Case: 07-15763 01/29/2009 ID: 6790144 DktEntry: 78

RICHARDS | WATSON | GERSHON ATTORNEYS AT LAW – A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION

355 South Grand Avenue, 40th Floor, Los Angeles, California 90071-3101 Telephone 213.626.8484 Facsimile 213.626.0078

Page: 1 of	4	! V	E	D
MOLLY C. U.S. COU	DWY	ER, C	LER	K

JAN 29 2009

9LED	
OCKETED	INITIAL

RICHARD RICHARDS (1916-1988)

GLENN R. WATSON (RETIRED)

HARRY L. GERSHON (1922–2007)

STEVEN L. DORSEY WILLIAM L. STRAUSZ MITCHELL E. ABBOTT GREGORY W. STEPANICICH ROCHELLE BROWNE QUINN M. BARROW CAROL W. LYNCH GREGORY M. KUNERT THOMAS M. JIMBO ROBERT C. CECCON STEVEN H. KAUFMANN KEVIN G. ENNIS ROBIN D. HARRIS MICHAEL ESTRADA LAURENCE S. WIENER STEVEN R. ORR B. TILDEN KIM SASKIA T. ASAMURA B. TILDEN KIM
SASKIA T. ASAMURA
KAYSER O. SUME
PETER M. THORSON
JAMES L. MARKMAN
CRAIG A. STEELE
T. PETER PIERCE
TERENCE R. BOGA
LISA BOND
JANET E. COLESON
ROXANNE M. DIAZ
JIM G. GRAYSON
ROY A. CLARKE
WILLIAM P. CURLEY III
MICHAEL F. YOSHIBA
REGINA N. DANNER
PAULA GUTIERREZ BAEZA
TERESA HO-URANO
BRUCE W. GALLOWAY
DIANA K. CHUANG
PATRICK K. BOBKO
BILL D. DUNSMORE
AMY GREYSON
DEBORAH R. HAKMAN
D. CRAIG FOX
ALEXANDER ABBE
SUSAN E. RUSNAK SUSAN E. RUSNAK DAVID M. SNOW LOLLY A. ENRIQUEZ KIRSTEN R. BOWMAN G. INDER KHALSA GINETTA L. GIOVINCO TRISHA ORTIZ CANDICE K. LEE DAVID G. ALDERSON MELISSA M. CROSTHWAITE MARICELA E. MARROQUÍN GENA M. STINNETT JENNIFER PETRUSIS STEVEN L. FLOWER
STEVEN L. FLOWER
CHRISTOPHER J. DIAZ
MATTHEW E. COHEN
DEBBIE Y. CHO
GEOFFREY WARD TOUSSIANT S. BAILEY
WHITNEY G. MCDONALD
SERITA R. YOUNG VERONICA S. GUNDERSON SHIRI KLIMA DIANA H. VARAT

> OF COUNSEL MARK L. LAMKEN SAYRE WEAVER NORMAN A. DUPONT JIM R. KARPIAK

KATRINA C. GONZALES

SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE TELEPHONE 415.421.8484

ORANGE COUNTY OFFICE TELEPHONE 714.990.0901 January 28, 2009

#### **VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS**

Molly C. Dwyer, Clerk United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit 95 Seventh Street San Francisco, California 94103

Re: *Nordyke, et al., v. King, et al.,* (Case No. 07-15763)

Dear Ms. Dwyer:

On January 26, 2009, Appellants in the above-entitled case filed what appears to be a supplemental letter brief, dated January 20, 2009. Though Appellants fail to provide any authority for the supplemental letter brief, the format and request of the letter indicate it was filed pursuant to F.R.App.P. 28(j). There is no other federal rule of appellate procedure authorizing the post-oral argument filing of a document such as the document filed by Appellants on January 26, 2009.

Appellees object to this post-briefing letter because it far exceeds the 350-word limit set forth in Rule 28(j), and does not introduce any "pertinent or significant authorities" that came to Appellants' attention after the January 15, 2009, oral argument in this matter, as required by that Rule.

Appellants' letter cites no pertinent or significant authorities that were unavailable at oral argument. Appellants' letter simply seeks to rebut arguments made by Appellees at the hearing, which Appellants have

Case: 07-15763 01/29/2009 ID: 6790144 DktEntry: 78 Page: 2 of 4

### RICHARDS | WATSON | GERSHON

Molly C. Dwyer January 28, 2007 Page 2

since concluded they did not rebut adequately. Appellants' letter cites only to the Joint Statement of Undisputed Facts and the Penal Code, all available on the date of argument. Appellants do not even assert that the cited evidence and authorities were not available on January 15, 2009. Additionally, Appellants' letter attaches "exhibits," which are documents already in the Record, and which are not permitted by F.R.App.P. 28(j).

Accordingly, Appellees object to the letter and "exhibits" and request the Clerk and the Court disregard them in their entirety. If the Court chooses to consider Appellants' letter brief, Appellees request that the Court also consider the following: As the Record reflects, the letters of County Counsel Richard Winnie on which Appellants rely to argue that the exception in subsection (f)(4) of the Ordinance is not available to their event, were all written prior September 28, 1999, the date when subsection (f)(4) was adopted at second reading of the Ordinance. Joint Statement of Undisputed Facts, No. 6. Additionally, Appellants have submitted no written plan to the Fair Association to show how they would conduct a gun show consistent with the Ordinance, as adopted.

Respectfully submitted,

Veroniea S. Gunderson

12061\0002\1114100.1

Case: 07-15763 01/29/2009 ID: 6790144 DktEntry: 78 Page: 3 of 4

#### RICHARDS | WATSON | GERSHON

Molly C. Dwyer January 28, 2007 Page 3

## **CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE**

Appellees, pursuant to Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure, Rule 28(j) and Ninth Circuit Rule 28-6, submit this Certificate of Compliance. The 350-word limitation of Rule 28(j) has not been exceeded inasmuch as the body of the letter, excluding the address, salutation, header, and closing, contains 350 words.

Dated: January 28, 2009

Veronica S. Gunderson

Case: 07-15763 01/29/2009 ID: 6790144 DktEntry: 78 Page: 4 of 4

#### PROOF OF SERVICE

I, Stella L. Wagner, declare that I am employed in the City of Los Angeles, County of Los Angeles, State of California. I am over the age of 18 years and not a party to this action; my business address is 355 South Grand Avenue, 40<sup>th</sup> Floor, Los Angeles, California 90071-3101.

On January 28, 2009, I served the following document:

# LETTER OBJECTING TO APPELLANTS' POST-BRIEFING LETTER DATED JANUARY 20, 2009

on the following interested parties in this action:

Donald J. Kilmer, Jr. Law Offices of Donald Kilmer 1645 Willow Street, Suite 150 San Jose, California 95125 Don B. Kates, Esq. Attorney at Law 22608 N.E. 269<sup>th</sup> Street Battleground, Washington 98604

Richard E. Winnie County Counsel 333 Hegenberger, Suite 400 Oakland, California 94621

By placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at Los Angeles, California addressed as set forth below. I am readily familiar with the firm's practice for collection and processing correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. Under that practice, it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing contained in this affidavit.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on January 28, 2009, at Los Angeles, California.

Stella L. Wagner
Stella L. Wagner