

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

-----oo0oo-----

IVAN PENA, ROY VARGAS, DONA  
CROSTON, BRETT THOMAS, SECOND  
AMENDMENT FOUNDATION, INC.,  
and THE CALGUNS FOUNDATION,  
INC.,

2:09-cv-01185 FCD KJM

Plaintiffs,

v.

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

WILFREDO CID,

Defendant.

\_\_\_\_\_ /

-----oo0oo-----

This matter is before the court on defendant Wilfredo Cid's ("defendant" or "Cid") motion to dismiss plaintiff Ivan Pena, Roy Vargas, Dona Croston, Brett Thomas, Second Amendment Foundation, Inc., and The Calguns Foundation, Inc.'s (collectively, "plaintiffs") complaint. In addition to their opposition to defendant's motion, plaintiffs filed a Notice of Possible Relevant Authority, informing the court that the Ninth Circuit

1 was rehearing en banc the matter of Nordyke v. King, 575 F.3d 890  
2 (9th Cir. 2009) (granting petition for rehearing en banc). On  
3 September 28, 2009, the court issued a minute order directing the  
4 parties to file supplemental briefing regarding why this action  
5 should not be stayed. In their reply, plaintiffs request a stay  
6 pending resolution of the incorporation issue by either the  
7 Supreme Court of the Ninth Circuit, withdraw their pending motion  
8 for summary judgment, and seek an order allowing discovery to  
9 proceed. Defendant Cid requests that this order be stayed  
10 pending the Ninth Circuit's en banc decision in Nordyke v. King.  
11 For the reasons set forth below,<sup>1</sup> the court STAYS this action  
12 pending the Ninth Circuit's en banc decision in Nordyke v. King.

13 This case arises out of plaintiffs' challenge to the  
14 constitutionality of California's "Handgun Roster Scheme" set  
15 forth in California Penal Code §§ 12125-30. (Pls.' Am. Compl.,  
16 filed May 11, 2009, ¶¶ 12-25.) Plaintiffs allege that these  
17 sections violate the Second Amendment by banning access to  
18 handguns whose possession is constitutionally protected. (Id. ¶¶  
19 53-57.) Plaintiffs also allege that these limitations violate  
20 their rights to equal protection. (Id. ¶ 59.)

21 In June 2008, the Supreme Court issued its decision in  
22 District of Columbia v. Heller, 128 S. Ct. 2783 (2008), holding  
23 that the Second Amendment conferred an individual right to keep  
24 and bear arms and that statutes enacted in the District of  
25 Columbia violated those rights. The Court's decision in Heller,

---

26  
27 <sup>1</sup> Because oral argument will not be of material  
28 assistance, the court orders this matter submitted on the briefs.  
E.D. Cal. Local Rule 78-230(h).

1 however, did not address whether the Second Amendment is  
2 incorporated and thus, applies against states and local  
3 governments. In April 2009, the Ninth Circuit issued its  
4 decision in Nordyke v. King, 563 F.3d 439 (9th Cir. 2009),  
5 holding that the Due Process Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment  
6 incorporates the Second Amendment, but concluding that the  
7 ordinance at issue did not violate the plaintiffs' constitutional  
8 rights. In July 2009, the Ninth Circuit accepted the case for  
9 rehearing en banc and directed that "[t]he three-judge panel  
10 opinion shall not be cited as precedent by or to any court of the  
11 Ninth Circuit." Nordyke, 575 F.3d 890. The en banc panel heard  
12 oral argument on the matter on September 24, 2009. On September  
13 25, 2009, the court vacated submission, pending the Supreme  
14 Court's disposition of Maloney v. Rice, No. 08-1592, McDonald v.  
15 City of Chicago, 08-1521, and National Rifle Ass'n of America,  
16 Inc. v. City of Chicago, No. 08-1497. On September 30, 2009, the  
17 Supreme Court granted the petition for a writ of certiorari in  
18 McDonald. -- S. Ct. --, 2009 WL 1631802 (Sept. 30, 2009).

19 A district court has the discretionary power to control the  
20 disposition of the cases on its docket "in a manner which will  
21 promote economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and  
22 for the litigants." CMAX, Inc. v. Hall, 300 F.2d 265, 268 (9th  
23 Cir. 1962); see Landis v. N. Am. Co., 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936).  
24 How these objectives can be achieved "calls for the exercise of  
25 judgment, which must weigh competing interests and maintain an  
26 even balance." Landis, 299 U.S. at 254-55; see Lockyer v. Miran  
27 Corp., 398 F.3d 1098, 1110 (9th Cir. 2005) ("Where it is proposed  
28 that a pending proceeding be stayed, the competing interests

1 which will be affected by the granting or refusal to grant a stay  
2 must be weighed."). Such competing interests include "the  
3 possible damage which may result from the granting of a stay, the  
4 hardship or inequity which a party may suffer in being required  
5 to go forward, and the orderly course of justice measured in  
6 terms of the simplifying or complicating of issues, proof, and  
7 questions of law which could be expected to result from a stay."  
8 CMAX, 300 F.2d at 268.

9 "A trial court may, with propriety, find it is efficient for  
10 its own docket and the fairest course for the parties to enter a  
11 stay of an action before it, pending resolution of independent  
12 proceedings which bear upon the case." Lockyer, 398 F.3d at 1111  
13 (quoting Levy v. Certified Grocers of Cal., Ltd., 593 F.2d 857,  
14 863-64 (9th Cir. 1979); see Landis, 299 U.S. at 255 (rejecting as  
15 "too mechanical and narrow" the view that there is no power to  
16 stay a proceeding upon the outcome of a controversy to which the  
17 litigant is a stranger). These separate proceedings may be  
18 judicial, administrative, or arbitral in nature, and proper  
19 imposition of a stay does not require that the issues in such  
20 separate proceedings are necessarily controlling of the action  
21 before the court. Id. (quoting Levy, 593 F.2d at 863-64).  
22 However, "[a] stay should not be granted unless it appears likely  
23 the other proceedings will be concluded within a reasonable time  
24 in relation to the urgency of the claims presented to the court."  
25 Id. (quoting Levy, 593 F.2d at 864).

26 The issues to be addressed by the court in Nordyke are broad  
27 in scope and material to the case brought by plaintiffs.  
28 Specifically, a foundational issue in both Nordyke and in this

1 case is whether the Second Amendment is incorporated and thus,  
2 applicable to state and local governments. The issue of  
3 incorporation has been addressed by the Second and Seventh  
4 Circuits; in contrast to the Ninth Circuit's decision in Nordyke,  
5 these courts held that the Second Amendment was not incorporated.  
6 The Supreme Court granted certiorari in McDonald, one of the  
7 cases from the Seventh Circuit addressing this issue. Further,  
8 the en banc decision in Nordyke will also evaluate a firearms  
9 regulation in light of Heller and McDonald. Such evaluation will  
10 almost certainly provide crucial direction to the court in its  
11 analysis of the firearms regulation in this case.

12 **CONCLUSION**

13 For the foregoing reasons, this action is STAYED in its  
14 entirety pending the Ninth Circuit's en banc decision in Nordyke  
15 v. King. The parties shall submit a joint status report to the  
16 court within ten days of the Ninth Circuit's order.

17 IT IS SO ORDERED.

18 DATED: October 2, 2009

19 

20 

---

FRANK C. DAMRELL, JR.  
21 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28