

1 HARMEET K. DHILLON (SBN: 207873)
 2 harmeet@dhillonlaw.com
 3 MICHAEL A. COLUMBO (SBN: 271283)
 4 mcolumbo@dhillonlaw.com
 5 MARK P. MEUSER (SBN: 231335)
 6 mmeuser@dhillonlaw.com
 7 DHILLON LAW GROUP INC.
 177 Post Street, Suite 700
 San Francisco, California 94108
 Telephone: (415) 433-1700

8 DAVID A. WARRINGTON*
 9 dwarrington@dhillonlaw.com
 10 CURTIS M. SCHUBE*
 11 cschube@dhillonlaw.com
 12 DHILLON LAW GROUP INC.
 2121 Eisenhower Avenue, Suite 402
 Alexandria, VA 22314
 Telephone: (571) 400-2121

13 *Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

15 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16 SAN JOSE DIVISION

17
 18 NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR GUN
 19 RIGHTS, INC., a nonprofit corporation, and
 20 MARK SIKES, an individual,

21 Plaintiffs,

22 v.

23 CITY OF SAN JOSE, a public entity,
 24 JENNIFER MAGUIRE, in her official capacity
 as City Manager of the City of San Jose, and the
 25 CITY OF SAN JOSE CITY COUNCIL,

26 Defendants.
 27
 28

Case Number: 5:22-cv-00501-BLF

**PLAINTIFFS' OPPOSITION ~~FOR TO~~
 THIRD PARTY BRADY'S MOTION ~~TO~~
 FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS BRIEF**

Courtroom: 3-5th Floor

Judge: Honorable Beth Labson Freeman

Complaint Filed: January 25, 2022

[MPI Hearing Held: July 14, 2022](#)

MTD Filed: February 7, 2022



1 Plaintiffs National Association for Gun Rights and Mark Sikes oppose third party Brady's
2 Motion for Leave to File Amicus Brief.

3 On June 27, 2022, the Court solicited the parties to submit supplemental briefs addressing a
4 recent decision of the Supreme Court by July 8, 2022, in advance of the July 14, 2022, hearing on
5 Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction. The Court did not solicit amicus briefs from the
6 public, generally, or from Brady, specifically. Brady, however, submitted its Motion for Leave to
7 File ~~amicus-Amicus brief~~ Brief, to which it attached an amicus brief, on July 11, 2022, after the
8 deadline set by the ~~court~~ Court for the parties to submit their ~~motion for leave to file their~~
9 ~~brief~~ supplemental briefs and only three days before the hearing.

10 At the hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction, Plaintiffs had an opportunity
11 to verbally respond point-by-point to Defendant San Jose's supplemental brief. -At the time of the
12 hearing, Brady's brief was not before the ~~court~~ Court because its motion had not been granted.
13 During the hearing, the ~~court~~ Court did not mention Brady's brief.

14 Accordingly, Plaintiffs oppose Brady's Motion for Leave to File Amicus Brief because it is
15 untimely and prejudicial. -Plaintiffs will not have had any opportunity to respond to its substantive
16 points, as it did at least verbally during the hearing to Defendant San Jose's brief, if the Court
17 considers Brady's arguments against Plaintiffs' motion. If the Court is inclined to grant Brady's
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

1 motion to incorporate substantive points from Brady’s brief, Plaintiffs respectfully request an
2 opportunity to respond to any such points before the Court finalizes its opinion.

3
4
5 Date: July 15, 2022

Respectfully submitted,
DHILLON LAW GROUP INC.

6 By: /s/ Harmeet K. Dhillon
7 Harmeet K. Dhillon
8 Michael A. Columbo
9 Mark P. Meuser
10 DHILLON LAW GROUP INC.
11 177 Post Street, Suite 700
12 San Francisco, California 94108
13 (415) 433-1700

14 David A. Warrington*
15 Curtis M. Schube*
16 DHILLON LAW GROUP INC.
17 2121 Eisenhower Avenue, Suite 402
18 Alexandria, VA 22314
19 (571) 400-2121

20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
*Admitted *Pro Hac Vice*