
19

20           **i)     City of Compton.**

21           Plaintiffs produced documents that appear to be Compton Police Department ("CPD")  
22 incident reports that reflect the recovery of twenty-six (26) Taurus firearms by the CPD from 1996  
23 to 1999. Prior to this production, plaintiffs produced a property room database that identified fifty  
24 (50) additional Taurus firearms by serial number and report date only.

25           A comprehensive and detailed review of the documents plaintiffs produced under this  
26 Court's March 26, 2001 order reveals the following acquisitional evidence as to identified Taurus  
27 firearms:  
28

1	Straw Purchases	None
2	Illegal Sales by Federally Licensed Dealers	None
3	Gun Show Sales	None
4	Licensed Kitchen Table Dealer Sales	None

5

6        Theft – Plaintiffs produced documents that reflect that four (4) of the firearms recovered

7 by the CPD were acquired by theft. Among items found on a lawn at a Compton address

8 (redacted) (COMP 2451 - 2468) was a Taurus revolver reported stolen by the Las Vegas Police

9 Dept. Another incident, COMP 2742 - 2757 shows a Taurus reported stolen by the Riverside

10 County Sheriff's office but the suspect from the whom the firearm was seized had no knowledge

11 the firearm was stolen. COMP 5964 - 5972 is a report of recovered property with records

12 indicating the Taurus firearm was reported stolen by Los Angeles County Sheriff's Office in

13 March 1994. There is no evidence regarding the circumstances surrounding the theft. COMP

14 8919 - 8926 is a report of a recovered Taurus firearm reported stolen through CLETS, a law

15 enforcement database. The documents merely indicate that these firearms were stolen. Another

16 report (COMP 0782 - 0786) indicates that Taurus firearm was listed as found property but it is

17 unknown whether it is stolen or not.

18        Plaintiffs' production does not provide a factual nexus between the manner of firearm

19 acquisition in Compton and Taurus's alleged business practices. The documents merely reflect

20 that four (4) stolen firearms were recovered by the CPD from 1996-1999 without providing a

21 description of the circumstances surrounding the thefts.

22

23        j)        County of Los Angeles.

24        Plaintiffs produced documents that appear to be Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department

25 ("LASD") incident reports that reflect the recovery of sixty-six (66) Taurus firearms by the LASD

26 from 1996 to 1999. Prior to this production, plaintiffs produced a property room database that

27 identified one hundred thirty-one (131) additional Taurus firearms by serial number and report

28 date only.

1 A comprehensive and detailed review of the documents plaintiffs produced under this  
2 Court's March 26, 2001 order reveals the following acquisitional evidence as to identified Taurus  
3 firearms:

4 Straw Purchases	None
5 Gun Show Sales	None
6 Licensed Kitchen Table Dealer Sales	None

7  
8 Theft: Plaintiffs produced documents that reflect that fifteen (15) of the firearms recovered  
9 by the LASD were acquired by theft or likely acquired by theft. The documents do not provide  
10 any information on the circumstances surrounding the theft and, at times, the reporting officer  
11 "believes" the firearm to be stolen. Five (5) of the firearms recovered by LASD were reported  
12 only as "possibly" stolen or "most likely" stolen. Another four (4) of the firearms recovered were  
13 stolen were from various law enforcement authorities. Plaintiffs produced documents reflecting  
14 four (4) of the firearms were reported stolen prior to their recovery by LASD. LACO 0027974 -  
15 27999 is a report of a search warrant in which numerous firearms were recovered. LACO  
16 0030172 - 30211 (and duplicate report 038468 - 38507) reflect firearms recovered during an  
17 alcohol beverage control investigation in which the store owner admits that he buys firearms from  
18 customers. The factual circumstances surrounding the thefts are not disclosed.

19 There is no information in any of the documents produced suggesting that anything Taurus  
20 did or did not do had any causal relationship to those thefts. Therefore, there is no evidence of a  
21 factual nexus between the manner of firearm acquisition in the County of Los Angeles and  
22 Taurus's alleged business practices.

23 Illegal Sales By Federally Licensed Dealers: There is evidence that federal firearms  
24 licensee John Raymond Thompson was indicted on July 1, 1998 for exporting three Taurus  
25 firearms to Mexico without first obtaining a license from the State Department or written  
26 authorization to do so. Mr. Thompson was fined and sentenced to 51 months in prison  
27 (SFC24640-SFC24994).

28 ///

1 There is no evidence in the documents identifying these criminal actions by third parties  
2 that there exists any factual nexus between the intentional wrongdoing described and Taurus's  
3 business practices.

4  
5 **k) City of Los Angeles.**

6 Plaintiffs produced documents that appear to be Los Angeles Police Department ("LAPD")  
7 incident reports that reflect the recovery of two hundred (200) Taurus firearms by the LAPD from  
8 1996 to 1999. Prior to this production, plaintiffs produced a property room database that  
9 identified four hundred seventy seven (477) additional Taurus firearms by serial number and  
10 report date only. A comprehensive and detailed review of the documents plaintiffs produced  
11 under this Court's March 26, 2001 order reveals the following acquisitional evidence as to  
12 identified Taurus firearms:

13 Straw Purchases	None
14 Illegal Sales by Federally Licensed Dealers	None
15 Gun Show Sales	None
16 Licensed Kitchen Table Dealer Sales	None

17  
18 Theft: There is evidence in the documents produced by Plaintiffs that fifteen (15) of the  
19 identified Taurus firearms recovered by LAPD were stolen. The circumstances surrounding the  
20 thefts of most of these firearms are not disclosed. The documents identifying twelve (12) of those  
21 recovered firearms had been reported stolen prior to their recovery by the LAPD. Two of the  
22 incidents produced are reports of thefts in which the firearms were stolen out of a motor vehicle (2  
23 LA City 00681 - 6192 and 2 LA City 005345 - 5358). One report indicates a residence was  
24 burglarized and a Taurus firearm was among the items stolen (CDRom 2 LA City 013366).

25 There is no information in those documents suggesting that anything Taurus did or did not  
26 do had any causal relationship to these thefts. Therefore, there is no evidence of a factual nexus  
27 between the manner of firearm acquisition in Los Angeles and Taurus's alleged business practices.

28 ///

1 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the  
2 foregoing is true and correct.

3  
4  
5 Dorothy D. Knight  
6 DOROTHY D. KNIGHT  
7

8 1755047.1  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28