Case	#:1332	102/20/24 Fage 10/0 Fage ID
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	C. D. Michel – SBN 144258  cmichel@michellawyers.com Joshua Robert Dale – SBN 209942  idale@michellawyers.com Konstadinos T. Moros – SBN 306610  kmoros@michellawyers.com Alexander A. Frank – SBN 311718  afrank@michellawyers.com MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C. 180 E. Ocean Blvd., Suite 200  Long Beach, CA 90802  Telephone: (562) 216-4444  Donald Kilmer-SBN 179986  Law Offices of Donald Kilmer, APC 14085 Silver Ridge Road Caldwell, Idaho 83607  Telephone: (408) 264-8489  Email: Don@DKLawOffice.com	
11	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
13	CENTRAL DISTRICT O	F CALIFORNIA
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28	CALIFORNIA RIFLE & PISTOL ASSOCIATION, INCORPORATED; THE SECOND AMENDMENT FOUNDATION; GUN OWNERS OF AMERICA, INC.; GUN OWNERS FOUNDATION; GUN OWNERS OF CALIFORNIA, INC.; ERICK VELASQUEZ, an individual; CHARLES MESSEL, an individual; BRIAN WEIMER, an individual; CLARENCE RIGALI, an individual; KEITH REEVES, an individual, CYNTHIA GABALDON, an individual; and STEPHEN HOOVER, an individual,  Plaintiffs,  V.  LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT; SHERIFF ROBERT LUNA, in his official capacity; LA VERNE POLICE DEPARTMENT; LA VERNE CHIEF OF POLICE COLLEEN FLORES, in her official capacity; ROBERT BONTA, in his official capacity as Attorney General of the State of California and DOES 1-10,  Defendants.	CASE NO: 8:23-cv-10169-SPG (ADSx)  EVIDENTIARY OBJECTION AND MOTION TO STRIKE DECLARATION OF PROFESSOR ROBERT SPITZEF IN SUPPORT OF DEFENDANT ROBERT BONTA'S OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION  Hearing Date: March 13, 2024 Hearing Time: 1:30 p.m. Courtroom: 5C Judge: Hon. Sherilyn Peace Garnett
	EVID. OBJ. TO AND MOT. STRIKE SPITZER DECLARATION	

## TO THE HONORABLE COURT:

Plaintiffs California Rifle & Pistol Association, Incorporated, The Second Amendment Foundation, Gun Owners of America, Inc., Gun Owners Foundation, Gun Owners of California, Inc., Erick Velasquez, Charles Messel, Brian Weimer, Clarence Rigali, Keith Reeves, Cynthia Gabaldon, and Stephen Hoover hereby jointly object, pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence 401, 402, 602, 702, and 703, to the Declaration of Professor Robert Spitzer, lodged by Defendant Robert Bonta, in support of his opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction. These objections are raised on the following grounds and as to the following matters contained within the declaration:

## 1. Objection to $\P$ 10:

<u>Foundation (Fed. R. Evid. 602, 702 & 703)</u>: Declarant provides no foundation for the purported characterization of the historical laws that he describes. No source materials are provided or referenced for the Court to understand the declarant's source for this claim.

## 2. Objection to ¶¶ 21 through 24:

<u>Foundation (Fed. R. Evid. 602, 702 & 703)</u>: Declarant provides no foundation for the purported characterization of the historical laws that he describes. No source materials are provided or referenced for the Court to understand the declarant's source for this claim.

Relevancy (Fed. R. Evid. 401 & 402): That there were historical carry license laws that gave discretion to issuing authorities has no relevance because *New York State Rifle & Pistol Association v. Bruen* established the *right* to be armed outside of the home and declared such broad discretion unconstitutional.

## 3. Objection to $\P 41$ :

Relevancy (Fed. R. Evid. 401 & 402): Gunpower regulations have no relevancy to any of the carry-specific policies at issue in this litigation.

1 Objection to ¶¶ 43 through 45: 4. 2 Relevancy (Fed. R. Evid. 401 & 402): Licensing is not generally at issue in 3 this litigation. Thus, historical commercial licensing regulations that impacted 4 firearms in some commercial manner are not relevant. 5 Objection to ¶¶ 46 through 48: 5. 6 Relevancy (Fed. R. Evid. 401 & 402): Firearm commerce record-keeping 7 requirements have no relevancy to the carry-specific issues here in this litigation. 8 6. Objection to  $\P$  52 through 57: 9 Relevancy (Fed. R. Evid. 401 & 402): Plaintiffs do not challenge any mental 10 health-related restrictions in this action. That there may be some historical support 11 for the broad proposition that mentally ill or abnormal people were barred from 12 possessing firearms is simply not at issue in this case. 13 7. Objection to  $\P$  58 through 72: 14 Relevancy (Fed. R. Evid. 401 & 402): Historical laws that restricted 15 intoxicated people or habitually intoxicated people from possessing firearms has no 16 bearing on the carry license issuing criteria and politics at issue in this case. Objection to ¶¶ 73 & 74: 17 8. 18 Relevancy (Fed. R. Evid. 401 & 402): Hunting-related firearms statutes that 19 regulated non-local residents differently than local residents, from pre-Ratification, 20 the immediate antebellum era, and Reconstruction era have no bearing on the carry 21 license issuing criteria and politics at issue in this case. These statutes also imposed 22 harsher penalties on non-local residents; they didn't bar non-local residents from a 23 privilege granted to locals only. 24 25 26 27 28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE