

EDMUND G. BROWN JR., State Bar No. 37100
Attorney General of California
STEPHEN P. ACQUISTO, State Bar No. 172527
Supervising Deputy Attorney General
ANTHONY R. HAKL, State Bar No. 197335
Deputy Attorney General
1300 I Street, Suite 125
P.O. Box 944255
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550
Telephone: (916) 322-9041
Fax: (916) 324-8835
E-mail: Anthony.Hakl@doj.ca.gov

Attorneys for Defendant Wilfredo Cid

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**IVAN PEÑA, ROY VARGAS, DOÑA
CROSTON, BRETT THOMAS, SECOND
AMENDMENT FOUNDATION, INC., and
THE CALGUNS FOUNDATION, INC.,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

WILFREDO CID,

Defendant.

2:09-cv-01185-FCD-KJM

**DEFENDANT CID'S SUPPLEMENTAL
BRIEF**

Date: None
Time: None
Dept: No. 2, 15th Floor
Judge: Frank C. Damrell, Jr.
Trial Date: None
Action Filed: April 30, 2009

By order filed September 28, the Court directed "the parties to file supplemental briefing regarding why this action should not be stayed pending the Ninth Circuit's en banc decision in *Nordyke v. King*." (Doc. no. 20.) As explained below, Defendant Cid agrees that this action should be stayed until the Ninth Circuit issues its en banc decision in *Nordyke*.

**I. THE COURT SHOULD STAY THIS ACTION IN ITS ENTIRETY PENDING THE NINTH
CIRCUIT'S EN BANC DECISION IN *NORDYKE V. KING*.**

On September 30, the Supreme Court granted the petition for certiorari in *McDonald v. City of Chicago*, No. 08-1521. This term, therefore, the Court will consider the applicability of the Second Amendment to the states and local entities.

1 Additionally, once the Supreme Court decides *McDonald*, the Ninth Circuit en banc panel
 2 will decide *Nordyke*. Following oral argument en banc, the Ninth Circuit vacated the submission
 3 of *Nordyke* pending the Supreme Court's disposition of *McDonald*, as well as *National Rifle*
 4 *Ass'n of America, Inc. v. City of Chicago*, No. 08-1497, the companion case to *McDonald*, and
 5 *Maloney v. Rice*, No. 08-1592, the New York Second Amendment case.¹

6 At the time Cid filed his motion to dismiss, the panel decision in *Nordyke* was important
 7 because it both addressed the incorporation issue and evaluated whether the Second Amendment
 8 invalidated the firearms regulation at issue in light of *District of Columbia v. Heller*, --- U.S. ---,
 9 128 S. Ct. 2783 (2008). Although it now appears the Supreme Court will resolve the
 10 incorporation issue, the en banc decision in *Nordyke* remains important because, apart from how
 11 the incorporation question is answered, *Nordyke* will involve the Ninth Circuit's evaluation of a
 12 firearms regulation in light of both *Heller* and *McDonald*. Cid therefore would disagree with any
 13 suggestion that the *Nordyke* en banc opinion will have no relevance beyond the incorporation
 14 issue. (See Pls.' Not. of Possible Relevant Auth. filed Aug. 24 at 2.)

15 In sum, in the upcoming months the Supreme Court will decide *McDonald*. And then the
 16 Ninth Circuit will decide *Nordyke*. Both cases will at least instruct, if not directly control, this
 17 case. It would be a waste of resources to proceed in this case in any fashion until the issuance of
 18 the opinions in *McDonald* and then *Nordyke*. Thus, this action should be stayed in its entirety
 19 pending the Ninth Circuit's issuance of the en banc decision in *Nordyke*.

20 **II. ANY ORDER STAYING THIS ACTION SHOULD DIRECT THAT ANY MOTION TO**
 21 **DISMISS BY CID BE DECIDED BEFORE PLAINTIFFS FILE ANY MOTION FOR**
 22 **SUMMARY JUDGMENT ONCE THE STAY IS LIFTED.**

23 Earlier in this case Plaintiffs attempted to have their motion for summary judgment heard at
 24 the same time as Cid's motion to dismiss. Cid responded with an application for an order
 25 shortening time and motion for relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(f). The Court
 26 then ordered that Cid's motion to dismiss remain set for October 2, as originally noticed, set the

27 ¹ Presumably, the Court will hold *National Rifle Ass'n of America* and *Maloney* until it
 28 decides *McDonald*.

1 Rule 56(f) motion for hearing on October 16, and continued the hearing on Plaintiffs' motion for
2 summary judgment to October 30. Accordingly, if this action is stayed, and consistent with the
3 interest of conserving the resources of the Court and parties, Cid requests that any order staying
4 this action direct him to file any motion to dismiss within 30 days from the lifting of the stay and
5 further direct that Plaintiffs not file any motion for summary judgment until Cid's motion to
6 dismiss is decided, or until the 30-day period expires if Cid does not file a motion to dismiss.

7 Dated: October 2, 2009

Respectfully Submitted,

8 EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
9 Attorney General of California
10 STEPHEN P. ACQUISTO
Supervising Deputy Attorney General

11 /s/ ***Anthony R. Hakl***

12 ANTHONY R. HAKL
13 Deputy Attorney General
Attorneys for Defendant

14 SA2009310413
15 10495227.doc
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28