

C. D. Michel – SBN 144258
cmichel@michellawyers.com
Sean A. Brady – SBN 262007
sbrady@michellawyers.com
Matthew D. Cubeiro – SBN 291519
mcubeiro@michellawyers.com
MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
180 East Ocean Boulevard, Suite 200
Long Beach, CA 90802
Telephone: 562-216-4444
Facsimile: 562-216-4445

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

STEVEN RUPP, et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

XAVIER BECERRA, in his official
capacity as Attorney General of the
State of California,

Defendant.

Case No.: 8:17-cv-00746-JLS-JDE

**PLAINTIFFS' STATEMENT OF
GENUINE DISPUTES OF
MATERIAL FACT AND
ADDITIONAL
UNCONTROVERTED FACTS**

Hearing Date: May 31, 2019
Hearing Time: 10:30 a.m.
Courtroom: 10A
Judge: Josephine L. Staton

Plaintiffs Steven Rupp, Steven Dember, Cheryl Johnson, Michael Jones, Christopher Seifert, Alfonso Valencia, Troy Willis, Dennis Martin, and the California Rifle & Pistol Association, Incorporated, respectfully submit the following Statement of Genuine Disputes of Material Fact pursuant to Local Rule 56-2.

I. STATEMENT OF GENUINE DISPUTES OF MATERIAL FACT

No.	Defendant's Uncontroverted Facts and Supporting Evidence	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
1	<p>In 1957, the U.S. Army requested Armalite, a small arms manufacturer, to produce a lightweight, high-velocity rifle that could operate in both semi-automatic and full-automatic modes, with firepower capable "of penetrating a steel helmet or standard body armor at 500 yards."</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 1 at 29, ¶ 68.</p>	<p>Disputed. Defendant's supporting evidence, consisting of Defendant's expert report, does not cite a source for the quoted statement.</p>
2	<p>According to one of the designers of the AR-15, the rifle was engineered to generate "maximum wound effect."</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 1 at 30, ¶ 73.</p>	<p>Disputed. Defendant's supporting evidence, consisting of Defendant's expert report, does not cite a source for the quoted statement.</p>
3	<p>After field testing in combat operations in Vietnam, the Advanced Research Projects Agency ("ARPA") noted that the "lethality of the AR-15 and its reliability record were particularly impressive."</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 1 at 29, ¶ 68.</p>	<p>Undisputed as to what the report states.</p>

No.	Defendant's Uncontroverted Facts and Supporting Evidence	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
4	<p>The ARPA found that all casualties inflicted by the AR-15 in combat were fatal, including hits to only extremities.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 1 at 29-30, ¶¶ 68-69.</p>	<p>Disputed. Defendant's supporting evidence, consisting of Defendant's expert report, does not support that the ARPA report found that "all casualties inflicted by the AR-15 in combat were fatal, including hits to only extremities."</p>
5	<p>In a 1989 report, the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco & Firearms described features such as folding and telescoping stocks, pistol grips, and flash suppressors as "military features and characteristics . . . carried over to the semiautomatic versions of the original military rifle."</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 22 at 1048-49.</p>	<p>Disputed. Defendants own supporting evidence states that "the vast majority of sporting firearms employ a more traditional pistol grip," suggesting many sporting firearms do in fact employ a pistol grip of some type. Defendants evidence also states that flash suppressors which also serve to dampen muzzle climb have some benefits in sporting uses. Defendants evidence also states that as to sporting uses for folding/telescoping stocks, such items make the firearm easier to carry when hiking or backpacking.</p>
6	<p>In a 1998 study, the Bureau of Alcohol Tobacco & Firearms examined semiautomatic assault rifles with what it described as "distinctive military configuration," which incorporated physical features such as the ability to accept a detachable magazine, holding/telescoping stocks, separate pistol grips, and flash suppressors.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 21 at 992.</p>	<p>Disputed. Defendants supporting evidence states that ATF does not consider a detachable magazine, in and of itself, a military feature prohibiting the firearm from being imported in the United States.</p>

No.	Defendant's Uncontroverted Facts and Supporting Evidence	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
7	<p>The AR-15 is the civilian version of the military's M-16.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 2 at 121-22, ¶ 15; Def. Exh. 16 at 818:3-13.</p>	<p>Disputed to the extent Defendant's statement suggests the firearms are functionally the same.</p>
8	<p>Rifles restricted by the AWCA appear like their military counterparts and possess many of the same features.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 16 at 787:6-10, 790:10-22.</p>	<p>Disputed as to the rifles restricted by the AWCA possessing "many of the same features." As noted in Defendant's supporting evidence, the selection of what rifles were to be banned under the AWCA was based solely on their "appearance" and not what features the firearms actually possessed.</p>
9	<p>Rifles restricted by the AWCA are capable of firing the same centerfire rifle rounds as U.S. military rifles and "could have the same high capacity for firepower as the military weapons." Civilian assault rifles commonly use ammunition rounds created mainly for military use. The .223 is the civilian version of 5x56 military round. The .308 is the civilian version of the 7.62x51 NATO round.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 2 at 128, ¶ 34; <i>see</i> Def. Exh. 10 at 320:3-14.</p>	<p>Disputed. The .223 Remington first appeared in 1957 and was designed by Remington Arms. The 5.56 appeared years later in 1964 and was designed by FN Herstal in Belgium, having been based on the .223 Remington. The same is true of the 308 Winchester, having been introduced in 1952 and being the cartridge for which the 7.62x51 NATO (adopted two years later) is based on. The testimony of Blake Graham is therefore factually incorrect and does not support the stated fact.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Ex. 64; Ex. 68.</p>
10	<p>The difference between the M-16 and the AR-15 is that the M-16 is a</p>	<p>While Defendant's supporting evidence does not support this</p>

No.	Defendant's Uncontroverted Facts and Supporting Evidence	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
	<p>select-fire rifle that allows the shooter to fire in either automatic or semiautomatic mode, while the AR-15 fires only in semiautomatic mode.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 45 at 1544; Def. Exh. 16 at 818:3-13.</p>	<p>statement, Plaintiffs do not dispute that AR-15 style semiautomatic rifles are not select-fire.</p>
11	<p>Semiautomatic weapons can be fired at rates of 300 to 500 rounds per minute. According to a Congressional report, this makes them "virtually indistinguishable in practical effect from machineguns."</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 27 at 1090.</p>	<p>Disputed. Defendant's supporting evidence does not in any way support the claim that semiautomatic weapons can be fired at rates of 300 to 500 rounds per minute. In any event, whether this is or is not a realistic measurement, that rate is not unique to the banned firearms under the AWCA, and equally applies to all semiautomatic firearms.</p>
12	<p>A test by the San Jose police showed that a 30-round magazine empties in slightly less than two seconds on automatic, while the same magazine empties in just five seconds on semiautomatic.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 20 at 934.</p>	<p>Disputed. The alleged test referred to by Defendants was conducted by then San Jose Police Chief Joseph D. McNamara over 30 years ago. No information concerning the firearms model, the skill of the shooter, type of timing device, or whether the results included reaction time were ever provided regarding this test, and for that reason there is no way to verify the accuracy of the claims made by Chief McNamara regarding the results.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Ex. 63 at 221-222.</p>

No.	Defendant's Uncontroverted Facts and Supporting Evidence	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
13	<p>A semiautomatic weapon can be converted to automatic fire by installing certain parts, such as bump stocks or multiburst trigger activators.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 27 at 1090; Def. Exh. 3 at 140, ¶ 20; Def. Exh. 15 at 642:1-10.</p>	<p>Disputed. None of the supporting evidence offered by Defendants states that installing a bump stock or multiburst trigger activator will convert a firearm into a fully automatic machinegun. Even so, the installation of such devices is not limited to only those firearms prohibited by the AWCA, but all semiautomatic firearms.</p>
14	<p>According to a 1989 ATF Report, large-capacity magazines "are indicative of military firearms," and the fact "[t]hat a firearm is designed and sold with a large capacity magazine, e.g., 20-30 rounds, is a factor to be considered in determining whether a firearm is a semiautomatic assault rifle."</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 22 at 1048.</p>	<p>Undisputed as to what is stated in the report.</p>
15	<p>AR-platform rifles capable of accepting detachable magazines take 3 to 5 seconds less to reload than the same rifle with a fixed magazine.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 10 at 331:7-333:7.</p>	<p>Disputed. As stated in Defendant's supporting evidence, there are faster variants of each type of magazine release mechanism that are also dependent on the user's own ability.</p>
16	<p>A protruding pistol grip helps to stabilize the rifle during rapid fire and enables a shooter to maintain accuracy.</p>	<p>Disputed to the extent Defendant's statement suggests that this is the sole or main purpose of a pistol grip.</p> <p>As stated by Plaintiffs' expert, the pistol grip simply places the shooting</p>

No.	Defendant's Uncontroverted Facts and Supporting Evidence	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
	<p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 3 at 137-38, ¶ 9; Def. Exh. 22 at 1048; Def. Exh. 11 at 349:11-22; Def. Exh. 16 at 844:6-15; Def. Exh. 19 at 913.</p>	<p>hand in the optimal position to operate the trigger, magazine release, and safety mechanism. And an AR-type firearm can still be fired without the pistol grip installed.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Ex. 3 at 7-9.</p>
17	<p>An assault rifle with a pistol grip would allow a shooter to shoot more accurately and reload faster.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 3 at 137-38, ¶ 9.</p>	<p>Disputed. The citation to Defendant's supporting evidence does not support the claim that a pistol grip allows a user to reload faster.</p>
18	<p>According to a 1989 ATF Report, a pistol grip beneath the action of the rifle can also "be an aid in one-handed firing of the weapon in a combat situation."</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 22 at 1048.</p>	<p>Undisputed as to what is stated in the report. However, disputed to the extent Defendant's statement suggests "combat" is the only situation one can benefit from being able to use the firearm with one hand.</p> <p>As stated by Plaintiffs' expert, the vertical pistol grip design is easier to operate with one hand than less-pronounced grips. This is because it places the hand in a location where the user can manipulate the firearm's primary controls, including the safety. What's more, this can be of benefit when needing to use one hand to hold a flashlight or call 911.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Ex. 1 at 12.</p>

No.	Defendant's Uncontroverted Facts and Supporting Evidence	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
19	<p>A forward pistol grip on a rifle was a feature of early machineguns; it can help insulate the non-trigger hand from heat during rapid fire.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 16 at 777:5-11; <i>see id.</i> at 774:7-12.</p>	<p>Disputed to the extent that Defendants are suggesting forward pistols grips are <i>only</i> useful on machineguns to insulate the non-trigger hand from heat during rapid fire. What's more, other features, such as a barrel shroud, serve the same purpose as noted by Defendant's evidence and are not a prohibited feature for rifles banned by the AWCA.</p>
20	<p>According to a 1989 ATF Report, the "predominant advantage" of a folding or telescoping stock "is for military purposes, and it is not normally found on the traditional sporting rifle."</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 22 at 1048.</p>	<p>Disputed. As Defendant's evidence states, while this may be a "predominate use," there are in fact sporting used for such devices. Early examples of folding stocks can be found on guns manufactured as early as the late 1600s, such as the Giovanni Beretta Folding Stock Miquelet Fowler. And a significant use for a telescoping or folding stock not mentioned by Defendants here is to allow the rifle to be stored in a space that it would not normally fit in.</p> <p>As stated by Plaintiffs' expert, a user-adjustable telescoping stock is simply an acknowledgement that people come in different sizes. And the position and/or stance of the user can impact the optimal length of the firearm and thereby affect the firearms accuracy.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Ex. 65; Ex. 3 at 9-10; Ex. 1 at 12.</p>

No.	Defendant's Uncontroverted Facts and Supporting Evidence	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
21	<p>A folding or telescoping stock renders the rifle more concealable as would a semiautomatic centerfire rifle that is under 30 inches in length. A semiautomatic centerfire rifle under 30 inches in length is more concealable than the same rifle that is 30 inches or longer.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 2 at 124, ¶ 21 & 126, ¶ 27.</p>	<p>Disputed. A rifle equipped with a folding/telescoping stock is not necessarily one that is less than 30 inches in length. It is possible for a fixed stock firearm to be 30 inches in length and not also be prohibited by the AWCA, yet that same firearm is more concealable than a rifle with a folding or telescoping stock that is more than 30 inches in length in its shortest configuration, which would potentially be prohibited under the AWCA by nature of being equipped with a folding/telescoping stock.</p> <p>Defendant's expert cannot recall any instances where a criminal was able to conceal an AR-style firearm because it was equipped with a telescoping stock.</p> <p>As stated by Plaintiffs' expert, telescoping stocks have a relatively short adjustment range of about three to four inches, meaning there is little—if any—change in the user's ability to conceal an AR-style firearm with a telescoping stock.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Ex. 57 at 48-49; Ex. 3 at 10; Ex. 56 at 90-91.</p>
22	<p>A flash suppressor is a standard feature of the M-16.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 16 at 773:1-11.</p>	<p>Undisputed.</p>

No.	Defendant's Uncontroverted Facts and Supporting Evidence	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
23	<p>Flash suppressors can be affixed to the muzzle of a rifle to reduce the flash emitted upon firing, which can aid a shooter in low-light conditions to maintain accurate fire.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 2 at 125, ¶ 22; Def. Exh. 3 at 138, ¶ 11; Def. Exh. 16 at 855:3-14; Def. Exh. 22 at 1049.</p>	<p>Disputed. As noted in Defendant's supporting evidence, a flash suppressor "may" do so, but it is "not sure how effective flash suppressors are."</p>
24	<p>Flash suppressors can help conceal a shooter's position, especially at night.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 22 at 1049; Def. Exh. 16 at 836:7-15.</p>	<p>Disputed.</p> <p>As stated by Plaintiffs' expert, a flash suppressor will not hide the flash from those in the direct line of fire or to the side.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> 11 C.C.R. § 5471(r) (defining flash suppressor to mean a device that functions to perceptibly reduce or redirect muzzle flash <i>from the shooter's field of vision</i>); Ex. 3 at 10.</p>
25	<p>Manufacturers of assault rifles have marketed the rifles to civilians based on their military features and military design.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 32 at 1277; <i>see, e.g.</i>, Def. Exhs. 24-25.</p>	<p>Disputed. Defendant's supporting evidence does not support the statement. For example, Defendant's exhibit 25 states that Colt rifles are "based on the same military <i>standards and specifications</i> as the United States issue Colt M16." The documents do not state the firearm has been marketed based off its military "features" or "design."</p>

No.	Defendant's Uncontroverted Facts and Supporting Evidence	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
26	<p>As of November 2, 2018, there were up to approximately 184,552 assault weapons registered with the Department of Justice, of which approximately 166,640 are assault rifles.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 18 at 895.</p>	Undisputed.
27	<p>There have been up to approximately 194,065 assault weapons that have ever been registered with the Department of Justice, of which up to approximately 175,180 were assault rifles (according to best-available approximately as of November 7, 2018). Many one-time registered weapons may no longer be registered for various reasons including death of the registrant or the registrant became prohibited from possessing the weapon. There are approximately 30.5 million adults in California as of 2018.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 18 at 895; Def. Exh. 39 at 1511.</p>	Undisputed.
28	<i>Number 28 was skipped in Defendant's Statement of Uncontroverted Facts</i>	N/A
29	Gun ownership is becoming more concentrated.	Disputed. Defendant's supporting evidence does not provide any evidence in support of this claim other than generalized statements

No.	Defendant's Uncontroverted Facts and Supporting Evidence	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
	<p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 15 at 658:12-22; <i>see</i> Def. Exh. 1 at 6-10; Def. Exh. 7 at 252, ¶ 18.</p>	<p>from Defendant's expert. For example, Defendant's own expert "presumes" the ownership of so-called "assault weapons" is at least as concentrated as the numbers provided by Defendant's expert which are not supported by evidence.</p> <p>Plaintiffs' expert has testified that there are reasons to believe that gun ownership is underreported in many surveys because those surveys are voluntary and the effect of "social desirability bias." Evidence suggests the proportion of gun owners who possess an "assault rifle" has risen dramatically in recent years, with about one of every two active hunters owning a rifle meeting the definition of an "assault weapon" and, by conservative estimates, about 7 million people likely own at least one such rifle.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Ex. 52 at 3-4.</p>
30	<p>66 percent of AR- or AK-rifles owners own two or more such rifles.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 42 at 1532</p>	<p>Disputed. Defendants state 66 percent of "AR- or AK-rifles" owners own two or more such rifles. But Defendant's supporting evidence states that this is true as to "MSR" or "Modern Sporting Rifles," which include "other semi-automatic rifles with detachable magazines" that are not AR or AK platform rifles.</p>

No.	Defendant's Uncontroverted Facts and Supporting Evidence	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
31	<p>Over 30 percent of AR- or AK-platform rifle owners own three or more such rifles, and over one quarter of owners report having four or more such rifles.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 42 at 1531, 1535.</p>	<p>Disputed. Defendants statement applies to "AR- or AK-rifles" owners. Yet Defendant's supporting evidence states that this is true as to "MSR" or "Modern Sporting Rifles," which include "other semi-automatic rifles with detachable magazines" that are not AR or AK platform rifles. What's more, Defendant's supporting evidence states this number as applied to years 2010 and 2013 only, which may not reflect current ownership trends as the statement suggests.</p>
32	<p>The number of fatalities that occur in a mass shooting is correlated with the use of an assault weapon.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 15 at 728:20-24; Def. Exh. 6 at 232; Def. Exh. 23 at 1067; Def. Exh. 1 at 45, ¶ 109.</p>	<p>Disputed as to the definition of "assault weapon" and "mass shooting" as those terms are used in Defendant's statement which are not specifically defined in Defendant's supporting evidence.</p> <p>Plaintiff's rebuttal expert disputes Defendant's statement in that no research has reported evidence that rules out the possibility that any association between "mass shootings" and the use of an "assault weapon" is spurious.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Ex. 51 at 11-12.</p>
33	<p>Rifles will penetrate soft body armor designed to stop common handgun rounds.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u></p>	<p>Disputed as to Defendant's supporting evidence referencing Exhibit 14 without ascertainable page numbers (Defendants cite page 123 and page 124, but Exhibit 14</p>

No.	Defendant's Uncontroverted Facts and Supporting Evidence	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
	Def. Exh. 14 at 123:19-124:1; Def. Exh. 11 at 370:5-18.	<p>only contains pages 472-583). Also disputed as to Defendant's exhibit 11, the testimony of LAPD Detective Mersereau, who is not testifying as an expert regarding the ballistic properties of a rifle round on soft body armor.</p> <p>Even so, this fact equally applies to all rifles and not just those banned by the AWCA. And while a rifle's bullet <i>may</i> penetrate soft body armor, it is not known if all rifle bullets necessarily will.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Ex. 51 at 12.</p>
34	<p>Between January 1, 1998 and December 31, 2001, at least 41 of the 211 law enforcement officers slain in the line of duty were killed with assault weapons.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 31 at 1249.</p>	<p>Disputed. Defendants supporting evidence is a report from the Violence Policy Center, which arrives at this figure using "data obtained from the Federal Bureau of Investigation." But as stated in this report, the FBI data "does not identify the firearm used in some instances," nor does it address when an "assault weapon" is used (FBI data only labels firearms as either rifles, pistols, shotguns, or "other"). What's more, it is entirely unclear what is meant by the term "assault weapon" as used in this report, and whether the firearms are in fact those same types of firearms prohibited by the AWCA.</p>

No.	Defendant's Uncontroverted Facts and Supporting Evidence	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
		<u>Supporting Evidence</u> RJN Ex. 1; Ex. 51 at 12.
35	<p>When a bullet enters a victim's body, it would create a permanent cavity or a permanent cavity and a temporary cavity. A permanent cavity "is the tissue that is actually crushed or destroyed by the projectile's interaction with it." A temporary cavity is caused by tissue being stretched away from the permanent cavity. Handguns do not typically cause temporary cavity damage.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 14 at 508:15-19, 511:16-24; Def. Exh. 38 at 1505, 1507; Def. Exh. 44 at 1541; Def. Exh. 14 at 511:16-24.</p>	<p>Disputed. As stated by Defendant's supporting evidence, with "larger or faster projectiles you can have temporary cavity damage." But many handgun cartridges are in fact larger in both weight and diameter than typical rifle rounds such as those used by AR-15 style semiautomatic firearms. Based on Defendant's supporting evidence, such handgun rounds would in fact cause temporary cavity damage. Even so, Defendant's statement applies equally to all types of rifles and not just those specifically prohibited by the AWCA.</p>
36	<p>After a rifle round enters the body, it would turn over vertically and exit the body base forward. It would create the greatest permanent wound cavity at the point of the maximum vertical rotation.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 14 at 504:5-505:5.</p>	<p>Disputed as to "rifle round." Defendant's supporting evidence does not differentiate between rifle or handgun rounds (instead only referring to "long skinny projectile which fails to expand"). Even so, Defendant's statement applies equally to all types of rifles and not just those specifically prohibited by the AWCA.</p>
37	<p>The temporary cavity, if one is created, by a handgun wound is typically not as injurious to the tissue as the temporary cavity typically from a rifle wound, and can be more easily treated by a physician.</p>	<p>Disputed. As stated in Defendant's supporting evidence, "you can make this untrue by the selection of certain cartridges." Even so, Defendant's statement applies equally to all types of rifles and not just those</p>

No.	Defendant's Uncontroverted Facts and Supporting Evidence	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
	<u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 14 at 514:4-23; Def. Exh. 44 at 1541.	specifically prohibited by the AWCA.
38	<p>During the period in which the federal assault weapons ban was in effect, the use of banned assault weapons in crimes was reduced.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 15 at 662:14-663:1.</p>	<p>Disputed. As stated in Defendant's supporting evidence, "you have to understand what in this context the term Aws means." It refers "only to the narrow subset that had been banned under the federal assault weapon ban."</p> <p>Plaintiffs' expert, to which Defendant's rely upon for their statement, also makes clear in his report that while the federal ban was in effect, criminals substituted mechanically identical unbanned semiauto firearms that could be fired just as fast, could also accept easily changed detachable magazines, and were just as lethal as the banned guns.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Ex. 51 at 12-13.</p>
39	<p>The AWCA is broader than the federal assault weapons ban because, unlike the federal ban's two-feature test, the AWCA restricts centerfire rifles capable of accepting a detachable magazine if it has one of the listed features.</p> <p><u>Supporting Evidence</u> Def. Exh. 15 at 610:4-11.</p>	Undisputed.

II. PLAINTIFFS' ADDITIONAL UNDISPUTED MATERIAL FACTS

Plaintiffs' also contend that the following material facts are not in dispute:

No.	Plaintiffs' Uncontroverted Facts	Supporting Evidence
1	California has prohibited what it classifies as "assault weapons" over the past three decades.	Cal. Penal Code §§ 30600-30605 (formerly Cal. Penal Code §§ 12280 (originally adopted in 1989)).
2	California has never directly notified owners of firearms classified by California of "assault weapons" of the need to register them as "assault weapons" in order to continue their lawful possession.	Defendant's Supplemental Response to Plaintiff Troy Willis's First Set of Interrogatories, Response to Interrogatory No. 10; See also AG00018310-AG00018320.
3	Countless individuals have lawfully modified their firearms, removed them from the state of California, or sold or transferred them to avoid the "assault weapon" registration requirements.	Cal. Penal Code § 30920 (requiring persons who lawfully possessed firearms subsequently declared "assault weapons" to dispossess themselves of their firearms or register them with the California Department of Justice).
4	The California Department of Justice, Bureau of Firearms, anticipated between 1 to 1.5 million "assault weapon" registrations during the most recent "assault weapon" registration period alone.	RJN Ex. 2

Dated: May 2, 2019

MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.

s/ Sean A. Brady

Sean A. Brady
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

Case Name: *Rupp, et al. v. Becerra*
Case No.: 8:17-cv-00746-JLS-JDE

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED THAT:

I, the undersigned, am a citizen of the United States and am at least eighteen years of age. My business address is 180 East Ocean Boulevard, Suite 200, Long Beach, California 90802.

I am not a party to the above-entitled action. I have caused service of:

**PLAINTIFFS' STATEMENT OF GENUINE DISPUTES OF MATERIAL
FACT AND ADDITIONAL UNCONTROVERTED FACTS**

on the following party by electronically filing the foregoing with the Clerk of the District Court using its ECF System, which electronically notifies them.

Xavier Becerra
Attorney General of California
Peter H. Chang
Deputy Attorney General
E-mail: peter.chang@doj.ca.gov
John D. Echeverria
Deputy Attorney General
E-mail: john.echeverria@doj.ca.gov
455 Golden Gate Ave., Suite 11000
San Francisco, CA 94102

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed May 2, 2019.

s/ Laura Palmerin
Laura Palmerin