

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 MICHELLE NGUYEN, an individual;  
12 DOMINIC BOGUSKI, an individual;  
13 JAY MEDINA, an individual; FRANK  
14 COLLETTI, an individual; JOHN  
15 PHILLIPS, an individual; PWGG, L.P.,  
16 a California Limited Partnership;  
17 DARIN PRINCE, an individual;  
18 NORTH COUNTY SHOOTING  
19 CENTER, INC., a California  
20 Corporation; FIREARMS POLICY  
21 COALITION, INC.; SAN DIEGO  
22 COUNTY GUN OWNERS PAC; and  
23 SECOND AMENDMENT  
24 FOUNDATION,

19 Plaintiffs,

20 v.

21 ROB BONTA, in his official capacity as  
22 Attorney General of California; and  
23 LUIS LOPEZ, Director of the Attorney  
24 General's Department of Justice Bureau  
25 of Firearms,

24 Defendants.

Case No. 3:20-cv-02470-WQH-MDD

**ORDER**

26 HAYES, Judge:

27 On December 18, 2020, Plaintiffs initiated this action by filing a Complaint  
28 challenging the enforcement of California Penal Code Section 27535, which restricts

1 the purchase of more than one handgun or semiautomatic centerfire rifle by a single  
 2 person within a thirty-day period. (ECF No. 1). Plaintiffs bring two claims against  
 3 Defendants pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983 for violation of Plaintiffs' rights under the  
 4 Second and Fourteenth Amendments.

5 On April 8, 2022, Plaintiffs and Defendants filed respective Motions for  
 6 Summary Judgment. (ECF Nos. 23, 29). Both motions contend that the Court should  
 7 apply *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 554 U.S. 570 (2008) and the "two-step  
 8 framework" articulated by the Court of Appeals in adjudicating Plaintiffs' Second  
 9 Amendment claim. (See ECF Nos. 23-1 at 15-17, ECF No. 29 at 20).

10 On June 23, 2022, the United States Supreme Court issued *New York Rifle &*  
 11 *Pistol Assn., Inc. v. Bruen*, 597 U.S. \_\_\_, 2022 WL 2251305 (2022). The Court finds  
 12 that additional briefing regarding the effect of *Bruen* on the resolution of the parties'  
 13 Motions for Summary Judgment is appropriate.


14 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs and Defendants shall each file a  
 15 supplemental brief addressing the following questions:

- 16 1) What standard applies to Plaintiffs' Second Amendment claim after *Bruen*?
- 17 2) How does that standard apply to resolve the Motions for Summary
- 18 Judgment (ECF Nos. 23, 29)?

19 The parties' supplemental briefs are due on or before July 29, 2022, and are not to  
 20 exceed twenty (20) pages in length. On the same date the parties may file any  
 21 evidence not already presented to the Court in support of the supplemental briefs.

22 IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that on or before August 12, 2022, Plaintiffs and  
 23 Defendants may each file a response to the opposing parties' supplemental brief, not  
 24 to exceed ten (10) pages in length.

25 Dated: June 30, 2022

  
 26 Hon. William Q. Hayes  
 27 United States District Court  
 28