| 1 | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA |
|----|---|
| 2 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA |
| 3 | WESTERN DIVISION |
| 4 | HONORABLE CHRISTINA A. SNYDER |
| 5 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE PRESIDING |
| 6 | |
| 7 | JUNIOR SPORTS MAGAZINE, INC.,) ET AL., |
| 8 | PLAINTIFF,) CASE NO. |
| 9 | VS.) CV 22-4663-CAS |
| 10 | ROB BONTA, ET AL., |
| 11 | DEFENDANT.) |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS |
| 15 | MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2022 |
| 16 | LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA |
| 17 | LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | LAURA MILLER ELIAS, CSR 10019 |
| 23 | FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER 350 WEST FIRST STREET, ROOM 4455 |
| 24 | LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90012 PH: (213)894-0374 |
| 25 | |
| | |

| 1 | APPEARANCES OF COUNSEL: | | | |
|----|-------------------------|----------------------------------|--|--|
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | | | | |
| 4 | ON BEHALF | OF PLAINTIFF: | | |
| 5 | | MICHEL AND ASSOCIATES PC | | |
| 6 | | BY: ANNA BARVIR, ESQ. | | |
| 7 | | 180 EAST OCEAN BOULEVARD | | |
| 8 | | SUITE 200 | | |
| 9 | | LONG BEACH, CA 90802 | | |
| 10 | | | | |
| 11 | | LAW OFFICES OF DONALD KILMER | | |
| 12 | | BY: DONALD KILMER, ESQ. | | |
| 13 | | 14085 SILVER RIDGE ROAD | | |
| 14 | | CALDWELL, ID 83607 | | |
| 15 | | | | |
| 16 | ON BEHALF | OF DEFENDANT: | | |
| 17 | | | | |
| 18 | | CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE | | |
| 19 | | BY: KEVIN KELLY | | |
| 20 | | DEPUTY ATTORNEY GENERAL | | |
| 21 | | 300 SOUTH SPRING STREET | | |
| 22 | | SUITE 9012 | | |
| 23 | | LOS ANGELES, CA 90013 | | |
| 24 | | | | |
| 25 | | | | |
| | | | | |

| 1 | | |
|----|-------------------|------|
| 2 | IN | DEX |
| 3 | | |
| 4 | PROCEEDINGS | PAGE |
| 5 | | |
| 6 | STATUS CONFERENCE | 4 |
| 7 | | |
| 8 | | |
| 9 | | |
| 10 | | |
| 11 | | |
| 12 | | |
| 13 | | |
| 14 | | |
| 15 | | |
| 16 | | |
| 17 | | |
| 18 | | |
| 19 | | |
| 20 | | |
| 21 | | |
| 22 | | |
| 23 | | |
| 24 | | |
| 25 | | |
| | | |

1 LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA; MONDAY, SEPT. 12, 2022; 11:08 A.M. 3 THE CLERK: Item No. 5. Case No. CV 22-4663. 4 5 Junior Sports Magazine versus Rob Bonta. Counsel, please state your appearances. 6 7 MS. BARVIR: Good morning. Anna Barvir for 8 plaintiffs Junior Sports Magazines, Ray Brown, The California Youth Sports Association, Redlands California Clay Shooting 9 10 Sports, Inc., CPRA, CPRA Foundation and Gun Owners of 11 California. 12 My co-counsel is Don Kilmer and he is representing 13 plaintiff Second Amendment Foundation. 14 THE COURT: All right. Good morning. 15 MR. KELLY: Good morning, Your Honor. Kevin Kelly 16 Deputy Attorney General for defendant Attorney General Rob 17 Bonta. 18 THE COURT: All right. Good morning. 19 So as I understand the status, and I appreciate the 20 defendant's status conference statement, we have legislation 21 that has been passed by both the state assembly and the state 22 senate, but it is yet to be signed by the Governor. I am not 23 a betting person, but I think the likelihood of his not 24 signing it is between slim and none, maybe less than that. 25 So I think we ought to proceed accordingly, uh,

because I know that the plaintiffs are anxious to have the matter adjudicated. And, uh, it's not as if I have been sitting. I could have issued an order previously, but I really think that the order will have -- will make more sense if, uh, it considers what the state legislature has done.

So I guess we need a supplemental briefing schedule and a new hearing, um, but if anyone disagrees, let me know.

MS. BARVIR: Your Honor, I thank you for your, um, advice here. Of course plaintiffs are very anxious to have this motion for preliminary injunction that's pending ruled on. You know, we have our plaintiff, especially our named plaintiff, is sitting and waiting on Your Honor's ruling in this matter to let its final, um, its September/October issue of its magazine go to print.

So we would like, um, your consideration and if it's possible, ruling. I understand that Your Honor has indicated that. You know, it recognizes that the Court could have ruled especially we think on the commercial speech aspects even regardless of what happens with the amended bill, um, but we understand the need for the Court's interest in supplemental briefing. We just would ask that anything like that would be as quick as we could possibly make it.

THE COURT: I couldn't agree more.

MS. BARVIR: Thank you.

THE COURT: But look, here's the problem. The only

reason I want to have supplemental briefing. From what little I've seen, the plaintiffs have raised the fact that this new legislation is essentially an admission against interest. And they further contend that even with the new legislation -- sorry. Even if this legislation were enacted, you would still object and say that the statute is overly broad and that it interferes with both commercial and noncommercial speech rights.

But I think it would be helpful for me in light of the new provisions to understand the contentions of the parties regarding those provisions because at minimum, um, it seems to me that even if this were never signed by the Governor, as I say I expect it will be, someone is going to argue the amended statute sets forth the outer limits for enforcement of this provision and you can't go back to the earlier statute, uh, in determining what to do.

And I think any order I write ought to take into account the, you know, changes that have been made so that I can fairly consider their effect and that's one of the things I would want to do in any order, uh, because of the peculiar procedural posture in this case. I think we have to have a final order whatever it says, uh, which addresses the changes that have been made by legislature whether they become law or not.

MS. BARVIR: I think that's fair, Your Honor.

THE COURT: So that is the question. I think we need a supplemental brief obviously from the plaintiffs and from the defendants, and I will work as quickly as possible. Just so you know my scheduling difficulties, I think I am here October 17th. I'll be quite honest, after the 17th, my schedule becomes quite difficult because I've made some travel plans.

The very last day that I could really address this matter based on my current schedule would either be the 17th or the 31st. But I'm supposed to leave the country after the 31st and obviously, if I had to make changes to any tentative order, I could do it while in transit, but given the desire of the parties to have a speedy decision, if there's any way we can have a hearing on the 17th, it seems to me that would be the prudent thing to do.

MS. BARVIR: Thank you, Your Honor.

October 31st I'm actually out of the country at that time so I wouldn't be available and 10-17 would be the absolute latest. Plaintiffs would actually be, um, interested in even faster if something like that is do-able. I understand the 10th is a holiday. If there's anything available before that, we would like Your Honor's consideration.

THE COURT: We could do October 3rd. Um, what that means is you would have to get a brief in probably within a

week to ten days and that puts a fair amount of pressure on the State. I think the 17th is the better day, um, and I understand why you guys think this is important that people are waiting at the printing presses deciding what to do and so on and I appreciate that.

But on the other hand, I think everyone ought to have a fair chance to brief this thing and I ought to have a fair chance to consider your arguments because they're very important to the plaintiff and they're very important to the defendant.

So what I'm really wondering would be -- I'd like to be in a position if we're gonna have a hearing on the 17th, I would like to have the week of the 10th even though we aren't in court on the 10th to have all the briefs before me. So I'm thinking maybe if the State's brief came in on October 7th, then the plaintiff's briefs maybe could come in what, the week of the 26th unless you wanted to send them in earlier?

THE CLERK: Judge, just the week prior it would be on September 30th.

THE COURT: You mean for the briefing.

THE CLERK: Yes, for the briefing, for plaintiff's brief.

THE COURT: Okay. Although we could have it come in earlier in that week; correct? If you can get it in, uh,

let me ask you, Ms. Barvir, can you get the brief in let's say maybe the 28th?

MS. BARVIR: I can do that, Your Honor, earlier if necessary to give us an earlier hearing or perhaps submit on the briefs. Obviously, we want to be heard as soon as we can so we will work as hard as we can to get Your Honor briefing as soon as we can.

THE COURT: Let's say that you have to get it to me by September 28th. If you want to get it to me earlier, fine. And then, Mr. Kelly, I guess we're saying we'd like to have your brief no later than the 7th of October.

MR. KELLY: That's fine with us, Your Honor.

THE COURT: You know, I really do not intend to just consider this and take it under submission and decide it on the papers because I would like to have a sensible tentative order for you to argue about rather than just surprise you with something. So from my point of view, I'd rather do it in my traditional way with a hearing date, a tentative order and a chance for everyone to come in.

We will try to get that tentative order to you earlier rather than later, although it's in part gonna depend just on the arguments you guys make.

Okay. Does that solve the problem for now until we get to the next round?

MR. KELLY: I think so, Your Honor. I don't have

```
1
      anything further.
                THE COURT: Ms. Barvir?
 3
                MS. BARVIR: Oh, I'm sorry. I don't have anything
 4
      to add.
                THE COURT: Unartfully, I asked each of you whether
 5
      you had any further comments.
 6
 7
                MS. BARVIR: Thank you. I have no further
 8
      comments. I think plaintiffs are on the record and
 9
      Your Honor understands how imperative it is that we get a
10
      ruling soon.
11
                THE COURT: I do.
12
                MS. BARVIR: Thank you.
13
                THE COURT: Yes, Mr. Kilmer?
14
                MR. KILMER: When we conduct this hearing, will it
15
      be by zoom or live in the courtroom?
16
                THE COURT: One never knows. Um, most probably by
17
      zoom, but we'll figure it out as we get closer. I'm gonna be
18
      in trial the next couple of weeks. If I am in trial, it may
19
      well be I'll be in the courtroom.
20
                MR. KILMER: I would have to make travel plans,
21
      Your Honor because I'm located in another state.
22
                THE COURT: Right, I know you are.
23
                Well, is it an imposition to do it by zoom?
24
                MR. KILMER: No, I would prefer.
25
                THE COURT: Okay. Anyone else object to zoom?
```

| 1 | MR. KELLY: No, Your Honor. |
|------------|--|
| 2 | MS. BARVIR: No, Your Honor. |
| 3 | THE COURT: Let's all agree it will be by zoom. |
| 4 | MR. KILMER: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 5 | MS. BARVIR: Thank you, Your Honor. |
| 6 | THE COURT: Thank you, everybody. |
| 7 | (Proceedings were concluded 11:21 a.m.) |
| 8 | |
| 9 | |
| 10 | |
| 11 | |
| 12 | |
| 13 | |
| 14 | |
| 15 | |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | |
| 19 | |
| 20 | |
| 21 | |
| 22 | |
| 23 24 | |
| 24 | |
| <u>.</u> J | |

| 1 | |
|----|---|
| 2 | CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER |
| 3 | |
| 4 | COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES) |
| 5 |) SS. |
| 6 | STATE OF CALIFORNIA) |
| 7 | |
| 8 | I, LAURA ELIAS, OFFICIAL REPORTER, IN AND FOR THE UNITED |
| 9 | STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, |
| 10 | DO HEREBY CERTIFY THAT I REPORTED, STENOGRAPHICALLY, THE |
| 11 | FOREGOING PROCEEDINGS AT THE TIME AND PLACE HEREINBEFORE SET |
| 12 | FORTH; THAT THE SAME WAS THEREAFTER REDUCED TO TYPEWRITTEN |
| 13 | FORM BY MEANS OF COMPUTER-AIDED TRANSCRIPTION; AND I DO |
| 14 | FURTHER CERTIFY THAT THIS IS A TRUE AND CORRECT TRANSCRIPTION |
| 15 | OF MY STENOGRAPHIC NOTES. |
| 16 | |
| 17 | |
| 18 | DATE: NOVEMBER 1, 2022 |
| 19 | |
| 20 | /s/ LAURA MILLER ELIAS |
| 21 | LAURA MILLER ELIAS, CSR 10019 |
| 22 | FEDERAL OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER |
| 23 | |
| 24 | |
| 25 | |
| | |