THE DIGUISEPPE LAW FIRM, P.C. RAYMOND M. DIGUISEPPE CA State Bar No. 228457 4320 Southport-Supply Road Suite 300 Southport, NC 28461 P: 910-713-8804

WILLIAM SACK\*
FIREARMS POLICY COALITION
PA State Bar No. 325863
5550 Painted Mirage Road
Las Vegas, NV 89149-4584
P: (916) 596-3492
E: wsack@fpclaw.org

E: law.rmd@gmail.com

Pro-hac vice forthcoming Attorneys for Plaintiff John W. Dillon State Bar No. 296788 Dillon Law Group, APC 2647 Gateway Rd, Suite 105 #255 Carlsbad, CA 92009 P: 760.642.7150

E: jdillon@dillonlawgp.com

## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES FAHR; DESIREE BERGMAN; COLIN RUDOLPH; SAN DIEGO COUNTY GUN OWNERS PAC and, FIREARMS POLICY COALITION, INC.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CITY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA; and DAVID NISLEIT, in his official capacity as Chief of Police of San Diego City, California,

Defendants.

Case No.: **'21CV1676 BAS BGS** 

## **DECLARATION OF JAMES FAHR**

- I, James Fahr, am competent to state and declare the following based on my personal knowledge:
  - 1. I am a resident of San Diego, California.
  - 2. I am a responsible, peaceable citizen not disqualified from exercising my right to possess firearms and ammunition.
  - 3. I am not a licensed firearms manufacturer, importer, or dealer.
  - 4. I am a member of Plaintiffs FPC and SDCGO.
  - 5. I own and possess three uncompleted NFOs, which I lawfully acquired before enactment of the Ban. My understanding is that these components would be an unfinished frame or unfinished receiver under the new definition of and prohibition against unserialized "unfinished frames" or "unfinished receivers" under San Diego's Ban.
  - 6. I desire and intend to use my unfinished frames or receivers, now prohibited under the Ordinance to construct California-compliant firearms for my own self-defense, defense of others, and other lawful purposes.
  - 7. My unfinished frames or receivers now prohibited under the Ordinance are of a type that would allow for the construction of California-compliant AR-15-platform semi-automatic rifles in common use for lawful purposes by citizens throughout California and the United States.

- 8. I desire and intend to use for all lawful purposes, including self-defense, defense of others, and proficiency training at my local shooting range in the exercise of my rights secured under the Second Amendment, the firearms that I would otherwise construct but for the Ban.
- 9. But for the Ordinance and Defendants' imminent enforcement of it, I would retain my now-prohibited unfinished frames or receivers and use them to construct such firearms in common use for such purposes.
- 10. However, because of the Ordinance and Defendants' imminent enforcement of it, I must dispossess myself of the property within 30 days of the Ordinance's enactment or face criminal prosecution under § 53.18(c)(1) and thus forfeit the ability to use it for such protected purposes.
- 11.I also desire and intend to purchase, acquire, possess, and transport in San Diego additional unfinished frames and receivers prohibited under the Ordinance in the future so that I may construct other California-compliant firearms for my own self-defense, defense of others, and other lawful purposes in the exercise of my rights secured under the Second Amendment.
- 12.But for the Ordinance and Defendants' enforcement of it, I would exercise my constitutional right to purchase, acquire, possess, and transport in San Diego unfinished frames and receivers for the lawful and constitutionally protected purpose of constructing firearms in common use for self-defense, defense of

others, and other lawful purposes.

I, James Fahr, verify that I am a Plaintiff named in this action and all the information herein is true and correct to the best of my information, knowledge, and belief.

Dated: September 23. 2021

Jumy Fahr

James Fahr