

1 C. D. Michel – SBN 144258  
2 [cmichel@michellawyers.com](mailto:cmichel@michellawyers.com)  
3 Joshua R. Dale – SBN 209942  
4 [jdale@michellawyers.com](mailto:jdale@michellawyers.com)  
5 Konstadinos T. Moros – SBN 306610  
6 [kmoros@michellawyers.com](mailto:kmoros@michellawyers.com)  
7 Alexander A. Frank – SBN 311718  
8 [afrank@michellawyers.com](mailto:afrank@michellawyers.com)  
9 MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.  
10 180 E. Ocean Blvd., Suite 200  
11 Long Beach, CA 90802  
12 Telephone: (562) 216-4444

13 Donald Kilmer-SBN 179986  
14 Law Offices of Donald Kilmer, APC  
15 14085 Silver Ridge Road  
16 Caldwell, Idaho 83607  
17 Telephone: (408) 264-8489  
18 Email: [Don@DKLawOffice.com](mailto:Don@DKLawOffice.com)

19 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

20 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
21 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
22 **SOUTHERN DIVISION**

23 RENO MAY, an individual; ANTHONY  
24 MIRANDA, an individual; ERIC HANS,  
25 an individual; GARY BRENNAN, an  
26 individual; OSCAR A. BARRETTO, JR.,  
27 an individual; ISABELLE R.  
28 BARRETTO, an individual; BARRY  
BAHRAMI, an individual; PETE  
STEPHENSON, an individual; ANDREW  
HARMS, an individual; JOSE FLORES,  
an individual; DR. SHELDON HOUGH,  
DDS, an individual; SECOND  
AMENDMENT FOUNDATION; GUN  
OWNERS OF AMERICA; GUN  
OWNERS FOUNDATION; GUN  
OWNERS OF CALIFORNIA, INC.; THE  
LIBERAL GUN CLUB, INC.; and  
CALIFORNIA RIFLE & PISTOL  
ASSOCIATION, INCORPORATED,

Plaintiffs,

v.

ROBERT BONTA, in his official capacity  
as Attorney General of the State of  
California, and DOES 1-10,

Defendants.

Case No.: 8:23-cv-01696 CJC (ADSx)

**EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS OF  
PLAINTIFFS TO DECLARATION  
OF PETER C. MANCALL FILED  
IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT'S  
OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR  
PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Hearing Date: December 20, 2023  
Hearing Time: 1:30 p.m.  
Courtroom: 9 B  
Judge: Hon. Cormac J.  
Carney

1 **TO THIS HONORABLE COURT:**

2 Plaintiffs Reno May, Anthony Miranda, Eric Hans, Gary Brennan, Oscar A.  
3 Barretto, Jr., Isabelle R. Barretto, Barry Bahrami, Pete Stephenson, Andrew Harms,  
4 Jose Flores, Dr. Sheldon Hough, DDS, The Second Amendment Foundation, Gun  
5 Owners of America, Inc., Gun Owners of California, Inc., The Liberal Gun Club,  
6 Inc., and California Rifle & Pistol Association, Incorporated, hereby jointly object,  
7 pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 401, 402, 403, 601, 702, 703, and 704 to the Declaration  
8 of Peter C. Mancall, lodged by Defendant in support of his Brief in Opposition to  
9 Plaintiffs’ Motion for Preliminary Injunction. These objections are raised on the  
10 following grounds and as to the following matters contained within the declaration:

11 **1. Objection to Paragraphs 8-9:**

12 Relevance. Colonial-era proclamations by the King of England regarding  
13 the carrying of firearms, including an apparent outright ban on carry for self-  
14 defense of the kind rejected in *Bruen*, are not relevant to the evidence of Founding  
15 through Reconstruction historical firearm regulation analogues that governments  
16 must produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation. *See New York*  
17 *State Rifle & Pistol Ass’n v. Bruen*, 597 U.S. \_\_\_, 142 S. Ct. 2111, 2133, 2146-47  
18 (2022).

19 **2. Objection to Paragraph 10:**

20 Foundation. There is no citation or insufficient citations to facts or sources  
21 provided to support the opinion expressed by the declarant, and no other  
22 information is provided by the declarant to support the origin of or veracity of the  
23 declarant’s opinion.

24 **3. Objection to Paragraph 11:**

25 Foundation. The citation to a single source regarding early Virginia law  
26 does not provide a sufficient foundation to support the opinion expressed by the  
27 declarant that “ ‘taverns are clearly the number one exhibit in early America of a  
28 business regulated by government.’ ” No other information is provided by the

1 declarant to support the origin of or veracity of the declarant’s opinion.

2 **4. Objection to Paragraph 12:**

3 Relevance. Prevailing views of alcohol use in the pre-Founding Colonial  
4 period, not tethered to any discussion of regulations, particularly firearms  
5 regulations, are not relevant to the evidence of Founding through Reconstruction  
6 historical firearm regulation analogues that governments must produce to show a  
7 history and tradition of firearms regulation.

8 **5. Objection to Paragraphs 13-14:**

9 Relevance. Laws enacted to impermissibly target one race for disparate  
10 treatment, such as laws preventing Indians from buying liquor, are not relevant  
11 evidence establishing an historical tradition of constitutional firearms regulations.  
12 *See Bruen* at 2152 n.27. Further, laws banning the sale of alcohol without regard to  
13 firearm carriage are not relevant to the evidence of Founding through  
14 Reconstruction historical firearm regulation analogues that governments must  
15 produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

16 **6. Objection to Paragraph 15:**

17 Foundation. No citation to any laws supporting the opinion that there were  
18 laws, much less widespread laws, banning carrying of swords in taverns. No  
19 citation to any laws or material supporting the opinion that purported laws banning  
20 carrying of swords in taverns were or would have been applied to firearms carriage.

21 Relevance. Purported laws banning carriage of swords, if they existed or  
22 were numerous enough to show a history or tradition of banning carrying of swords  
23 in taverns, are not relevant to the evidence of Founding through Reconstruction  
24 historical firearm regulation analogues that governments must produce to show a  
25 history and tradition of firearms regulation.

26 **7. Objection to Paragraphs 16-21:**

27 Foundation. Citation to a couple of Colonial or Founding era laws  
28 regulating gambling and liquor does not evidence an historical practice.

1           Relevance. Laws regulating gambling and liquor in the same  
2 establishment, if such laws existed and evidenced an historical practice, and where  
3 there are no mentions of firearms or firearms regulation attendant to those laws, are  
4 not relevant to the evidence of Founding through Reconstruction historical firearm  
5 regulation analogues that governments must produce to show a history and tradition  
6 of firearms regulation.

7           **8.    Objection to Paragraphs 22-23:**

8           Foundation. No citation to authority to support proposition that gambling  
9 laws were ubiquitous. Relevance. Laws regulating gambling, if such laws existed  
10 and evidenced an historical practice, and where there are no mentions of firearms or  
11 firearms regulation attendant to those laws, are not relevant to the evidence of  
12 Founding through Reconstruction historical firearm regulation analogues that  
13 governments must produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

14           **9.    Objection to Paragraph 24:**

15           Relevance. Laws regulating gambling in a single state during the relevant  
16 analogical period, where there are no mentions of firearms or firearms regulation  
17 attendant to those laws, are not relevant to the evidence of Founding through  
18 Reconstruction historical firearm regulation analogues that governments must  
19 produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

20           **10.   Objection to Paragraph 25:**

21           Relevance. Laws regulating gambling during the relevant analogical  
22 period , where there are no mentions of firearms or firearms regulation attendant to  
23 those laws, are not relevant to the evidence of Founding through Reconstruction  
24 historical firearm regulation analogues that governments must produce to show a  
25 history and tradition of firearms regulation.

26           **11.   Objection to Paragraph 26:**

27           Foundation. No support in paragraph or prior citations for the opinion that  
28 “Existing laws relating to the regulation of taverns and gambling reveal that the

1 state had an interest in reducing violence in taverns, and that the threat of violence  
2 was higher when there was gambling taking place there.”

3 Relevance. Laws regulating gambling during the relevant analogical  
4 period, where there are no mentions of firearms or firearms regulation attendant  
5 with those laws, are not relevant to the evidence of Founding through  
6 Reconstruction historical firearm regulation analogues that governments must  
7 produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

8 **12. Objection to Paragraphs 27-28:**

9 Relevance. Laws regulating the serving of alcohol during the relevant  
10 analogical period, where there are no mentions of firearms or firearms regulation  
11 attendant to those laws, are not relevant to the evidence of Founding through  
12 Reconstruction historical firearm regulation analogues that governments must  
13 produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

14 **13. Objection to Paragraph 29:**

15 Foundation/Relevance. Citation to one Connecticut law regulating  
16 gambling and alcohol during the relevant period does not evidence an historical  
17 practice. Relevance. Laws regulating gambling and alcohol consumption during  
18 the relevant analogical period, where there are no mentions of firearms or firearms  
19 regulation attendant to those laws, are not relevant to the evidence of Founding  
20 through Reconstruction historical firearm regulation analogues that governments  
21 must produce to show a history and tradition of firearms regulation.

22 **14. Objection to Paragraph 30:**

23 Foundation/Relevance. Citation to one South Carolina law regulating  
24 alcohol in taverns during the relevant period does not evidence an historical  
25 practice. Relevance. Laws regulating taverns during the relevant analogical period,  
26 where there are no mentions of firearms or firearms regulation attendant to those  
27 laws, are not relevant to the evidence of Founding through Reconstruction historical  
28 firearm regulation analogues that governments must produce to show a history and

1 tradition of firearms regulation. Post-Reconstruction laws for regulating taverns are  
2 manifestly not relevant to the evidence of Founding through Reconstruction  
3 historical analogues that governments must produce to show a tradition of firearm  
4 regulation.

5  
6  
7  
8  
9

Dated: November 20, 2023

**MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.**

/s/ C.D. Michel  
C.D. Michel  
Counsel for Plaintiffs

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

Dated: November 20, 2023

**LAW OFFICES OF DON KILMER**

/s/ Don Kilmer  
Don Kilmer  
Counsel for Plaintiff The Second Amendment  
Foundation

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  
26  
27  
28

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**  
IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Case Name: *May, et al. v. Bonta*  
Case No.: 8:23-cv-01696 CJC (ADSx)

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED THAT:

I, the undersigned, am a citizen of the United States and am at least eighteen years of age. My business address is 180 East Ocean Boulevard, Suite 200, Long Beach, California 90802.

I am not a party to the above-entitled action. I have caused service of:

**EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS OF PLAINTIFFS TO DECLARATION OF  
PETER C. MANCALL FILED IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT’S  
OPPOSITION TO MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

on the following party by electronically filing the foregoing with the Clerk of the District Court using its ECF System, which electronically notifies them.

Robert L. Meyerhoff, Deputy Attorney General  
California Department of Justice  
300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702  
Los Angeles, CA 90013  
Email: [Robert.Meyerhoff@doj.ca.gov](mailto:Robert.Meyerhoff@doj.ca.gov)  
*Attorney for Defendant*

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

Executed November 20, 2023.

  
Christina Castron