JONATHAN M. COUPAL, State Bar No. 107815 TIMOTHY A. BITTLE, State Bar No. 112300 LAURA E. DOUGHERTY, State Bar No. 255855 Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Foundation 1201 K Street, Suite 1030 3 Sacramento, CA 95814 (916) 444-9950 4 Attorneys for Plaintiffs HOWARD JARVIS TAXPAYERS ASSN., et al. 6 7 8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 SAN JOSE DIVISION 10 NATIONAL ASSN. FOR GUN RIGHTS, No. 22-cv-00501-BLF 11 et al., 12 **Plaintiffs** 13 14 CITY OF SAN JOSE, et al., 15 Defendants 16 HOWARD JARVIS TAXPAYERS ASSN.. No. 22-cv-02365-BLF 17 et al.. 18 **Plaintiffs** DECLARATION OF TIMOTHY BITTLE IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS' 19 MOTION TO REMAND ٧. 20 CITY OF SAN JOSE, Date: April 6, 2023 21 Time: 9:00 a.m. Defendant Judge: Hon. Beth Labson Freeman 22 Dept: San Jose Courtroom 3 23 I, Timothy A. Bittle, declare as follows: 24 25 I am an attorney, duly licensed by the State of California, admitted to practice before this Court, and counsel of record for plaintiffs in this action. I have personal 26 27

knowledge of the facts to follow and if called upon as a witness, my testimony would be the same.

- 1. Exhibit 1 attached hereto is a true and correct copy of the relevant sections of the court reporter's transcript of this Court's August 18, 2022, hearing on the motion of defendant City of San Jose to dismiss the complaint of plaintiff Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association, et al. (HJTA). I obtained the transcript from the Court's online docket for Case No. 22-cv-02365-BLF, Document 28, which docket was subsequently closed when this case was consolidated with *National Association of Gun Rights, et al. v. City of San Jose*, Case No. 22-cv-00501-BLF. (See Court's Order Consolidating Related Cases, Doc. 30, filed October 4, 2022.) The portions of the transcript quoted in HJTA's accompanying Points and Authorities are highlighted.
- Exhibit 2 attached hereto is a true and correct copy of the Order
 Approving Publication of Summons, issued by Superior Court Judge Socrates
 Manoukian in Santa Clara County Superior Court Case No. 22CV395596, filed March
 25, 2022, which I obtained from the Clerk of said Superior Court.
- 3. Exhibit 3 attached hereto is a true and correct copy of the Proof of Published Service of Summons, filed April 14, 2022, by plaintiffs in Santa Clara County Superior Court Case No. 22CV395596, which I obtained from the Clerk of said Superior Court.

I certify upon penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed this 10th day of January, 2023, in the City of Vacaville, California.

TIMOTHY A. BITTLE

Exhibit 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE COURT: THAT'S AN INTERESTING THEORY, AND RIGHT NOW I'M GOING TO DISMISS THAT CLAIM, AND IF YOU WANT TO ALLEGE FACTS THAT HELP ME OUT ON THAT, THAT'S FINE. I WILL GIVE YOU LEAVE TO AMEND ON THAT. I WASN'T GOING TO, BUT I'M GOING TO LOOK AT THE KESSLER CASE AGAIN. I THOUGHT IT KIND OF LOCKED IT UP. I THINK THAT IS A PRETTY BROAD READING OF THE CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION, IT'S NOVEL, NO ONE ELSE HAS EVER READ IT THAT WAY, NO ONE HAS EVER APPLIED IT, BUT I WILL GIVE YOU LEAVE TO AMEND. AND YOU KNOW I'M NOT CRITICAL OF YOUR PLEADING, YOU HAD HOPED THIS CASE WOULD STAY IN STATE COURT AND IT DIDN'T WORK OUT THAT WAY, SO YOU DIDN'T FILE A MOTION TO REMAND EITHER. I WAS SUGGESTING SOME, THAT IF YOU WANTED TO GO BACK TO STATE COURT, YOU PROBABLY THOUGHT ABOUT IT MORE THAN I HAVE, BUT THERE ARE CERTAINLY WAYS THAT YOU COULD DO THAT. ALL RIGHT. ANY LAST COMMENTS, MR. BITTLE? MR. BITTLE: JUST A HOUSEKEEPING MATTER, YOUR HONOR. YOU DID ACKNOWLEDGE THAT WE FILED THIS AS A REVERSE VALIDATION ACTION IN STATE COURT, AND IT PUBLISHED THE SUMMONS AND SOMEONE RESPONDED TO THE PUBLISHED SUMMONS, A GROUP CALLED THE GOLDEN STATE SECOND AMENDMENT COALITION, THEY'RE REPRESENTED BY AN ATTORNEY NAMED JASON BEZIS, THEY FILED AN ANSWER TO OUR COMPLAINT IN STATE COURT. JUST FOR MY BENEFIT AND THEIRS, IS THERE ANY OPPORTUNITY FOR THEM TO PARTICIPATE HERE IN FEDERAL COURT, BECAUSE --

1 THE COURT: THAT'S AN INTERESTING ISSUE, MR. BITTLE. 2 I HAD BEEN THINKING THAT I MAY DECLINE SUPPLEMENTAL 3 JURISDICTION OVER THE VALIDATION ACTION ITSELF, BECAUSE IT IS 4 SUCH A UNIQUE PROCESS UNDER STATE LAW THAT THE STATE COURTS ARE 5 BETTER SUITED TO DEAL WITH IT. 6 I CAN'T TELL WHAT YOU -- YOU HAD ONE SPARSE LINE SAYING 7 THIS IS A VALIDATION ACTION UNDER CCP 860, AND THEN YOU GO INTO 8 THESE OTHER CLAIMS THAT ARE NOT PURELY VALIDATION. 9 THE FEDERAL COURT IS SIMPLY NOT EQUIPPED TO, AND NOR 10 SHOULD WE BE HANDLING AND TRYING TO UNDERSTAND THESE UNIOUELY STATE PROCEDURES. 11 12 SO I MEAN, THAT'S THE OTHER PROBLEM HERE IS THAT I'M --13 AND THEN I DON'T KNOW WHAT REMAINS IF I DECLINE THE VALIDATION ACTION. 14 15 MR. BITTLE: YEAH. THAT'S AN INTERESTING QUESTION. I MEAN, I FEEL LIKE THE BULK OF OUR COMPLAINT WAS PLED 16 17 UNDER STATE LAW, AND PERHAPS IF WE DISMISS THE FEDERAL FIRST 18 AMENDMENT CLAIM, ALL THE REST OF OUR CASE COULD GO BACK TO 19 STATE COURT, IF YOUR HONOR GAVE US THE OPPORTUNITY TO DO THAT. 20 THE COURT: I ACTUALLY THINK, MR. BITTLE, THAT THAT 21 MAKES SENSE. VALIDATION ACTIONS CAN BE OF VALUE TO THE PUBLIC AGENCY AS WELL; IN FACT, THAT'S WHY THE LAW WAS CREATED, SO 22 23 THAT A PUBLIC AGENCY COULD VALIDATE ITS ACTION BEFORE IT 24 CHANGED ITS POSITION IN RELIANCE. 25 THE REVERSE VALIDATION IS WELL UNDERSTOOD UNDER STATE LAW,

AND THAT'S WHAT YOU HAVE TAKEN ADVANTAGE OF. THAT'S, IN MY 1 2 15 MINUTES OF RESEARCH IN READING THE CCP, AND ACTUALLY, I WAS 3 ON THE STATE BENCH FOR 13 YEARS AND I NEVER SAW ONE OF THESE, BUT THAT WOULD BE A LONG TIME AGO NOW, SO I'M A LITTLE BIT 4 5 RUSTY. 6 I WANT YOU TO THINK ABOUT THAT, BECAUSE I AM NOT INCLINED 7 TO ACCEPT SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION ON THE VALIDATION ACTION. 8 IF YOU WANT TO, AND I WILL GIVE YOU SOME TIME ON THIS TO SUBMIT 9 A STATEMENT THAT YOU WOULD DECLINE TO AMEND THE FEDERAL CLAIMS 10 IF, AND ONLY AMEND THE VALIDATION, THAT MAY HELP ME IN SIMPLY, 11 OR MAYBE IN THIS ORDER I SHOULD SIMPLY SAY THAT I'M NOT 12 ACCEPTING SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION, THEN YOU CAN DECIDE WHAT 13 TO DO. MAYBE THAT'S THE BEST. THAT'S THE CLEANEST. 14 MR. BITTLE: WHAT WOULD BE THE PROCEDURAL METHOD THAT 15 I WOULD USE? 16 THE COURT: I WOULD REMAND THE VALIDATION ACTION TO 17 THE STATE COURT, BECAUSE THIS WAS REMOVED, AND I WOULD RETAIN 18 THE CLAIMS THAT ARE FEDERAL, IF ANY REMAIN. YOU MAY NOT WISH TO LITIGATE ON TWO FRONTS, THAT'S YOUR CHOICE. 19 20 MR. BITTLE: I DON'T. 21 THE COURT: SO THAT'S A CONVERSATION WITH YOUR 22 CLIENTS, OF COURSE, I DON'T NEED TO PUT YOU ON THE SPOT NOW. 23 BUT I THINK WHAT I'M GOING TO DO, MR. BITTLE, IS I'M GOING 24 TO ISSUE THIS ORDER. I WILL DEAL WITH WHETHER I ACCEPT 25 SUPPLEMENTAL JURISDICTION OR NOT ON THE VALIDATION. IT'S NOT

Exhibit 2

MAR 2 3 2022

| 1 2 3 4 5 | JONATHAN M. COUPAL, State Bar No. 10 TIMOTHY A. BITTLE, State Bar No. 112300 LAURA E. DOUGHERTY, State Bar No. 25 Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Foundation 921 Eleventh Street, Suite 1201 Sacramento, CA 95814 Tel: (916) 444-9950 Fax:(916) 444-9823 Email: tim@hjta.org Attorneys for Plaintiffs | 0 | Filed March 25, 2022 Clerk of the Court Superior Court of CA County of Santa Clara 22CV395596 By: rsandoval | | |
|---------------------------------|--|-------------------------|---|--|--|
| 6 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | |
| 10 | HOWARD JARVIS TAXPAYERS ASSN., SILICON VALLEY TAXPAYERS ASSN., | No. 22CV395596 | | | |
| 11 | SILICON VALLEY PUBLIC ACCOUNTA- BILITY FOUNDATION, JIM BARRY, and | | | | |
| 12 | GEORGE ARRINGTON, | | | | |
| 13 | Plaintiffs | | ORDER APPROVING N OF SUMMONS | | |
| 14 | V. |) | | | |
| 15 | CITY OF SAN JOSE, and ALL PERSONS (INTERESTED in the matter of San Jose |) | | | |
| 16 | Ordinance No. 30716, establishing an Annual Gun Harm Reduction Fee, | Department: Case Filed: | 20 March 7, 2022 | | |
| 17 | Defendants |) Trial Date: | Not Set | | |
| 18 | | Calendar prefe | erence per CCP § 867 | | |
| 19 | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | |
| 22 | , | | | | |
| 2324 | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

2022,

1 **ORDER** On the application of plaintiffs, which was considered 24 March 2 3 in Department 20 with notice to counsel for defendant City of San Jose, the Court 4 having considered the authorities cited and good cause appearing therefor: 5 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that plaintiffs' application for approval to publish 6 summons as to All Persons Interested in the matter of San Jose Ordinance No. 30716 7 is GRANTED AS FOLLOWS: 8 1. Plaintiffs shall use the form of Summons attached hereto as Exhibit 1. 9 2. Plaintiffs shall cause the Summons to be published once a week for three 10 consecutive weeks, with at least five days intervening between publication dates, in the 11 Legal Notices section of the San Jose Mercury News. 12 3. Plaintiffs shall obtain Proof of Publication from said newspaper and file it 13 with this Court immediately thereafter, or show good cause for their failure to do so. 24 March 14 DATED: , 2022. 15 16 HON. Socrates Peter Manoukian 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

| • | Case 5:22-cv-00501-BLF | Document 86-1 | Filed 01/10/23 | Page 10 of 18 | | |
|----|------------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|--|--|
| | | | | | | |
| 1 | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | | | | |
| 7 | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | | |
| 12 | EXHIBIT 1 | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | ~ | , | | |
| 18 | | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | | |

SUMMONS

NOTICE! YOU HAVE BEEN SUED. THE COURT MAY DECIDE AGAINST YOU WITHOUT YOUR BEING HEARD UNLESS YOU RESPOND NOT LATER THAN [A date to be determined that is 10 or more days after the completion of publication of the summons in the newspaper]. READ THE INFORMATION BELOW.

AVISO! USTED HA SIDO DEMANDADO. EL TRIBUNAL PUEDE DECIDIR CONTRA USTED SIN AUDIENCIA A MENOS QUE USTED RESPONDA NO MÁS TARDE QUE EL DÍA [The date from above that is 10 or more days after the completion of publication of the summons in the newspaper]. LEA LA INFORMACIÓN QUE SIGUE.

TO ALL PERSONS INTERESTED IN THE MATTER OF CITY OF SAN JOSE ORDINANCE NO. 30716, ESTABLISHING AN ANNUAL GUN HARM REDUCTION FEE.

A civil complaint has been filed in California Superior Court for the County of Santa Clara by Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association and other plaintiffs against defendant City of San Jose for the purpose of determining the validity of the City's Annual Gun Harm Reduction Fee.

Plaintiffs allege that the new fee violates their constitutional rights of free speech and association, places an unconstitutional condition on the right to bear arms, is a special tax which needed 2/3 voter approval, unlawfully delegates governmental taxing power to a private organization, and for these reasons is invalid.

To be heard regarding this matter, you must file with the court a written response

to the complaint by [the date from above that is 10 or more days after the completion of publication of the summons in all newspapers]. If you do not file a timely written response with the court, plaintiffs may apply for entry of default and the relief sought by their complaint. You may obtain a copy of the complaint by contacting plaintiffs' counsel using the address or telephone number shown below. If you respond to defend the legality or validity of the matter, you will not be subject to punitive action such as wage garnishment or seizure of real or personal property.

YOU MAY SEEK THE ADVICE OF AN ATTORNEY IN ANY MATTER CONNECTED WITH THE COMPLAINT OR THIS SUMMONS. SUCH ATTORNEY SHOULD BE CONSULTED PROMPTLY SO THAT YOUR PLEADING MAY BE FILED OR ENTERED WITHIN THE TIME REQUIRED BY THIS SUMMONS.

PUEDE SOLICITAR EL CONSEJO DE UN ABOGADO EN CUALQUIER ASUNTO RELACIONADO CON LA DENUNCIA O CON ESTA CITACIÓN. DICHO ABOGADO DEBERÁ CONSULTARSE INMEDIATAMENTE PARA QUE SU ALEGATO PUEDA SER PRESENTADO O ENTRADO EN EL MOMENTO REQUERIDO POR ESTA CITACIÓN JUDICIAL.

The name and address of the Court is (El nombre y dirección del Tribunal es):

Superior Court, County of Santa Clara

191 North First Street

San Jose, CA 95113

CASE NUMBER (Numero del Caso): 22CV395596

26

27

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiffs' attorney is (El nombre, dirección y número de teléfono de los abogados del demandante es): Timothy A. Bittle Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Foundation 921 11th Street, Ste. 1201 Sacramento, CA 95814 Tel: 916-444-9950

Exhibit 3

R. Fleming

Electronically Filed JONATHAN M. COUPAL, State Bar No. 107815 by Superior Court of CA, TIMOTHY A. BITTLE, State Bar No. 112300 County of Santa Clara, LAURA E. DOUGHERTY, State Bar No. 255855 on 4/14/2022 2:59 PM Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Foundation 921 Eleventh Street, Suite 1201 Reviewed By: R. Fleming Sacramento, CA 95814 Case #22CV395596 (916) 444-9950 4 Envelope: 8753617 Email: tim@hjta.org 5 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 6 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 FOR THE COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA 9 HOWARD JARVIS TAXPAYERS ASSN., No. 22CV395596 SILICON VALLEY TAXPAYERS ASSN., SILICON VALLEY PUBLIC ACCOUNTA-11 BILITY FOUNDATION, JIM BARRY, and 12 GEORGE ARRINGTON, **Plaintiffs** 13 PROOF OF PUBLISHED SERVICE OF SUMMONS ON "ALL PERSONS 14 INTERESTED" ٧. CITY OF SAN JOSE, and ALL PERSONS 15 INTERESTED in the matter of San Jose Ordinance No. 30716, establishing an 16 Department: 20 Annual Gun Harm Reduction Fee. March 7, 2022 Case Filed: Trial Date: Not Set 17 **Defendants** 18 Calendar preference per CCP § 867 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

4.0

I, Timothy A. Bittle, declare as follows:

I am an attorney, duly licensed by the State of California, admitted to practice before this Court, and counsel of record for plaintiffs in this action. I have personal knowledge of the facts to follow and if called upon as a witness my testimony would be the same.

- 1. On March 24, 2022, Judge Socrates Peter Manoukian signed plaintiffs' proposed Order Approving Publication of Summons. The Order directed that notice be given to All Persons Interested using the form of Summons attached to the Order. The Order required publication once a week for three consecutive weeks, with at least five days intervening between publication dates, in the Legal Notices section of the San Jose Mercury News.
- 2. Plaintiffs caused the Summons to be published as ordered on the following dates: April 1, April 7, and April 13, 2022. The newspaper's Proof of Publication is attached hereto as EXHIBIT A.

I certify upon penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed April 14, 2022, in the City of Sacramento, California.

TIMOTHY A. BITTLE Counsel for Plaintiffs

Exhibit A

Case 5:22-cv-00501-BLF Document 86-1 Filed 01/10/23

75 E. Santa Clara St . Suite 1100 San Jose, CA 95113 408-920-5332

3757186

HOWARD JARVIS TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION **ACCTS PAYABLE** 921 11TH ST., #1201 SACRAMENTO, CA 95814-2822

PROOF OF PUBLICATION IN THE CITY OF SAN JOSE IN THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA **COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA**

FILE NO. 22CV395596

In the matter of

San Jose Mercury News

The undersigned, being first duly sworn, deposes and says: That at all times hereinafter mentioned affiant was and still is a citizen of the United States, over the age of eighteen years, and not a party to or interested in the above entitled proceedings; and was at and during all said times and still is the principal clerk of the printer and publisher of the San Jose Mercury News, a newspaper of general circulation printed and published daily in the City of San Jose, County of Santa Clara, State of California as determined by the court's decree dated June 27, 1952, Case Numbers 84096 and 84097, and that said San Jose Mercury News is and was at all times herein mentioned a newspaper of general circulation as that term is defined by Sections 6000; that at all times said newspaper has been established, printed and published in the said County and State at regular intervals for more than one year preceding the first publication of the notice herein mentioned. Said decree has not been revoked, vacated or set aside.

I declare that the notice, of which the annexed is a true printed copy, has been published in each regular or entire issue of said newspaper and not in any supplement thereof on the following dates, to wit:

04/01/2022, 04/07/2022, 04/13/2022

Dated at San Jose, California April 13, 2022

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

Principal clerk of the printer and publisher of the San Jose Mercury News

SUMMONS

NOTICE! YOU HAVE BEEN SUED. THE COURT MAY DECIDE AGAINST YOU WITHOUT YOUR BEING HEARD UNLESS YOU RESPOND NOT LATER THAN MAY 3, 2022. READ THE INFORMATION BELOW.

AVISO! USTED HA SIDO DEMANDADO. EL TRIBUNAL PUEDE DECIDIR CONTRA USTED SIN AUDIENCIA A MENOS QUE USTED RESPONDA NO MÁS TARDE QUE EL DÍA 3 DE MAYO, 2022. LEA LA INFORMACIÓN QUE SIGUE.

TO ALL PERSONS INTERESTED IN THE MATTER OF CITY OF SAN JOSE ORDINANCE NO. 30716, ESTABLISHING AN ANNUAL GUN HARM REDUCTION FEE.

JOSE ORDINANCE NO. 30716, ESTABLISHING AN ANNUAL GUN HARM REDUCTION FEE.

A civil complaint has been filed in California Superior Court for the County of Santa Clara by Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Association and other plaintiffs against defendant City of San Jose for the purpose of determining the validity of the City's Annual Gun Harm Reduction Fee. Plaintiffs allege that the new fee violates their constitutional rights of free speech and association, places an unconstitutional condition on the right to bear arms, is a special tax which needed 2/3 voter approval, unlawfully delegates governmental taxing power to a private organization, and for these reasons is invalid.

To be heard regarding this matter, you must file with the court a written response with the court, plaintiffs may apply for entry of default and the relief sought by their complaint. You may obtain a copy of the complaint by contacting plaintiffs' counsel using the address or telephone number shown below. If you respond to defend the legality or validity of the matter, you will not be subject to punitive action such as wage garnishment or seizure of real or personal property. YOU MAY SEEK THE ADVICE OF AN ATTORNEY IN ANY MATTER CONNECTED WITH THE COMPLAINT OR THIS SUMMONS. SUCH ATTORNEY SHOULD BE CONSULTED PROMPTLY SO THAT YOUR PLEADING MAY BE FILED OR ENTERED WITHIN THE TIME REQUIRED BY THIS SUMMONS. PUEDE SOLICITAR EL CONSEJO DE UN ABGGADO EN CUALOUIER

MONS.
PUEDE SOLICITAR EL CONSEJO DE UN ABOGADO EN CUALQUIER
ASUNTO RELACIONADO CON LA DENUNCIA O CON ESTA CITACIÓN.
DICHO ABOGADO DEBERÁ CONSULTARSE INMEDIATAMENTE PARA QUE
SU ALEGATO PUEDA SER PRESENTADO O ENTRADO EN EL MOMENTO
REQUERIDO POR ESTA CITACIÓN JUDICIAL.

The name and address of the Court is (El nombre y dirección del Tribu-

Superior Court, County of Santa Clara 191 North First Street San Jose, CA 95113 CASE NUMBER (Numero del Caso): 22CV395596

The name, address, and telephone number of plaintiffs' attorney is (El nombre, dirección y número de teléfono de los abogados del demandante es):

Timothy A. Bittle Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Foundation 921 11th Street, Ste. 1201 Sacramento, CA 95814 Tel: 916-444-9950 SJMN#6657022; April 1,7,13,2022