

No. 17-17144

**UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT**

LORI RODRIGUEZ, et al.,
Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

CITY OF SAN JOSE, et al.
Defendants-Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the District of California, Northern Division

Case Number: 5:15-cv-03698-EJD

**ERRATA TO CITATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL
AUTHORITIES
(Dkt. Entry 62)**

RICHARD DOYLE, City Attorney (88625)
NORA FRIMANN, Assistant City Attorney (93249)
CLIFFORD S. GREENBERG, Sr. Deputy City Attorney (122612)
MATTHEW PRITCHARD, Deputy City Attorney (284118)
Office of the City Attorney
200 East Santa Clara Street, 16th Floor
San José, California 95113-1905
Telephone Number: (408) 535-1900
Facsimile Number: (408) 998-3131
E-Mail Address: cao.main@sanjoseca.gov

Attorneys for Defendants-Appellees CITY OF SAN JOSE,
CITY OF SAN JOSE POLICE DEPARTMENT, and
OFFICER STEVE VALENTINE

ERRATA TO APPELLEES CITATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES

The City of San Jose respectfully submits this Notice of Errata to its Citation of Supplemental Authorities, which the City filed on January 8, 2019 (Dkt. Entry 62). In the last sentence of paragraph 2, the City mistakenly wrote the following sentence: “This was because ‘being unable to purchase a subset of [guns]’ different from the ‘exact gun [the plaintiffs] want[ed did] not significantly burden the’ core Second Amendment ‘right to self-defense in the home.’ *Id.* (text rearranged for clarity).”

The City respectfully requests that the sentence be corrected so that it reads as follows: “This was because ‘being unable to purchase a subset of [guns]’ that did not include the ‘exact gun [the plaintiffs] want[ed did] not significantly burden the’ core Second Amendment ‘right to self-defense in the home.’ *Id.* (text rearranged for clarity).” The amended document is attached as Exhibit A to this Errata.

Respectfully submitted,

January 9, 2019

/s/ Matthew Pritchard
Attorney for Defendants-Appellees

Exhibit A



Office of the City Attorney
RICHARD DOYLE, CITY ATTORNEY

MATTHEW PRITCHARD
Deputy City Attorney
Direct Line: (408) 535-1205

January 8, 2019

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

Re: Supplemental Authorities in Rodriguez, et al. v. City of San Jose, et al., Case No. 17-17144

Dear Ms. Dwyer:

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Appellate Procedure 28(j), the City submits *Pena v. Lindley*, 898 F.3d 969 (9th Cir. 2018) and *Wilson v. Lynch*, 835 F.3d 1083 (9th Cir. 2016) as supplemental authorities in this matter.

In *Pena*, this Court held that California's Unsafe Handgun Act did not violate the Second Amendment. The plaintiffs in the case were unable to buy several popular guns as a result of the Act. *Pena*, 898 F.3d at 978. They argued the law accordingly burdened their Second Amendment rights and that strict scrutiny was appropriate. *See id.* Assuming without deciding that the law's restrictions constituted a burden on the plaintiffs' right to bear arms, the Court held that only intermediate scrutiny would apply. *Id.* This was because "being unable to purchase a subset of [guns]" that did not include the "exact gun [the plaintiffs] want[ed did] not significantly burden the" core Second Amendment "right to self-defense in the home." *Id.* (text rearranged for clarity).

Similarly, this Court held in *Wilson* that intermediate scrutiny applied to a federal policy prohibiting gun sales to medical marijuana cardholders. *Wilson*, 835

Re: Supplemental Authorities in Rodriguez, et al. v. City of San Jose, et al.

January 9, 2019

Page 2

F.3d at 1093. In reaching its holding, this Court observed that the policy barred “only the sale of firearms to [the cardholder]—not her possession of firearms.” *Id.* Because the federal policy did not prohibit cardholders from possessing firearms but instead only prevented the sale of new firearms to them, this Court held that the policy did “not place a severe burden” on cardholders’ core Second Amendment rights. *Id.*

Both *Pena* and *Wilson* relate to a central question before the Court in this case: whether the City’s withholding of particular firearms from Plaintiff Rodriguez pursuant to a California court order burdens her Second Amendment rights, and if so, whether the burden is “severe.” Neither *Pena* nor *Wilson* is cited in the parties’ briefing, but unforeseen circumstances have necessitated a recent substitution of counsel in this matter, and counsel intends to rely on those authorities at argument.

Respectfully submitted,

RICHARD DOYLE, City Attorney

By: /s/ Matthew Pritchard
MATTHEW PRITCHARD
Deputy City Attorney

MWP/cem