



**Post-Heller Litigation Summary Appendix: Ongoing Second Amendment Civil Litigation**  
Updated 7/2/12

The chart below lists significant pending federal and state civil cases involving Second Amendment challenges to federal, state, and local firearms laws and practices. The cases are organized in categories based on the types of laws being challenged. Please note that suits challenging laws in more than one category appear under one category only in the chart below.

Case Name/Number	Challenged Jurisdiction	Nature of Second Amendment Challenge	Status of Litigation
<b>Licensing and Registration</b>			
<i>Bauer v. Harris</i> No. 11-01440	California	Challenging state law that permits the California Department of Justice to levy fees on the purchase and transfer of firearms.	An amended complaint was filed on 2/9/12, which the defendants answered on 3/8/12. A scheduling conference is scheduled to take place on 8/9/12.
<i>Ezell v. City of Chicago</i> No. 10-5135	Chicago, IL	Challenging prohibition on firearm ranges and requirement that residents complete an hour of range training in order to receive a city firearms permit	On 7/6/11, the Seventh Circuit reversed a district court order denying the plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction and remanded the case to the district court. On 9/29/11, the district court denied the defendant's motion to dismiss the plaintiffs' case as moot, and on 10/26/11, it denied the plaintiffs' motion to enjoin enforcement of the City's new ordinance regulating firing ranges. The defendant filed an answer to the plaintiffs' amended complaint on 11/16/11. Discovery is currently ongoing and, following an extension, fact discovery is to be completed by 8/13/12. The judge recently denied the plaintiffs' motion to quash subpoenas, and the plaintiffs' motion to compel discovery responses was granted in part and denied in part on 5/10/12.

<p><i>Heller v. District of Columbia</i> ("Heller II") No. 10-7036 No. 08-1289</p>	<p>Washington, DC</p>	<p>Challenging laws establishing certain registration requirements and prohibiting registration of assault weapons and large capacity ammunition magazines</p>	<p>On 10/4/11, the D.C. Circuit affirmed the judgment of the district court holding that the District of Columbia's prohibition against assault weapons and large capacity magazines is constitutional and that District law requiring basic registration of handguns is constitutional. The circuit court vacated the district court's judgment upholding the constitutionality of District law requiring the basic registration of long guns and additional registration-related requirements for all firearms, remanding the case back to the district court for further proceedings. On 5/14/12, notice of the District's passage of the Firearms Emergency Amendment Act of 2012 was filed in the court. The Act repeals numerous requirements that the plaintiffs are challenging.</p>
<p><i>Illinois Ass'n of Firearms Retailers v. City of Chicago</i> (Previously <i>Benson v. City of Chicago</i>) No. 10-4184</p>	<p>Chicago, IL</p>	<p>Challenging ordinance adopted following the <i>McDonald</i> decision, including provisions prohibiting the sale of firearms, the carrying of firearms outside of the home, the registration of unsafe handguns, and the possession of more than one operable firearm, and provisions establishing firearm training and minimum age requirements</p>	<p>The defendants' motion to dismiss Count V of the complaint was denied on 1/19/12. On 11/17/11, the parties filed a joint statement to dismiss Count III of the complaint (challenging the prior ban on privately-owned firing ranges) as moot. The parties have also filed a joint statement with regard to Count VI of the complaint. On 3/2/12, the defendants filed a motion for summary judgment. On 5/24/12, the court denied the defendants' motion requesting that briefing on the motion for summary judgment be stayed pending Seventh Circuit decisions in <i>Shepard v. Madigan</i> and <i>Moore v. Madigan</i>, which the plaintiffs opposed. Following a deadline extension, defendants filed a reply brief in support of their motion for summary judgment on 6/29/12.</p>
<p><i>Kwong v. Bloomberg</i> No. 12-1578</p>	<p>New York, NY</p>	<p>Challenging New York City's handgun licensing scheme, which requires payment of a \$340 fee for issuance or renewal of a 3-year "Residence Premises" handgun license</p>	<p>On 3/26/12, the district court granted the defendants' and Intervenor's cross-motions for summary judgment, finding that the licensing fee does not violate the Second Amendment. The plaintiffs have appealed the decision to the Second Circuit where the plaintiffs-appellants filed their opening brief on 6/29/12.</p>

<p><i>Lane v. Holder</i> No. 11-1847</p>	<p>United States and Virginia</p>	<p>Challenging federal law prohibiting the transfer or receipt of firearms acquired outside of one's state of residence except through a federally licensed dealer. Also challenging District law requiring that all firearms brought into the District be registered with the assistance of a federally licensed in-District dealer.</p>	<p>Following a district court order denying the plaintiffs' motion for preliminary injunction and dismissing the action, the plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal to the Fourth Circuit. The District of Columbia has been dismissed from the case pursuant to consent of both parties. Appellate court briefing is complete, and oral arguments have not yet been scheduled.</p>
<p><i>Mishaga v. Monken</i> No. 10-3187</p>	<p>State of Illinois</p>	<p>Challenging state requirement for Firearm Owner Identification Card in order to possess a firearm (challenge brought by non-resident seeking to possess a firearm while staying in an Illinois home)</p>	<p>Following a district court order denying the defendants' motion to dismiss on 11/22/10, the parties filed cross-motions for summary judgment on 10/3/11. Briefing on the motions is complete, and a decision is pending.</p>
<p><i>Second Amendment Arms v. City of Chicago</i> No. 10-4257</p>	<p>Chicago, IL</p>	<p>Challenging ordinance adopted following the <i>McDonald</i> decision, including all of the provisions at issue in <i>Benson</i> and numerous additional provisions</p>	<p>Following the Seventh Circuit's recent decision in <i>Ezell</i> and Chicago's amendment of its firearms laws, the plaintiffs filed a second amended complaint on 9/9/11. On 11/4/11, the defendants filed a partial motion to dismiss the second amended complaint. Briefing on the motion is complete.</p>
<p><i>West Virginia Citizens Defense League, Inc. v. City of Charleston</i> No. 11-48</p>	<p>Charleston, Dunbar, and South Charleston, WV</p>	<p>Challenging local ordinances requiring handgun registration, prohibiting the sale of more than one handgun within a 30-day period, requiring 72-hour waiting period for completion of sale, prohibiting the purchase of a firearm by a person who has received voluntary mental health treatment or has pending criminal charges, and prohibiting carrying of a firearm without a license (or carrying in certain areas)</p>	<p>Defendants' motion to dismiss the complaint is awaiting a ruling by the court. As directed by a court order dated 7/1/11, the parties filed supplemental briefs in July on the applicability of the Pullman Doctrine in order to determine whether an unsettled question of state law could dispose of the case. The case has been stayed since 5/19/11, with the exception of briefing on Pullman Abstention, pending a decision on the motion to dismiss.</p>

Carrying of Firearms			
<i>Baker v. Kealoha</i> No. 11-00528	State of Hawaii; City and County of Honolulu	Challenging state restrictions on transporting and carrying firearms without a license and alleging that state law vesting licensing authorities with “sole and absolute discretion” to deny licenses violates the Second Amendment	Plaintiffs filed the complaint on 8/30/11 and filed a motion for preliminary injunction on the same day. The defendants filed a motion to dismiss the complaint on 9/21/11 and filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings on 9/28/11. At a hearing on 3/21/12, the court denied the plaintiffs’ motion for preliminary injunction, granted the state defendants’ motion for judgment on the pleadings, and granted in part and denied in part the Honolulu defendants’ motion to dismiss. The plaintiffs filed a Notice of Appeal on 6/3/12. The appellants have indicated that they are likely to request a stay pending the outcome in <i>Richards v. Prieto</i> .
<i>Birdt v. Beck</i> No. 12-55115 No. 10-8377	Los Angeles, CA	Challenging the denial of plaintiff’s application for concealed handgun license	On 1/13/12, the district court granted the defendants’ motion for summary judgment. The plaintiffs have appealed the decision to the Ninth Circuit, where plaintiffs-appellants filed their opening brief on 5/26/12. Defendants-appellees’ answering brief is due by 07/25/12, and appellant’s optional reply brief is due 14 days after service of the answering brief.
<i>Bonidy v. United States Postal Service</i> No. 10-2408	United States	Challenging USPS regulation prohibiting the carrying of firearms on postal property (plaintiffs are concealed carry permit holders)	Following a hearing on 11/18/11, the district court denied the defendants’ motion to dismiss the second amended complaint. The defendants filed an answer on 12/9/11. Dispositive motions are due by 9/28/12.
<i>Campbell v. Worthy</i> No. 12-11496	County of Wayne, MI; City of Harper Woods, MI	Challenging a Michigan law that prohibits the carrying of a concealed firearm in a motor vehicle without a license	The complaint was filed on 4/3/12.
<i>GeorgiaCarry.org v. Georgia</i> No. 11-10387	Upson County, GA; State of Georgia	Challenging a state law prohibiting the possession of firearms in places of worship	Plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal in the Eleventh Circuit on 1/26/11, following a district court order granting the defendants’ motion to dismiss. The matter has been fully briefed, and oral arguments were held on 10/6/11. A decision is pending.
<i>Hightower v. City of Boston</i> No. 11-2281 No. 08-11955	Boston, MA; State of Boston (As intervener)	Challenging revocation of plaintiff’s license, which entitled her to possess firearms and carry concealed guns in public places	On 9/29/11, the district court denied the plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment and granted the defendants’ motion for summary judgment. The plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal in the First Circuit on 11/2/11. Appellate court briefing is complete, and oral arguments took place on 6/6/12. A decision is pending.

<i>Jackson v. King</i> No. 12-00421	State of New Mexico	Challenging a New Mexico law that restricts the issuance of permits to carry concealed firearms to United States citizens	The complaint was filed on 4/21/12.
<i>Jacobs v. Reed</i> No. 10-913	San Jose, CA; Santa Clara County, CA; State of California	Challenging state law prohibiting the carrying of a concealed weapon without a permit and state law vesting discretion in issuing permits with local law enforcement	The case had been stayed pending the Ninth Circuit's en banc decision in <i>Nordyke</i> . There has been no change since the en banc court issued its decision in <i>Nordyke</i> in June.
<i>Kachalsky v. Cacace</i> No. 11-3642	Westchester County, NY; State of New York	Challenging state law requiring showing of good cause for issuance of concealed carry permit	On 9/2/11, the district court denied the defendants' motion to dismiss and the plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment and granted the defendants' cross-motion for summary judgment. The plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal in the Second Circuit on 9/7/11, and the defendants filed a cross-appeal on denial of their motion to dismiss. Briefing is complete, and oral arguments are scheduled to take place on 8/22/12. In the meantime, on 6/6/12, the court requested that the parties submit supplemental briefing on the impact of the Second Circuit's recent decision in <i>United States v. Decastro</i> .
<i>Mehl v. Blanas</i> No. 08-15773	Sacramento County, CA; State of California	Challenging the denial of plaintiff's application for concealed handgun license by County sheriff	The case was argued before the Ninth Circuit on 6/11/09. The appeal has been withdrawn from submission pending the Ninth Circuit's decision in <i>Nordyke v. King</i> .
<i>Moore v. Madigan</i> No. 12-01269 No. 11-3134	State of Illinois	Challenging law prohibiting the carrying of handguns (either openly or concealed) in public places	On 2/3/12, the district court denied the plaintiffs' motion for an injunction and dismissed the suit. The plaintiffs have appealed the decision to the 7th Circuit, where briefing is complete. Oral arguments took place on 6/8/12, on the same day as, and before the same panel that heard arguments in, <i>Moore v. Madigan</i> . A decision is pending.

<p><i>Nordyke v. King</i> No. 07-15763</p>	<p>Alameda County, CA</p>	<p>Challenging ordinance prohibiting firearm possession on County property</p>	<p>On 5/2/11, the Ninth Circuit affirmed the district court's grant of summary judgment on the appellees' First Amendment and equal protection claims but vacated the district court's denial of leave to amend the complaint, remanding the case back to the district court for further proceedings. However, on 11/28/11, the Ninth Circuit granted the plaintiffs-appellees' petition for rehearing en banc. Following oral arguments before the en banc panel, the court ordered the parties into mediation, which proved fruitless. Thereafter, on 6/1/12, the en banc panel published a decision affirming the district court's dismissal of all constitutional claims. On 6/15/12, the court denied the appellants' motion to modify the en banc panel's opinion to include instructions to the trial court regarding imposition of sanctions in the event the County fails to honor its reading of the ordinance. On 6/22/12, the appellants filed a motion to stay and/or recall the mandate to the lower court to allow the appellate court to retain jurisdiction to address further substantive issues.</p>
<p><i>Palmer v. District of Columbia</i> No. 09-1482</p>	<p>Washington, DC</p>	<p>Challenging laws prohibiting the open or concealed carrying of handguns</p>	<p>Summary judgment motions were argued before the district court on 1/22/10, and a decision has been taken under advisement. On 5/24/12, the defendants filed a supplemental memo in support of its motion for summary judgment, in response to which the plaintiffs filed a motion to strike the supplemental memo.</p>
<p><i>Peruta v. County of San Diego</i> No. 10-56971</p>	<p>San Diego, CA</p>	<p>Challenging sheriff's denial of an application for a license to carry a concealed weapon and the licensing requirements of good cause and of a duration of residency within a jurisdiction</p>	<p>The case is currently on appeal to the Ninth Circuit following a district court order granting the defendants' motion for summary judgment. The matter has been fully briefed, and a decision is pending. On 12/20/11, the court issued an order staying proceedings pending an en banc decision in <i>Nordyke</i>. On 6/25/12, the court granted the appellant's motion requesting relief from stay.</p>
<p><i>Peterson v. Garcia</i> (previously <i>Peterson v. LaCabe</i>) No. 11-1149</p>	<p>Denver, CO; State of Colorado</p>	<p>Challenging residency requirement for the issuance of a concealed carry permit</p>	<p>Plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal to the Tenth Circuit on 4/8/11 following a district court order that awarded summary judgment to the Intervenor Attorney General and denied the plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment. The matter has been fully briefed, and oral arguments were held on 11/17/11. Continued oral arguments took place on 3/19/12, with time specifically allotted to the amici. A decision is pending.</p>

<p><i>Piszczatoski v. Filko (f/k/a Muller v. Maenza)</i> No. 12-1150 No. 10-6110</p>	<p>Morris, Passaic, and Bergen Counties, Hammonton, and Montville, NJ; State of New Jersey</p>	<p>Challenging state laws establishing discretionary concealed handgun permitting system and requiring a showing of “justifiable need” or “urgent necessity” for a permit’s issuance</p>	<p>On 1/12/12, the district court granted the defendants’ motion to dismiss the suit, and the plaintiffs have appealed the decision to the Third Circuit. The plaintiffs-appellants have filed their opening brief, and the defendants-appellees have filed their response brief.</p>
<p><i>Pizzo v. Newsom</i> No. 09-4493</p>	<p>San Francisco, CA; State of California</p>	<p>Challenging state law granting local law enforcement discretion in the issuance of licenses to carry concealed weapons and ordinances requiring safe storage of handguns, prohibiting the discharge of firearms, and prohibiting the sale of certain ammunition that “serves no sporting purpose” or is designed to expand or fragment upon impact</p>	<p>Discovery has just been completed. The plaintiffs have filed a motion for summary judgment, in response to which the defendants have filed a brief in opposition. Plaintiffs must file their reply brief by 7/5/12.</p>
<p><i>Richards v. Prieto</i> No. 11-16255</p>	<p>Yolo County, CA</p>	<p>Challenging the denial of plaintiffs’ applications for concealed handgun licenses by County sheriff</p>	<p>The plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal to the Ninth Circuit following a district court order denying the plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment and granting the defendants’ motion for summary judgment. The matter has been briefed in full, and a decision is pending. On 12/20/11, the court stayed the case pending an en banc decision in <i>Nordyke</i>. On 5/25/12, the appellants filed a motion asking the court to keep <i>Richards</i> on the same schedule as <i>Peruta</i> so that the two cases can be argued before the same 9th Cir. panel. On 6/19/12 court granted the appellants' motion requesting relief from the stay.</p>
<p><i>Rothery v. Sacramento</i> No. 09-16852</p>	<p>Sacramento County, CA; State of California</p>	<p>Challenging the denial of plaintiff’s application for concealed handgun license by County sheriff</p>	<p>A district court order denying plaintiffs’ motion to dismiss has been appealed to the Ninth Circuit, where the plaintiffs-appellants have filed their opening brief. The matter is presently stayed pending a decision in <i>Mehl v. Blanas</i>.</p>
<p><i>Shepard v. Madigan</i> No. 11-405</p>	<p>State of Illinois</p>	<p>Challenging laws prohibiting the carrying of handguns (either openly or concealed) in public places</p>	<p>On 3/30/12, the district court granted the defendants’ motion to dismiss the action, finding that the laws do not violate the Second Amendment. The plaintiffs appealed the decision to the Seventh Circuit, where briefing is complete. Oral arguments took place on 6/8/12, on the same day as, and before the same panel that heard arguments in, <i>Moore v. Madigan</i>. A decision is pending.</p>

<p><i>Wisconsin Carry Inc. v. Wray (City of Madison)</i> No. 10-548</p>	<p>Madison, WI</p>	<p>Challenging police conduct related to open carrying by plaintiffs</p>	<p>A district court order dated 4/4/11 granted the defendants' motion to dismiss, but allowed the plaintiffs to file an amended complaint and allowed both parties to file briefs on the justiciability of the plaintiffs' claims. Following briefing by plaintiffs and defendants, the court ordered that the justiciability question had been resolved and accepted plaintiffs' amended complaint on 7/15/11. On 3/28/12, the court granted the parties' stipulated motion to dismiss the case as moot.</p>
<p><i>Woollard v. Gallagher (f/k/a Woollard v. Sheridan)</i> No. 10-2068</p>	<p>State of Maryland</p>	<p>Challenging state law requiring the demonstration of cause prior to the issuance of a concealed carry permit</p>	<p>On 3/5/12, the court filed an order granting the plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment and denying the defendants' motion for summary judgment. On 3/30/12, the court granted the defendants' motion for clarification or amendment of judgment and requested additional briefing on the defendants' motion to stay enforcement of the 3/5/12 order pending appeal. On 4/2/12, the defendants appealed the court's orders dated 3/5/12 and 3/30/12 to the Fourth Circuit. The appellants filed their opening brief on 6/21/12, and numerous amici have filed briefs in support of the appellants. The appellees' response brief is due by 7/16/12.</p>
<p><b>Safe Storage/Discharge of Firearms</b></p>			
<p><i>Jackson v. City and County of San Francisco</i> No. 09-2143</p>	<p>San Francisco, CA</p>	<p>Challenging ordinances requiring safe storage of handguns, prohibiting the discharge of firearms, and prohibiting the sale of certain ammunition that "serves no sporting purpose" or is designed to expand or fragment upon impact</p>	<p>On 9/27/11, the court denied the defendants' motion to dismiss for lack of standing and granted leave to amend the moot standing claim. The plaintiffs declined to file an amended complaint, and the defendants filed an answer on 10/17/11. On 12/21/11, the court denied the plaintiffs' motion to strike the defendants' defenses relating to standing and ripeness. On 5/17/12, the plaintiffs filed a Motion for Partial Judgment on the Pleadings and Request for Judicial Notice. Briefing on the motions is complete, and a hearing on the motion is scheduled to take place on 7/12/12. All pretrial motions must be filed and served no later than 12/13/12.</p>
<p><b>Waiting Periods</b></p>			
<p><i>Silvester (a.k.a. Sylvester) v. Harris</i> No. 11-02137</p>	<p>State of California</p>	<p>Challenging state law that requires a firearm purchaser to wait ten days before receiving a newly-acquired firearm</p>	<p>The plaintiffs filed an amended complaint on 2/24/12, which the defendants answered on 3/15/12. Non-dispositive motions must be filed by 9/25/13; dispositive motions must be filed by 10/30/13; and a pretrial conference is scheduled to take place on 1/29/14.</p>

Classes of Weapons			
<p><i>Haynie v. Harris</i> No. 10-1255 (consolidated with <i>Richards v. Harris</i> No. 11-2493, and related to <i>Richards v. Harris</i> (“II”) No. 11-05580) and , <i>Plog-Horowitz v. Harris</i> (No. 12-0452)</p>	<p>State of California</p>	<p>Challenging law prohibiting possession of unregistered assault weapons on the grounds that the definition of “assault weapons” in unconstitutionally vague</p>	<p>On 10/21/11, the court granted defendant City of Pleasanton’s consolidated motion to dismiss the complaint in <i>Richards v. Harris</i> “I” (No. 11-2493) and <i>Haynie v. Harris</i> (No. 10-1255), holding that the plaintiffs did not have standing to sue and that their claims were not ripe for review. The plaintiffs filed an amended consolidated complaint on 11/4/11. On 12/21/11, the district court ordered that a third case, <i>Richards v. Harris</i> “II” (No. 11-05580), be related to the other <i>Harris</i> cases. On 3/1/12, the court granted the parties’ joint motion to relate a fourth case, <i>Plog-Horowitz v. Harris</i> (No. 12-0452) to the <i>Harris</i> cases.</p> <p>The defendants in <i>Richard v. Harris</i> “I” and <i>Haynie v. Harris</i> (No. 11-2493) and (No. 10-1255) filed a motion to dismiss two counts of the complaint on 12/23/11, and a hearing on the motion is pending.</p>
<p><i>Maloney v. Rice</i> No. 03-786</p>	<p>Nassau County, NY</p>	<p>Challenging state law prohibiting the possession of nunchaku (wooden stick weapon)</p>	<p>The matter was vacated and remanded to the district court following <i>McDonald</i>. Plaintiff has filed, and defendant has answered, a second amended complaint. Discovery is ongoing.</p>
<p><i>Pena v. Cid</i> No. 09-1185</p>	<p>State of California</p>	<p>Challenging law prohibiting the sale of any unsafe handgun (any handgun not included on a state roster of handguns meeting certain safety requirements)</p>	<p>The matter was stayed pending the Ninth Circuit's decision in <i>Nordyke v. King</i>. Although the parties had been ordered to file a joint status report within 10 days of a decision in <i>Nordyke</i>, on 6/8/12, the parties requested that the court continue the stay pending a decision on the post-disposition motion that is currently pending in <i>Nordyke</i>.</p>

<p>Richards v. Harris No. 11-2493 (consolidated with Haynie v. Harris No. 10-1255, and related to Richards v. Harris ("II") No. 11-05580) and , Plog-Horowitz v. Harris (No. 12-0452)</p>	<p>State of California; City of Rohnert Park, CA</p>	<p>Challenging law prohibiting possession of unregistered assault weapons on the grounds that the definition of "assault weapons" in unconstitutionally vague</p>	<p>The complaint was filed on 5/20/11. For additional information, see consolidated case <i>Haynie v. Harris</i>, above.</p>
<p><i>Richards v. Harris</i> ("II") No. 11-05580</p>	<p>State of California; Sonoma County, CA Sheriff's Office</p>	<p>Challenging law prohibiting possession of unregistered assault weapons on the grounds that the definition of "assault weapons" in unconstitutionally vague</p>	<p>The complaint was filed on 11/17/11. A case management conference scheduled in the case has been continued pending a decision on the motion to dismiss in related cases <i>Richards v. Harris "I"</i> and <i>Haynie v. Harris</i>, above.</p>
<p><i>Plog-Horowitz v. Harris</i> No. 12-0452</p>	<p>State of California, City of Cotati, CA</p>	<p>Challenging law prohibiting possession of unregistered assault weapons on the grounds that the definition of "assault weapons" in unconstitutionally vague</p>	<p>The complaint was filed on 1/27/12. A case management conference scheduled in the case has been continued pending a decision on the motion to dismiss in related cases <i>Richards v. Harris "I"</i> and <i>Haynie v. Harris</i>, above.</p>
<p><i>Wilson v. Cook County</i> No. 112026</p>	<p>Cook County, Illinois</p>	<p>Challenging ordinance prohibiting the possession or sale of any assault weapon or large capacity magazine</p>	<p>On 5/25/11, the Supreme Court of Illinois announced that it would hear an appeal of the appellate court decision affirming the trial court's dismissal of suit. Plaintiffs-appellants filed their opening brief in the Supreme Court on 7/29/11, and the defendants-appellees filed their response brief on 11/18/11. Oral arguments took place on 1/18/12, and a decision is pending.</p>

**Prohibited from Purchasing/Possessing Firearms**

<p><i>Dearth v. Holder</i> No. 09-00587</p>	<p>United States</p>	<p>Challenging plaintiff's inability to purchase and receive firearms under federal law due to his lack of residence within any state (as a United States citizen who resides in Canada)</p>	<p>Following the district court's dismissal of suit for lack of standing, plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal to the D.C. Circuit. On 4/15/11, the D.C. Circuit reversed the district court's decision and remanded the case for further proceedings. In the district court, the plaintiffs have filed a motion for summary judgment, and the defendants have filed a motion for judgment on the pleadings or, in the alternative, for summary judgment. Briefing on the motions is ongoing.</p>
<p><i>Enos v. Holder</i> No. 10-02911</p>	<p>United States</p>	<p>Challenging federal law imposing a lifetime ban on handgun acquisition and possession for domestic violence misdemeanants, alleging that it conflicts with a California law that imposes a ten-year ban on firearm acquisition and possession by domestic violence misdemeanants.</p>	<p>On 2/28/12, the federal district court granted the defendants' motion to dismiss the suit, holding that the law does not violate the Second Amendment. The plaintiffs have filed a notice of appeal to the Ninth Circuit. The appellants opening brief is due by 7/9/12; appellees' answering brief is due by 8/8/12; and appellants' reply brief is due 14 days after service of the answering brief.</p>
<p><i>Fisher v. Kealoha</i> No. 11-00589</p>	<p>City and County of Honolulu</p>	<p>Challenging Honolulu law enforcement officers' exercise of discretion in denying state licenses to purchase firearms.</p>	<p>On 4/19/12, following a hearing, the judge granted in part and denied in part the defendants' motion to dismiss and granted in part and denied in part the plaintiff's motion to dismiss. Among the claims the judge is allowing to proceed is the plaintiff's Second Amendment claim against the defendants. On 6/29/12, the court granted the plaintiff's motion for a preliminary injunction based in part upon a finding that the plaintiff is likely to succeed on the merits of his Second Amendment claim.</p>
<p><i>NRA v. McCraw</i> (previously <i>Jennings v. McCraw</i> and <i>D'Cruz v. McCraw</i>) No. 12-10091 No. 10-141</p>	<p>State of Texas</p>	<p>Challenging state law requiring an individual to be 21 years old (or above the age of 18 with military service) in order to acquire a concealed carry permit</p>	<p>On 1/19/12, the court granted the defendants' motion for summary judgment and denied the plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, finding that the Second Amendment does not extend outside of the home. The plaintiffs have filed a notice of appeal to the Fifth Circuit. The opening brief of the plaintiffs-appellants was filed on 3/21/12, and the defendants-appellees' filed their answering brief on 5/23/12.</p>

<p><i>NRA v. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives</i> (previously <i>Jennings v. ATF and D’Cruz v. ATF</i>) No. 11-10959 No. 10-140</p>	<p>United States</p>	<p>Challenging the federal law requiring that a person be 21 in order to purchase a handgun</p>	<p>On 10/4/11, following a district court order granting the defendants’ motion for summary judgment, the plaintiffs filed a notice of appeal to the Fifth Circuit. Briefing is complete, and oral arguments are tentatively scheduled to take place during the week of 7/9/12.</p>
<p><i>Schrader v. Holder</i> No. 11-05352 No. 10-1736</p>	<p>United States</p>	<p>Challenging plaintiff’s inability to purchase a firearm due to a misdemeanor assault conviction. (It appears that the conviction is being treated as a disqualifying offense in the federal NICS background check system because the underlying law did not provide a maximum sentence length.)</p>	<p>On 12/23/11, the district court granted the defendants’ motion to dismiss and denied the plaintiffs’ motion for summary judgment. The plaintiffs immediately appealed the decision to the D.C. Circuit. Appellate court briefing is complete.</p>
<p><i>Tyler v. Holder</i> No. 12-00523</p>	<p>United States; State of Michigan</p>	<p>Challenging federal law prohibiting firearm possession by anyone who has been involuntarily committed to a mental institution, and challenging policies of the U.S. government and State of Michigan preventing individuals who have been involuntarily committed to a mental institution from regaining their firearm rights.</p>	<p>The complaint was filed on 5/21/12.</p>
<p><i>Wilson v. Holder</i> No. 11-01679</p>	<p>United States</p>	<p>Challenging ATF regulations that classify medical marijuana card holders as unlawful users or addicts of a controlled substance. The complaint alleges that the classification prohibits sales of firearms to anyone holding a medical marijuana card under federal law and prohibits medical marijuana card holders from possessing firearms under federal law.</p>	<p>The complaint was filed on 10/18/11. On 2/7/12, the court granted the parties’ request to dismiss the individual defendants from the suit. Defendants have filed a motion to dismiss or in the alternative for summary judgment, and a decision is pending.</p>

<b>Restrictions on In-Home Possession</b>			
<i>Doe v. Wilmington Housing Authority</i> No. 10-473	State of Delaware	Challenging lease provision prohibiting possession of firearms in public housing	Oral arguments on plaintiffs' and defendants' cross-motions for summary judgment were held on 7/15/11. As requested during oral arguments, the parties submitted a joint letter addressing the interplay between state open and concealed carry laws on 7/22/11. The court has yet to rule on the summary judgment motions.
<i>Tribble v. State Bd. of Educ.</i> No. 2011-69	State of Idaho	Challenging state university housing agreement prohibiting the possession of firearms and ammunition in student housing	On December 7, the trial judge granted the defendants' motion for summary judgment, upholding the university's policy prohibiting guns in university-owned housing. On January 10, the plaintiff filed a notice of appeal to the Idaho Supreme Court.
<i>Winbigler v. Warren County Housing Authority</i> No. 12-04032	Warren County, Illinois	Challenging lease provisions that restrict the possession of firearms in public housing units administered by the Warren County Housing Authority	The complaint was filed on 4/3/12. The defendants answered the complaint on 5/29/12.
<b>Return of Seized Firearms</b>			
<i>Churchill v. Harris</i> No. 12-01740	State of California; City of San Francisco; City of Oakland, CA	Challenging the San Francisco Police Department's and Oakland Police Department's interpretations of CA law governing the return of seized firearms	The complaint was filed on 4/6/12. As stipulated by the parties, the case will proceed before a magistrate judge.
<b>Sale of Firearms</b>			
<i>Teixeira v. County of Alameda</i> No. 12-03288	County of Alameda, CA	Challenging County laws that prohibit the operation of any gun store within 500 feet of any school, liquor store, or restaurant.	The complaint was filed on 6/25/12.