

1 Alan Gura (Calif. Bar No. 178221)
Gura & Possessky, PLLC
2 101 N. Columbus St., Suite 405
Alexandria, VA 22314
3 703.835.9085/Fax 703.997.7665
4 Donald E.J. Kilmer, Jr. (Calif. Bar No. 179986)
Law Offices of Donald Kilmer, A.P.C.
5 1645 Willow Street, Suite 150
San Jose, CA 95125
6 408.264.8489/Fax 408.264.8487
7

8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10 Deanna Sykes, et al.,) Case No. 2:09-CV-01235-MCE-KJM
11 Plaintiffs,)
12 v.) **EXHIBIT D**
13 John M. Ginness, et al.,) **IN SUPPORT OF MOTION FOR**
14 Defendants.) **SUMMARY JUDGMENT**
15

16 EXHIBIT D IN SUPPORT OF
17 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT

18 COME NOW the Plaintiffs, Deanna Sykes, Andrew Witham, Adam Richards, Second
19 Amendment Foundation, Inc. And The Calguns Foundation, Inc., by an through undersigned
20 counsel, and submit their Exhibit D in Support of their Motion for Summary Judgment.
21

22 Respectfully Submitted, August 5, 2009

23 Donald E.J. Kilmer, Jr. (Calif. Bar No. 179986)
Law Offices of Donald Kilmer, A.P.C.
24 1645 Willow Street, Suite 150
San Jose, CA 95125
25 408.264.8489/Fax 408.264.8487
E-Mail: Don@DKLawOffice.com

Alan Gura (Calif. Bar No. 178221)
Gura & Possessky, PLLC
101 N. Columbus St., Suite 405
Alexandria, VA 22314
703.835.9085/Fax 703.997.7665

26 /s/ Donald Kilmer/
27 Donald Kilmer, Attorney for Plaintiffs

/s/ Alan Gura/
Alan Gura, Attorney for Plaintiffs

SA2001RF0041

Joint Legislative Budget Committee

CHAIR
STEVE PEACE

VICE CHAIR
TONY CARDENAS

SENATE

DICK ACKERMAN
DEDE ALPERT
JIM BATTIN
K. MAURICE JOHANNESSEN
JACK O'CONNELL
RICHARD G. POLANCO
JOHN VASCONCELLOS

GOVERNMENT CODE SECTIONS 9140-9143

CALIFORNIA LEGISLATURE

LEGISLATIVE ANALYST
ELIZABETH G. HILL

925 L STREET, SUITE 1000
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814
(916) 445-4656

ASSEMBLY

ROY ASHBURN
PATRICIA C. BATES
JACKIE GOLDBERG
FRED KEELEY
CAROLE MIGDEN
GEORGE RUNNER
RODERICK WRIGHT

December 13, 2001

Hon. Bill Lockyer
Attorney General
1300 I Street, 17th Floor
Sacramento, California 95814

Attention: Ms. Tricia Knight
Initiative Coordinator

RECEIVED
DEC 13 2001

INITIATIVE COORDINATOR
ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE

Dear Attorney General Lockyer:

Pursuant to Elections Code Section 9005, we have reviewed the proposed initiative constitutional amendment that establishes the right of Californians to possess firearms and requires the judiciary to apply a test of "strict scrutiny" in the evaluation of state and local actions regulating the right to bear arms (File No. SA2001RF0041).

Background

The U.S. Constitution's Second Amendment guarantees the right of citizens to keep and bear arms and has been subject to significant court review for years. Currently, the State Constitution has no equivalent provision. While the Second Amendment confers specific rights regarding the right to bear arms, the courts have allowed federal, state, and local governments to establish prohibitions and restrictions on firearm ownership.

Proposal

This measure adds a new section to the State Constitution that defines the existing right to defend life and liberty to include the right of each person to keep and bear arms for the defense of self, family, and home. The measure states that this right shall not be infringed.

Hon. Bill Lockyer

2

December 13, 2001

While individuals may possess and carry firearms, many of the state's existing systems for background checks, weapons permits, and law enforcement investigations of individuals with weapons would likely not change. For example:

- Because the measure has no impact on federal law and maintains prohibitions against the possession of weapons by convicted felons and the mentally incompetent, it appears that the state's systems for background checks (including waiting periods) for weapons purchases and concealed weapons permits would remain in place.
- Under the provisions of this constitutional amendment, it would still be illegal to possess and carry a firearm for the purposes of committing a criminal act.
- Because this measure makes no direct change to existing state constitutional law, the state and local governments would presumably still be responsible for using their police powers to guarantee public safety, thus allowing for the continued prohibition of weapons in certain public places or under certain circumstances (for example, while a person is intoxicated or while operating a motor vehicle).

However, local jurisdictions would not be able to limit who obtains concealed weapons permits unless the applicant does not meet federal or state criteria. In addition, individuals could no longer be arrested and tried for simple possession of a weapon, unless other circumstances existed. Currently, these types of arrests are misdemeanor offenses where the individual is generally cited and released.

The experience of other states enacting similar measures has been an initial increase in requests for concealed weapons permits, resulting in an increase in the number of background checks.

The measure also amends the State Constitution to require the application of a strict scrutiny test in judicial review of state actions that restrict individual rights to acquire and possess firearms. The strict scrutiny test presumes the challenged regulatory action to be invalid and the burden of proof is on state and local governments to show that the law serves a compelling public interest.

Under existing law, state and local government actions regulating firearms have generally been tested under the "rational relationship" test. This test presumes the legislation to be valid if it is rationally related to a legitimate government purpose. The burden of proof is on the challenging party to show that the law is unconstitutional.

Hon. Bill Lockyer

3

December 13, 2001

The measure does not limit the ability of the state to regulate the purchase and possession of firearms by individuals who are:

- Felons.
- Minors.
- Mentally incompetent.
- Subject to restraining orders based on their violent conduct.

Finally, this measure stipulates that all local government action on this subject is preempted by state law and the amendment.

Fiscal Effect

Direct Effects. The strict scrutiny test could remove perceived barriers to challenging firearm laws in the courts, resulting in increased legal expenses to the state for defending firearm laws, as well as additional court costs.

The remaining provisions of the measure will probably not result in any direct net cost to state government because it does not specifically change existing statutes. Rather, it establishes constitutional guidelines which apparently are not in conflict with existing state laws and the systems for their implementation. In addition, while there is a potential for an increase in the number of background checks (primarily concealed weapons permits) processed by the Department of Justice, this department is statutorily authorized to recover such costs through fees.

Local governments could experience some costs and savings. The net fiscal impact is unknown. Specifically, while the request for concealed weapons permits could increase, resulting in additional processing costs, the number of concealed weapons violations would likely decrease, resulting in savings to local law enforcement. This measure could also increase legal expenses to local governments resulting from an increase in the number of challenges to local firearm ordinances.

Indirect Effect. Research in other states has shown that similar measures can result in indirect savings and costs, however, much of this research is inconclusive regarding the net effect of such changes. Savings could result from the potential reduction in crime resulting from a larger number of citizens possessing firearms for self-defense. On the other hand, increased costs could result from injuries and death resulting from accidental and unintentional firearms use. The net impact of these savings and costs is unknown.

Hon. Bill Lockyer


4

December 13, 2001

Summary

We estimate that this measure would result in unknown, potential costs to the state and unknown net fiscal effects on local governments.

Sincerely,


Elizabeth Hill
Legislative Analyst


B. Timothy Gage
Director of Finance