No. 25-5961

In the
Supreme Court of the United States

EVA MARIE GARDNER,

Petitioner,

v.

MARYLAND,

Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF MARYLAND

BRIEF OF AMICI CURIAE SECOND AMENDMENT FOUNDATION, NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, CALIFORNIA RIFLE & PISTOL ASSOCIATION, INCORPORATED, SECOND AMENDMENT LAW CENTER, INC., MINNESOTA GUN OWNERS CAUCUS, AND THE CITIZENS COMMITTEE FOR THE RIGHT TO KEEP AND BEAR ARMS IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONER AND REVERSAL

C.D. Michel
Anna M. Barvir
MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
180 E. Ocean Blvd., Ste. 200
Long Beach, CA 90802
(562) 216-4444
cmichel@michellawyers.com

Konstadinos T. Moros
Counsel of Record
THE SECOND AMENDMENT FOUNDATION
12500 NE 10th Pl.
Bellevue, WA 98005
(425) 454-7012
kmoros@saf.org

Counsel for Amici Curiae

December 11, 2025

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

CONSTITUTION Page(s)

STATUTES

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued

AMICI CURIAE STATEMENT OF INTEREST

Second Amendment Foundation ("SAF") is a non-profit membership organization founded in 1974 with over 720,000 members and supporters in every state of the union. Its purposes include education, research, publishing, and legal action focusing on the constitutional right to keep and bear arms. Currently, SAF is involved in several Second Amendment-related lawsuits and thus has great interest in the outcome of this case.[1]

The National Rifle Association of America (NRA) is America's oldest civil rights organization and foremost defender of Second Amendment rights. It was founded in 1871 by Union veterans—a general and a colonel—who, based on their Civil War experiences, sought to promote firearms marksmanship and expertise amongst the citizenry. Today, the NRA is America's leading provider of firearms marksmanship and safety training for both civilians and law enforcement. The NRA has approximately four million members, and its programs reach millions more.

Founded in 1875, California Rifle & Pistol Association, Incorporated, is a nonprofit organization

---

[1] No counsel for a party authored this brief in whole or in part, nor did such counsel or any party make a monetary contribution to fund this brief. No person other than the amicus parties, its members or counsel, made a monetary contribution intended to fund the preparation or submission of this brief. The Parties were notified that this brief would be filed on November 21, 2025, in compliance with Rule 37.2.

that seeks to defend the Second Amendment and advance laws that protect the rights of individual citizens. In service of its mission to preserve the constitutional and statutory rights of gun ownership, California Rifle & Pistol Association regularly participates as a party or amicus in Second Amendment litigation.

Second Amendment Law Center, Inc. is a nonprofit corporation headquartered in Henderson, Nevada. Second Amendment Law Center is dedicated to promoting and defending the individual rights to keep and bear arms as envisioned by the Founding Fathers. Its purpose is to defend these rights in state and federal courts across the United States. It also seeks to educate the public about the social utility of firearm ownership and to provide accurate historical, criminological, and technical information about firearms to policymakers, judges, and the public.

Minnesota Gun Owners Caucus ("MGOC") is a 501(c)(4) non-profit organization incorporated under the laws of Minnesota with its principal place of business in Shoreview, Minnesota. MGOC seeks to protect and promote the right of citizens to keep and bear arms for all lawful purposes. MGOC serves its members and the public through advocacy, education, elections, legislation, and legal action. MGOC's members reside both within and outside Minnesota.

The Citizens Committee for the Right to Keep and Bear Arms is a non-profit corporation organized under Section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code, dedicated to promoting the benefits of the right to bear arms. The Court's interpretation of the Second

Amendment directly impacts the Committee's organizational interests, as well as the Committee's members and supporters, who enjoy exercising their Second Amendment rights. The Committee's substantial expertise in the field of Second Amendment rights would aid the Court in this case.

SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

In 2022, Lloyd Muldrow, a Marine veteran and self-defense instructor, stopped an attack by an armed assailant in a Baltimore bar. For his heroism, he would later receive the Carnegie Medal, which recognizes those who perform extraordinary acts of heroism in civilian life. But before that recognition, he suffered the humiliation of arrest and prosecution solely because he carried a firearm in Maryland with a permit issued by Virginia—one that Maryland refuses to honor. As reported, "police thanked him—and then they arrested him." *See* Valerie Richardson & Matt Delaney, *Baltimore Police Arrest 'Good Guy with the Gun' Who Stopped Armed Attacker*, Wash. Times (D.C, Sept. 2, 2022, https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2022/sep/2/good-samaritan-faces-charges-after-stopping-armed-/ (last visited Dec. 3, 2025). Mr. Muldrow would eventually receive probation for his "crime." His experience underscores that the issue of interstate carry rights is not limited to this case. Rather, it threatens responsible, licensed carriers nationwide—including Petitioner Gardner, who likewise was arrested in Maryland for carrying while holding a valid Virginia permit.

Just a few years ago, this Court confirmed that the Second Amendment protects "the general right to publicly carry arms for self-defense." *N.Y. State Rifle & Pistol Ass'n v. Bruen*, 597 U.S. 1, 31 (2022). That right, enshrined in our Federal Constitution, cannot possibly tolerate each state having the power to force individuals from every other state to jump through time-consuming and often costly hoops before it deigns

to allow them to carry a firearm within its borders. Interstate visitors are Americans, yet states like Maryland treat them as suspect foreigners that need to be re-vetted before exercising a fundamental right.

To be sure, *Bruen* might be read as approving "shall-issue" licensing regimes designed to ensure that those who carry firearms are law-abiding citizens. *Id.* at 38 n.9. Under that standard, it is arguably permissible for a state, if it chooses, to require individuals to acquire a permit to carry a firearm. But it may not refuse to honor the permits issued by other states and insist that every nonresident complete its own licensing scheme as a precondition to exercising the same nationally protected right.

This exact sort of abuse has already been rejected as it relates to other rights. For instance, because Ohio would not allow for same-sex marriages, James Obergefell and John Arthur married in Maryland. *Obergefell v. Hodges*, 576 U.S. 644, 658 (2015). After learning that Ohio would not recognize their marriage, they filed a lawsuit. *Id.* This Court ultimately held that the Fourteenth Amendment requires a state to recognize a marriage between two people of the same sex when their marriage was lawfully licensed and performed out-of-state. *Id.* at 681. In reaching this conclusion, this Court explained that:

> For some couples, even an ordinary drive into a neighboring State to visit family or friends risks causing severe hardship in the event of a spouse's hospitalization while across state lines. In light of the

> fact that many States already allow same-sex marriage—and hundreds of thousands of these marriages already have occurred—the disruption caused by the recognition bans is significant and ever-growing.

Id. at 680-81. *Obergefell*'s holding and its supporting logic, with respect to an unenumerated substantive due process right to marry, should apply with equal force to the enumerated right to bear arms found in the Second Amendment. Indeed, the danger present "in an ordinary drive into a neighboring State" is even greater when it comes to the right to carry, as both the Petitioner and people like Lloyd Muldrow have shown.

This brief will cover three main points. First, it will show how our historical tradition is very clear that visitors from other states were not required to get permits or special permission before exercising the right to carry. In fact, they received favorable treatment in the form of "traveler's exceptions." Second, Amici will discuss how burdensome it is to acquire and maintain carry permits from more than one state. Finally, Amici will conclude by looking at how Americans with carry permits are extraordinarily law-abiding, and so states have no legitimate safety concerns in honoring the permits of other states.

ARGUMENT

I. Travelers From Other States Were Historically Exempted from State and Local Restrictions on Carrying Firearms.

Before 1900, carrying a firearm openly generally did not require a permit or any other permission from the government. Concealed carry, on the other hand, was often restricted or banned entirely. Courts generally approved of this arrangement. *See, e.g.*, *Nunn v. State*, 1 Ga. 243, 251 (1846).

But there was one frequent exception. Travelers from other states were often allowed to carry their firearms concealed. The historical tradition of these "traveler's exception" laws is not some outlier, but overwhelming to the point that it justifies this Court summarily reversing the decision below. It is especially relevant here, given the Petitioner was arrested while driving through the state.

This tradition began in the colonial era. In 1686, the Province of East Jersey prohibited "privately" wearing various weapons but exempted "all strangers, travelling upon their lawful occasions thro' this Province, behaving themselves peaceably." 23 *The Grants, Concessions, and Original Constitutions of the Province of New Jersey* at 289-90 (1758).

An 1813 Kentucky law was perhaps the earliest post-founding example, prohibiting the concealed carry of certain weapons "unless when travelling on a journey." 1813 Ky. Acts 100, *An Act to Prevent Persons in this Commonwealth from Wearing Concealed Arms,*

Except in Certain Cases, ch. 89, § 1.[2] An 1820 Indiana law was similar, limiting its concealed carry ban by stating it "shall not be so construed as to affect travellers." 1819 Ind. Acts 39, *An Act to Prohibit the Wearing of Concealed Weapons*.

By the end of the Antebellum Era, at least three other states (Tennessee, Arkansas, and Alabama) had also banned concealed carry but provided express exceptions for travelers. *See* 1821 Tenn. Pub. Acts 15–16, *An Act to Prevent the Wearing of Dangerous and Unlawful Weapons*, ch. 13 ("[N]othing herein contained shall affect … any person that may be on a journey to any place out of his county or state."); REVISED STATUTES OF THE STATE OF ARKANSAS, ADOPTED AT THE OCTOBER SESSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY OF SAID STATE, A.D. 1837, at 280 (1838) (1837 law applying to every person "unless upon a journey"); 1841 Ala. Laws 149 (prohibiting concealed carry "unless such person shall … be travelling, or setting out on a journey").

This tradition continued well after the Civil War. An 1867 Nevada law barred concealed carry for everyone who was not a "peace officer or traveler."

---

[2] That law would soon be held unconstitutional under Kentucky's state constitution's bearing arms provision, but not because of the traveler exception. Rather, the state court ruled the restriction on concealed carry was unconstitutional in its entirety. "[I]n principle, there is no difference between a law prohibiting the wearing concealed arms, and a law forbidding the wearing such as are exposed; and if the former be unconstitutional, the latter must be so likewise." *Bliss v. Commonwealth*, 12 Ky. 90, 92 (1822).

1867 Nev. Stat. 66. And an 1864 California law did the same. 1863 Cal. Stat. 748.

Traveler's exceptions also applied to the rare jurisdictions that implemented more comprehensive carry bans that were not limited only to concealed carry. In 1871, Texas instituted a fine for anyone caught "carry[ing] on or about his person, saddle, or in his saddle-bags, any pistol, dirk, dagger, slung-shot, sword-cane, spear, brass-knuckles, bowie-knife, or any other kind of knife manufactured or sold for purposes of offense or defense," providing, however, that "[t]he preceding article shall not apply … to persons traveling." *The Revised Statutes of Texas*, 42–43 (1879).

Similarly, in the 1880s, the Arizona Territory banned the carry of "any dirk, dirk-knife, bowie-knife, pistol, rifle, shot-gun, or fire-arms of any kind … in any of the towns, villages or settlements" of two counties, but "provided, that any person traveling from one village, town or settlement, to another shall be permitted to carry fire-arms of any kind." 1883 Ariz. Sess. Laws 21–22. In 1887, the New Mexico Territory banned all carry of deadly weapons except that "[p]ersons traveling may carry arms for their own protection while actually prosecuting their journey and may pass through settlements on their road without disarming." 1886 N.M. Laws 57.

Besides state and territorial laws, many local governments implemented traveler's exceptions too, including the cities of Oakland and Sacramento. Fred L. Button, ed., *General Municipal Ordinances of the City of Oakland, California* (Oakland, CA; Enquirer,

1895), p. 218, sec. 1, citing *An Ordinance to Prohibit the Carrying of Concealed Weapons*, No. 1141 ("It shall be unlawful for any person in the City of Oakland, not being a public officer or a traveler actually engaged in making a journey, to wear or carry concealed about his person without a permit, as hereinafter provided, any pistol."); Ordinance no. 84, *Charter and Ordinances of the City of Sacramento, Prohibiting the Carrying of Concealed Deadly Weapons* (1876) ("It shall be unlawful for any person, not being a public officer or traveler, or not having a permit from the Police Commissioners of the City of Sacramento, to wear or carry, concealed, any pistol, dirk, or other dangerous or deadly weapon."). Los Angeles similarly banned all carry of certain "dangerous and deadly" weapons in 1878, unless carried by "persons actually traveling." *Revised Charter and Compiled Ordinances and Resolutions of the City of Los Angeles* 83 (Wm. M. Caswell ed., 1878).

Many more examples exist, *see, e.g.*, 1890 Okla. Sess. Laws 495; 1890 Wyo. Sess. Laws 140, but Amici have made their point. Indeed, the exception for travelers was so widely accepted that future Supreme Court Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes, Jr., wrote that, whether or not prohibitions on the concealed carry of weapons are constitutional, carry by travelers is generally a recognized right:

> As the Constitution of the United States, and the constitutions of several of the states, in terms more or less comprehensive, declare the right of the people to keep and bear arms, it has been

> a subject of grave discussion, in some of the state courts, whether a statute prohibiting persons, **when not on a journey, or as travellers, from wearing or carrying concealed weapons**, be constitutional.

2 James Kent, *Commentaries on American Law*, 340 n.2 (O.W. Holmes, Jr. ed., 12th ed. 1873) (emphasis added).

If it responds to the history above, Maryland will likely argue that many of these historical laws and ordinances were written so that they only protected travelers while they were traveling through the state or between cities in the state, and they would not apply after the traveler had stopped at a destination for more than a short time. *See, e.g.*, *Carr v. State*, 34 Ark. 448, 449 (1879) ("The exception in the statute is to enable travelers to protect themselves on the highways … Travelers do not need weapons, whilst stopping in towns, any more than citizens do."). Of course, the Petitioner *was* traveling through the state in her vehicle when she was arrested. Maryland law today does not provide even that minimal allowance for visitors from other states. Any form of carrying without a Maryland permit is illegal, whether currently traveling or not.

But regardless, that some traveler's exception laws were limited to those actively traveling does not change the result. This Court has said that its Second Amendment precedents "were not meant to suggest a law trapped in amber." *United States v. Rahimi*, 602 U.S. 680, 691 (2024). Rather, "the appropriate

analysis involves considering whether the challenged regulation is consistent with the principles that underpin our regulatory tradition." *Id.* at 692.

Here, the principle that underpins our regulatory tradition is that visitors from other states get *more* leeway than residents when it comes to the right to carry. The law not being "trapped in amber" must not be a one-way ratchet only favoring the government, it can also work in favor of the rights of Americans as well.

Moreover, travelers who stopped somewhere and thus did not fall under the traveler's exception laws could still generally carry firearms openly, it was only concealed carry that was typically restricted. Petitioner, by contrast, had no such option. Lacking a Maryland permit, her right to carry was entirely denied to her. The degree of burden imposed is thus much worse with Maryland's modern law, and "whether modern and historical regulations impose a comparable burden on the right of armed self-defense and whether that burden is comparably justified are '*central*' considerations when engaging in an analogical inquiry." *Bruen*, 597 U.S. at 29.

History is clear, and it tells us that Maryland must—at minimum—recognize carry permits issued by other states in line with the historical traveler's exception laws.[3] This Court should not ignore that

[3] In fact, this arrangement would be more favorable to Maryland than what our historical tradition tells us is permissible. Again, prior to 1900, open carry was generally allowed for everyone without any permit, with traveler's exceptions mostly applying to restrictions on concealed carry.

history, nor should it allow Maryland to rise to higher levels of generality in its claimed historical analogues. The traveler's exception laws are directly on point, well-represented in our history, and uncontroversial. They decide this case in Petitioner's favor.

II. The Considerable Burdens Facing Americans Seeking to Carry Across State Lines.

Today, 29 states have adopted permitless "constitutional" carry, under which anyone who may legally possess a firearm may carry it without a permit, including visitors from other states. Other states are more restrictive, but at least honor the permits of many other states in what are called "reciprocity" agreements. Nevada, for example, honors the carry permits of 29 other states. *See* Nev. Dep't of Pub. Safety, Recs., Commc'ns & Compliance Div., Recognition List (effective July 1, 2023), https://www.rccd.nv.gov/siteassets/content/services/2023_Recognition_List__002_28_June_23.pdf. Virginia goes further and honors all valid out-of-state concealed carry permits issued to individuals who are at least 21 years old and are carrying a photo ID issued by a government agency. Va. Code Ann. § 18.2-308.014 (2025).

Today, it is illegal to carry a firearm (openly or concealed) in Maryland without a permit. Being forced to recognize the permits of other states still allows Maryland to require that visitors carrying firearms at least have a permit issued by another state, a requirement that is more burdensome than what the historical tradition supports.

But many states refuse to honor permits from *any* other state—not even those with similarly strict requirements. The fact that this blanket refusal places a tremendous burden on the right to carry for interstate visitors seems to be a feature, not a bug. Unfortunately, these states are also some of our most visited, including, but not limited to, California, New York, Massachusetts, Illinois, New Jersey, and as especially relevant here, Maryland.

Amici understand the burden these states place on carry rights especially well, as they have often litigated against such burdens. Two of the Amici here were plaintiffs in a case that finally ended California's total ban on nonresident carry, and now that state must issue permits to nonresidents for the first time. *Cal. Rifle & Pistol Ass'n v. L.A. Cty. Sheriff's Dep't*, 745 F. Supp. 3d 1037, 1071 (C.D. Cal. 2024).

While that was an improvement over the prior status quo under which nonresidents had *no* legal avenue to carry in California, the obstacles still facing applicants are outright ridiculous. Getting a carry permit in California costs anywhere between about $500 and $2,000,[4] depending on the county and city. It also involves a lengthy wait, which can extend up to two years, an issue Amici also litigated in their case. *See id.* at 1054 ("Plaintiff Messel's application to LASD has been pending for more than two years.").

---

[4] Some of the Amici are also plaintiffs in a lawsuit challenging Santa Clara's roughly $2,000 in total expense for a carry permit. *See* First Amended Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief, *Blank v. County of Santa Clara*, No. 5:25-cv-08027-EJD (N.D. Cal. Nov. 14, 2025), ECF No. 11.

Additionally, California requires a training course, and following *Bruen*, increased the training course requirement from 8 hours to 16 hours, which further increases costs for applicants. Cal. Penal Code § 26165(a)(1). (The training course is required even if the applicant has already taken another training course to get a permit in their home state.) Some counties and cities even choose to require a psychological examination, which adds hundreds of dollars in additional expense. *Id.* § 26190(e). Finally, permits are only good for two years and then must be renewed, incurring even more time and expense. *Id.* § 26220(a).

With all the above in mind, imagine an Arizona resident planning an impromptu road trip to Los Angeles for the weekend. They have no meaningful right to carry in California, because even in the counties that issue permits the quickest, it takes at least a month or two to get a permit. Even if they planned their trip that far in advance, they must also have the financial means to pay the considerable expense of a California permit and have the time to take a two-day training course, as well as possibly sit for a psychological examination. California is not just treating the Second Amendment like a second-class right; the state is treating it as if it isn't a right at all.

The state directly at issue here, Maryland, is not much better than California. It too requires a two-day training course, fingerprinting, passport photos, application fees, and roughly 90 days of processing time. Md. Dep't of State Police, *Licensing Div., Handgun Wear and Carry Permit* (last visited Dec. 3,

2025), https://mdsp.maryland.gov/Organization/Pages/CriminalInvestigationBureau/LicensingDivision/Firearms/WearandCarryPermit.aspx.

The Petitioner here thus had no real way to get a Maryland permit in order to carry a firearm while traveling through the state unless she planned her trip months in advance, had hundreds of dollars to spend for the expense of the process, and could set aside two days to take *another* training course.[5]

For others, the burden is even worse. If you frequently travel across the country and regularly visit many states, you will not need just one or two extra permits, but a dozen or more, juggling all their different fees, training courses, and renewal processes.

At least one individual has posted about his and his wife's experience of trying to get as many different permits as possible on YouTube. At the time the video was posted two years ago, the couple had permits from Maryland, Pennsylvania, Washington D.C., Utah, Florida, Maine, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, New Jersey, and Massachusetts. *See* School of the American Rifle, *Taxing the 2nd Amendment - $8,149.00 to Carry in 44 States & D.C. - Husband & Wife*, YouTube (Jan. 26, 2023), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5pAZAdbQafk.

---

[5] Under § 18.2-308.02(B)(7) of the Virginia Code, Petitioner was required to take an in-person training course to get her Virginia carry permit. But Maryland does not honor that course, only those offered by a Maryland State Police-qualified instructor.

Combined, the permits are valid in 44 states and DC and cost the couple a grand total of over **$7,000**, with additional costs to come as permits come due for renewal. *Id.* And that cost does not factor in the considerable time investment required for application processes, taking various training courses, and remembering to renew permits as they expire. Even with all that time and expense, they would *still* need to spend thousands more to obtain permits in the remaining six states that do not recognize any of their many permits.

In sum, to exercise the right to carry in every state in the country, an American would need to spend thousands of dollars, take dozens of hours of repetitive training courses, often travel to each state to be interviewed and fingerprinted, and then remember to do it all again as permits expire and need to be renewed. Under the status quo, attempting to exercise the right to carry in all states by definition involves "exorbitant fees" and "lengthy wait times." *Bruen*, 597 U.S. at 38 n.9.

Does all of that sound like the treatment befitting a constitutional right? Do these massive burdens allow the right to carry to have the same scope it was "understood to have when the people adopted" it? *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 554 U.S. 570, 634 (2008). The answer, of course, must be no. Because if such burdens *are* permissible despite their total lack of historical support, then the historical standard of *Heller* and *Bruen* does not really exist in any meaningful sense.

III. Americans with Carry Permits Are Overwhelmingly Law-Abiding.

In response to all the above, Maryland will no doubt make appeals to public safety and claim that forcing it to honor the carry permits of other states would lead to increased crime and violence. This Court should reject that for two reasons, the first being that *Heller* and *Bruen* forbid such appeals to interest-balancing. "While judicial deference to legislative interest balancing is understandable—and, elsewhere, appropriate—it is not deference that the Constitution demands here." *Bruen*, 597 U.S. at 26.

But second, even assuming that such a public safety argument was permissible, Maryland has nothing to fear because Americans with carry permits are exceptionally law-abiding, much more so than the general population as a whole.[6]

This is true regardless of which state issued the permit. In their own litigation challenging California's bans on carrying in many public places, Amici presented extensive data from several state governments related to crime committed by carry permit holders, including from Florida, Texas, Wisconsin, Illinois, and Minnesota. *See* Memorandum

---

[6] This should not be taken to mean permitless states have significant violent crime problems. In fact, in the last five years several more states have adopted permitless carry, including large ones like Texas and Florida. Yet our national homicide rate has dropped precipitously. *See* Olivier Knox, *The U.S. Is on Track for Its Lowest Murder Rate Ever*, U.S. News & World Rep. (Sept. 29, 2025), https://www.usnews.com/news/u-s-news-decision-points/articles/2025-09-29/the-u-s-is-on-track-for-its-lowest-murder-rate-ever (last visited Dec. 9, 2025).

of Points & Authorities Supporting Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction at 30-35, *May v. Bonta*, No. 8:23-cv-01696-CJC-ADS (C.D. Cal. Sept. 29, 2023). These states have varying levels of burdens in getting carry permits. But all of them showed that crime by those issued permits is extremely rare. *Id.* That data led the district court to conclude: "[s]imply put, CCW permitholders are not the gun wielders legislators should fear." *May v. Bonta*, 709 F. Supp. 3d 940, 969 (C.D. Cal. 2023), *aff'd in part, rev'd in part sub nom. Wolford v. Lopez,* 116 F.4th 959 (9th Cir. 2024).[7]

At least one research organization that typically argues for more gun control, RAND, has recognized the same: "[E]vidence generally shows that, as a group, license holders are particularly law abiding and rarely are convicted for violent crimes." Rosanna Smart, et al., *The Science of Gun Policy: A Critical Synthesis of Research Evidence on the Effect of Gun Policies in the United States*, at 427 (4th ed. 2024), available online at https://www.rand.org/pubs/research_reports/RRA243-4.html (last visited Dec. 9, 2025).[8]

---

[7] Other courts have found the same, including the *Wolford* district court and another district court in New Jersey. "[T]he vast majority of conceal carry permit holders are law abiding." *Wolford v. Lopez,* 686 F. Supp. 3d 1034, 1076 (D. Haw. 2023), *aff'd in part, rev'd in part*, 116 F.4th 959 (9th Cir. 2024); "[D]espite ample opportunity for an evidentiary hearing, the State has failed to offer any evidence that law-abiding responsible citizens who carry firearms in public for self-defense are responsible for an increase in gun violence." *Koons v. Platkin*, 673 F. Supp. 3d 515, 577 (D.N.J. 2023).

[8] Maryland may point to *Concealed Carry Killers*, a project of the anti-gun Violence Policy Center, to try to paint those with

Given that the Petitioner was carrying in Maryland with a Virginia permit, it is worth noting here that those issued carry permits by Virginia are no exception in terms of being law-abiding citizens. According to the Virginia State Police, in 2024, a total of 686,994 concealed handgun permits were issued to residents, but only 815 were revoked. Va. State Police, *Facts & Figures 2024*, at 31 (2024), https://vsp.virginia.gov/wpcontent/uploads/2025/09/2024-Facts-and-figures-8.29.25Org.pdf (last visited Dec. 9, 2025).

That's a revocation rate of just 0.12%, which is a much better tally than the general population, considering about 8% of Americans overall are felons. Sarah K.S. Shannon et al., *The Growth, Scope, and Spatial Distribution of People With Felony Records in the United States, 1948-2010*, 54 Demography 1795 (2017), available online at https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5996985/. Nor does revocation only occur for those who commit *violent* crimes involving firearms, as other nonviolent crimes can also lead to one losing their Virginia carry permit, including crimes like illegal drug use or drunk driving.

---

carry permits in a negative light. A prior amicus brief filed by some of the Amici in the Ninth Circuit thoroughly rebutted the Violence Policy Center's arguments and demonstrated how the *Concealed Carry Killers* data inadvertently proved how law-abiding people with carry permits are. "In other words, according to the Concealed Carry Killers data, Americans who legally carry firearms are about 20 times less likely to commit homicide than the general population. This hardly supports Hawaii's claim that such persons are uniquely dangerous that they must be disarmed in public." Brief for Gun Owners of America, Inc. et al. as Amici Curiae Supporting Appellees at 26-29, *Wolford v. Lopez*, No. 23-16164 (9th Cir. Nov. 9, 2023).

The number of people with Virginia carry permits who committed a violent crime is thus even smaller than that 0.12% revocation rate suggests. Maryland has nothing to fear from those with Virginia carry permits.

CONCLUSION

A general right to publicly carry arms for self-defense cannot coexist with each state having the option to require visitors from other states to undergo a costly and time-consuming permit process to exercise that right. The Petitioner went through the trouble of getting a carry permit in Virginia, and she should not have to go through the same hassle in every state she visits, including Maryland. Her arrest for defending herself is repugnant to the Constitution and should be reversed. Amici believe the facts and law are clear enough here for this Court to do so summarily, but failing that, full review should be granted.

December 11, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

Konstadinos T. Moros
Counsel of Record
THE SECOND AMENDMENT FOUNDATION
12500 NE 10th Pl.
Bellevue, WA 98005
(425) 454-7012
kmoros@saf.org

Counsel for Amici Curiae