

MARA W. ELLIOTT, City Attorney
M. TRAVIS PHELPS, Assistant City Attorney
MATTHEW L. ZOLLMAN, Deputy City Attorney (CSBN 288966)
Office of the City Attorney
1200 Third Avenue, Suite 1100
San Diego, California 92101-4100
Telephone: (619) 533-5800
Facsimile: (619) 533-5856

Attorneys for Defendants City of San Diego and San Diego
Chief of Police David Nisleit

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES FAHR; DESIREE BERGMAN;) Case No. 21cv1676 BAS (BGS)
COLIN RUDOLPH; SAN DIEGO)
COUNTY GUN OWNERS PAC; AND) **JOINT STATUS REPORT**
FIREARMS POLICY COALITION,)
INC.,)

Plaintiffs,

) Judge: Hon. Cynthia Bashant
) Court Room: 4B
) Trial: Not Set

v.

CITY OF SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA)
AND DAVID NISLEIT, IN HIS)
OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS CHIEF OF)
POLICE OF SAN DIEGO CITY,)
CALIFORNIA,)

Defendants.

This matter was stayed for a period of days effective July 25, 2022, pending further proceedings in the appeal from the judgment in *Roger Palmer, et al. v. Stephen Sisolak, et al.*, 3:21-cv-02680-MMD-CSD (D. Nev.), Ninth Circuit Case No. 22-15645.

The Ninth Circuit heard oral argument on May 9, 2023, and issued an Order on May 26, 2023, retaining jurisdiction over the case while remanding to the

1 district court for the limited purpose of developing a record and making findings as
 2 to: (1) whether A.B. 286 conforms to “this Nation’s historical tradition of firearm
 3 regulation,” (2) whether it is possible in Nevada to lawfully add a serial number to a
 4 self-manufactured unserialized firearm and/or unfinished frame or receiver, and if
 5 so, how and under what circumstances; (3) whether it is possible in Nevada to
 6 lawfully obtain serialized self-manufacturing and/or self-assembly firearm kits, and
 7 if so, how and under what circumstances; and (4) what kind of self-manufacturing
 8 Plaintiffs want to engage in.

9 On July 24, 2023, the parties in *Palmer* filed a joint status report in the
 10 district court proposing a discovery plan to develop the record discussed in the
 11 Ninth Circuit’s Order. The proposed plan recommends three months of fact
 12 discovery, three months of expert discovery, and one month to develop proposed
 13 findings of fact. The Court has not yet adopted or otherwise responded to the
 14 parties’ proposal.

15 The parties in this case agree that the stay should remain in effect until the
 16 proceedings in the Ninth Circuit have concluded, for the same reasons that the case
 17 was stayed in the first instance.

18
 19 Dated: November 6, 2023

20 Respectfully submitted,

21 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

22 THE DIGUISEPPE LAW FIRM, P.C. DILLON LAW GROUP, APC

23
 24 /s/ Raymond M. DiGuiseppe
 Raymond M. DiGuiseppe
 25 THE DIGUISEPPE LAW FIRM, P.C.
 26 116 N. Howe Street, Suite A
 Southport, NC 28461
 27 P: 910-713-8804
 28 E: law.rmd@gmail.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

/s/ John W. Dillon
 John W. Dillon
 DILLON LAW GROUP, APC
 2647 Gateway Rd., Ste 105 #255
 Carlsbad, CA 92009
 P: 760.642.7150
 E: jdillon@dillonlawgp.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
 2

Attorneys for Defendants

MARA W. ELLIOTT, CITY ATTORNEY

/s/ Matthew L. Zollman

Matthew L. Zollman

Deputy City Attorney

1200 Third Avenue, Suite 1100

San Diego, CA 92101

P: (619) 533-5800

E: mzollman@sandiego.gov

Attorneys for Defendants

CERTIFICATION

I certify that I have obtained authorization to affix to this document the electronic signatures of the above-listed signatories, pursuant to Section 2(f)(4) of the Electronic Case Filing Administrative Policies and Procedures Manual.

Dated: November 6, 2023

/s/Matthew L. Zollman

Matthew L. Zollman