1	Raymond M. DiGuiseppe
2	The DiGuiseppe Law Firm, P.C. 4320 Southport-Supply Road, Suite 300
3	Southport, NC 28461
4	Tel.: 910-713-8804
5	Email: <u>law.rmd@gmail.com</u>
6	Michael P. Sousa
7	Law Offices of Michael P. Sousa, APC
	3232 Governor Dr., Suite A
8	San Diego, CA 92122 Tel.: 858-453-6122
9	Email: <u>msousa@msousalaw.com</u>
10	
11	Attorneys for Plaintiffs
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
13	FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
14	FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
15	LANA RAE RENNA, an individual; Case No. 3:20-cv-02190-DMS-DEB
16	DANIELLE JAYMES, an individual; HANNAH SPOUSTA, an individual;
	LAURA SCHWARTZ, an individual; PLAINTIFFS' NOTICE OF
17	MICHAEL SCHWARTZ, an individual; RELATED CASES
18	RICHARD BAILEY, an individual;
19	JOHN KLIER, an individual; JUSTIN SMITH, an individual; JOHN
20	PHILLIPS, an individual; PWGG, L.P., a
21	California Limited Partnership;
22	CHERYL PRINCE, an individual;
23	DARIN PRINCE, an individual; NORTH COUNTY SHOOTING CENTER, INC.,
	a California Corporation; RYAN
24	PETERSON, an individual;
25	GUNFIGHTER TACTICAL, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company;
26	FIREARMS POLICY COALITION,
27	INC.; SAN DIEGO COUNTY GUN
28	OWNERS PAC; CITIZENS
	1

COMMITTEE FOR THE RIGHT TO 1 **KEEP AND BEAR ARMS; and** 2 SECOND AMENDMENT 3 FOUNDATION. 4 Plaintiffs, 5 VS. 6 XAVIER BECERRA, in his official capacity as Attorney General of 7 California; and LUIS LOPEZ, in his 8 official capacity as Director of the 9 Department of Justice Bureau of Firearms. 10 Defendants. 11 12 13 14 Pursuant to Local Rule 40.1(f), Plaintiffs Lana Rae Renna, Danielle Jaymes, 15 Hannah Spousta, Laura Schwartz, Michael Schwartz, Richard Bailey, John Klier, 16 Justin Smith, John Phillips, PWGG, L.P., Cheryl Prince, Darin Prince, North County 17 18 Shooting Center, Inc., Ryan Peterson, Gunfighter Tactical, LLC, Firearms Policy 19 Coalition, Inc., San Diego County Gun Owners PAC, Citizens Committee for the 20 21 Right to Keep and Bear Arms, and Second Amendment Foundation (collectively 22 "Plaintiffs"), by and through counsel of record, provide notice of the following 23 matters as potentially related cases: Duncan v. Becerra, Case No. 3:17-cv-1017-24 25 BEN-JLB, filed in the Southern District of California, on May 17, 2017; Miller v. 26 Becerra, Case No. 3:19-cv-01537-BEN-JLB, filed in the Southern District of 27 28 California, on August 15, 2019; and Fouts v. Becerra, Case No. 3:19-cv-1662-BEN-

1 JLB, filed in the Southern District of California, on September 1, 2019.

The *Duncan* case involves a Second Amendment challenge to California's categorical prohibition against "large-capacity" magazines, commonly used for self-defense and other lawful purposes as integral parts of otherwise lawfully owned and commonly used firearms. The *Miller* case involves a Second Amendment challenge to California's categorical prohibition against so-called "assault weapons," which, despite the menacing label, are commonly used for self-defense and other lawful purposes. Lastly, the *Fouts* case involves a Second Amendment challenge to California's categorical prohibition against billies/batons which are also are commonly used as bearable arms for self-defense and other lawful purposes. All the challenged laws carry the weight of criminal sanctions, and the plaintiffs in each action are ordinary law-abiding citizens who are and will otherwise remain subject

to such sanctions should they attempt to exercise their constitutional rights to bear

arms in contravention of the statutes respectively prohibiting these bearable arms.

Thus, all three cases involve Second Amendment challenges to related

California laws prohibiting the possession, manufacture, transportation, sale, and
 transfer of otherwise lawfully owned and commonly used bearable arms.
 Consequently, they all involve substantially similar legal issues concerning whether
 and the extent to which the state may constitutionally restrain law-abiding citizens
 from possessing, manufacturing, transporting, selling, and/or transferring bearable

arms in common use for self-defense and other lawful purposes. Additionally, each
action seeks substantially the same relief against the offending related statutory
schemes—a declaration that the respective scheme is unconstitutional and an
injunction against further enforcement of the same on that grounds.

6 All the cases involve the Attorney General, Xavier Becerra, as a defendant, 7 and *Miller* includes the Chief of the California Department of Justice, Bureau of 8 9 Firearms, like here where the defendants include the current Director of the 10 California Department of Justice, Bureau of Firearms. And many of the same 11 12 plaintiffs in the instant case—Ryan Peterson, San Diego County Gun Owners 13 Political Action Committee, Gunfighter Tactical, LLC, John Phillips, Second 14 Amendment Foundation, and Firearms Policy Coalition—are plaintiffs in Miller. 15

Further, the consideration of this matter alongside these related matters would effect a savings of judicial effort and avoid or minimize the risk of multiple, inconsistent rulings and judgments within the same District. Accordingly, and pursuant to CivLR 40.1.h, the Clerk of the Court is requested to report the related cases to "the judges concerned at the earliest date practicable."

Date: November 10, 2020 */s/Raymond M. DiGuiseppe*Raymond M. DiGuiseppe
The DiGuiseppe Law Firm, P.C.
4320 Southport-Supply Road, Suite 300
Southport, NC 28461
Tel.: 910-713-8804
Email: law.rmd@gmail.com
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

4