

1 Roderick M. Thompson (State Bar No. 96192)
2 Cory Mason (State Bar No. 240987)
3 FARELLA BRAUN & MARTEL LLP
4 235 Montgomery Street, 30th Floor
5 San Francisco, CA 94104
6 Telephone: (415) 954-4400
7 Facsimile: (415) 954-4480

8 Attorneys for Amicus Curiae
9 Legal Community Against Violence

**ENDORSED
FILED**
San Francisco County Superior Court

JAN 25 2006

GORDON PARK-LI, Clerk
BY: CAROLYN BALISTRERI
Deputy Clerk

10 IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
11 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO
12 UNLIMITED JURISDICTION

13 PAULA FISCAL, et al.,
14 Plaintiffs and Petitioners,

15 vs.

16 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
17 FRANCISCO, et al.,
18 Defendants and Respondents.

Case No. CPF-05-505960

**AMICUS BRIEF OF LEGAL
COMMUNITY AGAINST VIOLENCE
IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS'
OPPOSITION TO WRIT OF MANDATE**

Hearing Date: February 15, 2006
Time: 9:30 a.m.
Department: 301
Judge: Honorable James L. Warren

Date Action Filed: December 29, 2005
Trial Date: None scheduled

TABLE OF CONTENTS

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

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND	1
III.	ARGUMENT	3
	A. The Doe Decision Is Distinguishable and Is Not Controlling Here.	3
	B. The Ninth Circuit Found Doe’s Reasoning To Be in Conflict With Later Court of Appeal Decisions on the Scope of Implied State Preemption of Local Gun Control Regulations.	5
	C. The Supreme Court in Great Western/Nordyke Set Forth the Standard in California for Preemption Analysis of Local Gun Regulations.	6
	1. The Supreme Court Granted Certification in 2002 and Clarified the Law on State Preemption of Local Gun Control Ordinances.	7
	2. The Supreme Court’s Treatment of Doe in Great Western Confines Doe to Its Narrow Holding that State Statutes Preempt Local Licensing and Registration Schemes.	10
	D. The Legislature Has Consistently Construed Section 12026 Narrowly as Limited to a Prohibition on Licensing and Permitting of Handguns at the Local Level.....	12
	E. Under the Great Western Standard, Section 3’s Possession Ban on Some Local Residents Creates No Licensing or Permitting Requirement, and, Therefore, Is Not Preempted Expressly or Impliedly by State Law.	14
	1. State Law Does Not Expressly Preempt Section 3.	15
	2. Section 3 Is Not Duplicative of State Law.....	15
	3. Section 3 Does Not Contradict State Law.....	16
	4. Finally, Section 3 Is Not Impliedly Preempted.	18
	a. Handgun Possession Regulation Has Not Been So Fully and Completely Covered by State Law to Indicate That It Is Exclusively a Matter of State Concern.....	19
	b. Gun Possession Regulation Is Not Partially Covered by State Law in Such Terms as to Indicate That It Is an Issue of Paramount State Concern.....	19
	c. Section 3 Is Narrowly Drawn To Minimize Adverse Effects on Citizens of Other Counties and Towns, Which Plainly Do Not Outweigh Its Benefits.....	19
	F. To the Extent State Law Has Partially Preempted the Field, the Remainder of Proposition H Should Be Upheld.	20
IV.	CONCLUSION.....	20

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

FEDERAL CASES

1 *Great Western Shows, Inc. v. Los Angeles County* (9th Cir. 2000)
2 229 F.3d 1258 5, 6, 11
3
4 *Nordyke v. King* (9th Cir. 2000)
5 229 F.3d 1266 5, 6
6
7 *Quilici v. Village of Morton Grove* (7th Cir. 1982)
8 695 F.2d 261 1
9
10 *Seegars v. Ashcroft* (D.C. Cir. 2005)
11 396 F.3d 1248, cert. den. (2006) 2006 U.S. Lexis 1049 1

STATE CASES

12 *California Rifle and Pistol Association, Inc. v. City of West Hollywood* (1998)
13 66 Cal.App.4th 1302 5, 6, 9, 11, 17
14
15 *California Teachers Association v. San Diego Community College District* (1981)
16 28 Cal.3d 692 14
17
18 *Childers v. Childers* (1946)
19 74 Cal.App.2d 56 4
20
21 *Doe v. City and County of San Francisco* (1982)
22 136 Cal.App.3d 509 *passim*
23
24 *Fisher v. City of Berkeley* (1984)
25 37 Cal.3d 644 19
26
27 *Fujii v. State* (1952)
28 38 Cal.2d 718 11
29
30 *Galvan v. Superior Court* (1969)
31 70 Cal.2d 851 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, 18, 19
32
33 *Great Western Shows, Inc. v. County of Los Angeles* (2002)
34 27 Cal.4th 853 *passim*
35
36 *Kauffman & Broad Communities, Inc. v. Performance Plastering, Inc.* (2005)
37 133 Cal.App.4th 26 14
38
39 *Nordyke v. King* (2002)
40 27 Cal.4th 875 *passim*
41
42 *Olsen v. McGillicuddy* (1971)
43 15 Cal.App.3d 897 9
44
45 *People v. Bell* (1989)
46 49 Cal.3d 502 14

