

EXHIBIT "A"

1 Jason A. Davis (Calif. Bar No. 224250)
2 Davis & Associates
3 27201 Puerta Real, Suite 300
4 Mission Viejo, CA 92691
5 Tel 949.436.GUNS/Fax 949.288.6894
6 Email: Jason@CalGunLawyers.com

7 Donald E.J. Kilmer, Jr. (Calif. Bar No. 179986)
8 Law Office of Donald Kilmer, A.P.C.
9 1645 Willow Street, Suite 150
10 San Jose, CA 95125
11 408.364.84889/Fax 408.264.8487
12 Email: Don@DKLawOffice.com

13
14
15 **IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
16 **FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**
17 **FRESNO DIVISION**
18

19 JEFF SILVESTER, MICHAEL POESCHL,
20 BRANDON COMBS, THE CALGUNS
21 FOUNDATION, INC., a non-profit
22 organization, and THE SECOND
23 AMENDMENT FOUNDATION, INC., a
24 non-profit organization,

25 Plaintiffs,

26 vs.

27 KAMALA HARRIS, Attorney General of
28 California (in her official capacity), and
DOES 1 to 20,

Defendant.

Case No: 1:11-cv-02137-AWI-SKO

**PLAINTIFF BRANDON COMBS'S
RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT
KAMALA D. HARRIS'S FIRST SET OF
INTERROGATORIES**

1 broad and unduly burdensome. (*IPV, Inc. v. Mercantile Bank of Topeka* (D KS 1998) 179 FRD
2 316, 321 – Providing “every fact” could require “laborious, time-consuming analysis, search and
3 description of incidental, secondary, and perhaps irrelevant and trivial details.”)

4 RESPONSE: Without waiving the above referenced objection, Plaintiff states that, I
5 cannot adequately defend myself or my family with the firearms that are usually kept at home.
6 My need and desire to protect self and family extend beyond the home, and include other
7 locations such as boats, cars, businesses, and other locations.

8 Moreover, at any given time, my firearms may be: not immediately physically available
9 due to the firearm’s proximity to my physical location – both within the home and outside of the
10 home; underpowered for certain self-defense scenarios; over-powered for certain self-defense
11 scenarios; inoperable; stolen; broken; unclear for reliable operation or otherwise unreliable; out
12 for service; loaned to another individual for up to a 30 day period in accordance with California
13 law; there may be a lack of ammunition available for the current firearm; an act of terrorism may
14 make the firearm[s] owned by me insufficient to defend self, family, or home; riots and looting
15 may render the firearm[s] owned by me to be insufficient; earthquakes and other natural disasters
16 may render any and all firearms possessed by me to be insufficient for self-defense and defense
17 of others; temporary seizures of firearms lawfully possessed may render the firearms insufficient
18 for self-defense.

19 In fact, under the Militia Act of 1792, many were required to have more than one firearm
20 – “and to be armed with a sword and pair of pistols, the holsters of which to be covered with
21 bearskin caps.”

22
23 **INTERROGATORY NO. 7**

24 Identify and describe in full and complete detail all harms that you suffer by, per
25 California Penal Code sections 26815(a) and/or 27540, having to wait 10 days between
26 purchasing and taking delivery of a firearm.

27 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 7**

28 OBJECTION: Contention interrogatories asking for each and every fact, or application

1 316, 321 – Providing “every fact” could require “laborious, time-consuming analysis, search and
2 description of incidental, secondary, and perhaps irrelevant and trivial details.”]

3 RESPONSE: Plaintiff contends that there are circumstances in which California Penal
4 Code section 26815(a)’s “waiting period” (between purchase and delivery of a firearm) to first-
5 time firearm purchasers would be unconstitutional, such as applications of the provision to
6 women who have been abused and have obtained Temporary Restraining Orders for their
7 protection, but such contentions are not the subject of this litigation.

8 **INTERROGATORY NO. 9**

9 If you contend that it is unconstitutional to apply California Penal Code section 27540’s
10 “waiting period” (between purchase and delivery of a firearm) to first-time firearms purchasers,
11 state all facts supporting this contention.

12 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 9**

13 OBJECTION: Contention interrogatories asking for each and every fact, or application of
14 law to fact, that supports particular allegations in an opposing pleading may be held to be overly
15 broad and unduly burdensome. [*IPV, Inc. v. Mercantile Bank of Topeka* (D KS 1998) 179 FRD
16 316, 321 – Providing “every fact” could require “laborious, time-consuming analysis, search and
17 description of incidental, secondary, and perhaps irrelevant and trivial details.”]

18 RESPONSE: Without waiving the above referenced objection, Plaintiff contends that
19 there are circumstances in which California Penal Code section 26815(a)’s “waiting period”
20 (between purchase and delivery of a firearm) to first-time firearm purchasers would be
21 unconstitutional, such as applications of the provision to women who have been abused and have
22 obtained Temporary Restraining Orders for their protection, but such contentions are not the
23 subject of this litigation.

24
25 **INTERROGATORY NO. 10**

26 If you contend that California Penal Code section 26815(a) would be unconstitutional if
27 that law’s “waiting period” (between purchase and delivery of a firearm) was one day, state all
28 facts supporting this contention.

1 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 10**

2 **OBJECTION:** Contention interrogatories asking for each and every fact, or application of
3 law to fact, that supports particular allegations in an opposing pleading may be held to be overly
4 broad and unduly burdensome. [*IPV, Inc. v. Mercantile Bank of Topeka* (D KS 1998) 179 FRD
5 316, 321 – Providing “every fact” could require “laborious, time-consuming analysis, search and
6 description of incidental, secondary, and perhaps irrelevant and trivial details.”]

7 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving the above referenced objection, Plaintiff states that the
8 provisions are unconstitutional, to the extent that they would apply to an individual whose state
9 records (including the Automated Firearm System and Armed and Prohibited Database) identify
10 them as a person not prohibited from possessing firearms and already being the owner of a
11 registered firearm, in that they violate my Second, Fourth and Fifth Amendment rights. The
12 Second Amendment applies beyond merely the home. There are several cases pending in the
13 Ninth, Seventh, and Second Circuit Courts of Appeals relating to whether the Second
14 Amendment’s “right to [...] bear arms” for the purpose of self-defense extends beyond the home.
15 See generally: *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 554 U.S. 570(2008) and *McDonald v. City of*
16 *Chicago*, 130 S.Ct. 3020 (2010). There are currently two cases pending in the Ninth Circuit
17 Court of Appeals relating to California law: *Richards v. Prieto* (Yolo County), Case No.: 11-
18 16255 and *Peruta v. County of San Diego*, Case No.: 10-56971. These cases were argued and
19 submitted on December 6, 2012. The court in *Moore v. Madigan*, 2012 U.S. App. LEXIS (7th
20 Cir. Ill. Dec. 11, 2012) found that the right did extend beyond the home, but stayed its decision
21 to give the state legislature an opportunity to enact a licensing scheme. But the court in
22 *Kachalsky v. County of Westchester*, 2012 U.S. App. LEXIS 24363 (2nd Cir. N.Y. Nov. 27, 2012)
23 found that the right did not extend beyond the home. These Constitutional violations, both
24 within the home and outside the home, are supported by the following facts:

25 I am a holder of valid California Certificates of Eligibility and am, per se, not in a class of
26 persons described within Penal Code sections 29800, *et seq.*, 29900, *et seq.*, or Welfare and
27 Institutions Code sections 8100 or 8103, or Title 27 Part 178.32 of the Code of Federal
28 Regulations. 11 C.C.R. §4036(b). In other words, I and other holders of a valid California

1 Certificate of Eligibility represented by CGF and SAF are known by the State of California, at all
2 times certified, to not be prohibited from possessing firearms under federal or state law.

3 Additionally, I am a holder of a valid license to carry a concealed firearm. As a holder of
4 a valid license to carry pursuant to Penal Code section 26150 *et seq.* I and other such holders
5 represented by CGF and SAF are, per se, not in a class of persons described in Penal Code
6 sections 29800, *et seq.*, 29900, *et seq.*, or Welfare and Institutions Code 8100 or 8103. Penal
7 Code section 26195(a)-(b). In other words, I and other holders of a valid license to carry
8 pursuant to Penal Code section 26150, *et seq.* represented by CGF and SAF are not prohibited
9 from possessing firearms under federal or state law and may often be armed with a loaded
10 concealed firearm, including while purchasing firearms for which they are subjected to a 10-day
11 ban on possessing.

12 I already have at least one firearm, but I seek to have additional firearms for protection of
13 myself and my family, *inter alia*, pursuant to my Second Amendment right to "keep and bear
14 arms." (Emphasis added to note the use of the plural.) I can otherwise demonstrate proof of
15 ownership and lawful possession of a firearm. For example, some firearms are registered in the
16 California Automated Firearms System database pursuant to, *inter alia*, Penal Code section
17 28200, *et seq.* In purchasing my firearms, I was already at least once subjected to the 10-day
18 waiting period prior to physically receiving my firearms. As a result of the 10-day waiting
19 period, I was obligated to endure a 10-day ban on the acquisition of my constitutionally protected
20 firearms and incur additional expense and burden by being forced to make a second visit to the
21 firearms dealer that sold me my firearm.

22 Though I must wait 10 days to acquire possession of each firearm I purchase for self-
23 defense, others seeking commercial, professional, and personal acquisition of firearms, such as
24 destructive device collectors, movie prop houses, auction purchasers, and "consultants-
25 evaluators," are permitted instant access to firearms.

26 The National Instant Check System, located at the FBI's Criminal Justice Information
27 Services Division in Clarksburg, West Virginia, provides full and instant service to FFLs in 30
28 states, five U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia. California voluntarily opted out of the

1 NICS instant background check and maintains its own background check system with an
2 extended 10-day waiting period against purchasers of firearms in California, including myself.
3 Moreover, the Attorney General has established and maintains an online database known as the
4 Prohibited Armed Persons File. The purpose of the file is to cross-reference persons who have
5 ownership or possession of a firearm as indicated by a record in the Consolidated Firearm
6 Information System and who, subsequent to the date of that ownership or possession of a
7 firearm, fall within a class of persons who are prohibited from owning or possessing a firearm.
8 Penal Code §30000, *et seq.*

9 The information contained in the PAPF is available for the purpose of determining if
10 persons are armed and prohibited from possessing firearms. Penal Code §30000, *et seq.*
11 Conversely, the PAPF is also available for the purpose of determining if persons are armed and
12 not prohibited by the very nature of the individual not appearing in the PAPF – but appearing in
13 the Automated Firearm System as the registered owner of a firearm.

14 In fact, the California Department of Justice had determined alternative methods that
15 eliminate delays upon law-abiding firearm owners while ensuring public safety as early as 1991.
16 In its AB 497 Alternative Feasibility Studies: Report of Findings (1991), the Department of
17 Justice identified multiple methods of performing proper background checks such that the
18 persons in prohibited categories would not be allowed to purchase a firearm from a licensed
19 California firearm dealer while imposing minimal infringement on gun owners' rights to
20 purchase and possess firearms. As I am a verifiable law-abiding firearm owner, there is no
21 justifiable reason to delay my acquisition of a firearm I already own.

22 If I were required to wait 1 day between purchasing a firearm and taking delivery of a
23 firearm, I would thereby be deprived of the use, custody and control of my personal property.
24 The delay would also deny me the ability to defend self, family, and home with said firearm that
25 I already own; the hypothetical waiting period mandates a brief window of 29 days from which I
26 must return to obtain physical possession of property that I already own, causes an additional
27 increased 1 day delay and added expenses of Dealer Record of Sale fees, storage fees, and
28 transportation fees when I am unavailable to take physical possession of the firearm within the

1 29 day window; causes increased travel expenses upon firearm purchases coinciding with
2 distance from my home to the licensed firearm dealer premises due to the requirement that I must
3 make a second trip to receive custody of the firearm purchased; limits my out-of-town purchases
4 and gun show purchases; and limits the market of firearms available to areas I am willing to
5 travel to twice during a period of at least 1 day and at most 30 days; causes added burden and
6 expense of locating and paying another more local dealer who may be willing, but is not
7 statutorily obligated, to process a firearms transfer originating at a competitor's licensed firearm
8 dealer; and causes me to lose the opportunity cost of the time spent on the second trip to receive
9 a firearm I already own.
10

11 **INTERROGATORY NO. 11**

12 If you contend that California Penal Code section 26815(a) would be unconstitutional if
13 that law's "waiting period" (between purchase and delivery of a firearm) was three days, state all
14 facts supporting this contention.

15 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 11**

16 **OBJECTION:** Contention interrogatories asking for each and every fact, or application of
17 law to fact, that supports particular allegations in an opposing pleading may be held to be overly
18 broad and unduly burdensome. [*IPV, Inc. v. Mercantile Bank of Topeka* (D KS 1998) 179 FRD
19 316, 321 – Providing "every fact" could require "laborious, time-consuming analysis, search and
20 description of incidental, secondary, and perhaps irrelevant and trivial details."]

21 **RESPONSE:** Without waiving the above referenced objection, Plaintiff states that the
22 provisions are unconstitutional, to the extent that they would apply to an individual whose state
23 records (including the Automated Firearm System and Armed and Prohibited Database) identify
24 them as a person not prohibited from possessing firearms and already being the owner of a
25 registered firearm, in that they violate my Second, Fourth and Fifth Amendment rights. The
26 Second Amendment applies beyond merely the home. There are several cases pending in the
27 Ninth, Seventh, and Second Circuit Courts of Appeals relating to whether the Second
28 Amendment's "right to [...] bear arms" for the purpose of self-defense extends beyond the home.

1 See generally: *District of Columbia v. Heller*, 554 U.S. 570(2008) and *McDonald v. City of*
2 *Chicago*, 130 S.Ct. 3020 (2010). There are currently two cases pending in the Ninth Circuit
3 Court of Appeals relating to California law: *Richards v. Prieto* (Yolo County), Case No.: 11-
4 16255 and *Peruta v. County of San Diego*, Case No.: 10-56971. These cases were argued and
5 submitted on December 6, 2012. The court in *Moore v. Madigan*, 2012 U.S. App. LEXIS (7th
6 Cir. Ill. Dec. 11, 2012) found that the right did extend beyond the home, but stayed its decision
7 to give the state legislature an opportunity to enact a licensing scheme. But the court in
8 *Kachalsky v. County of Westchester*, 2012 U.S. App. LEXIS 24363 (2nd Cir. N.Y. Nov. 27, 2012)
9 found that the right did not extend beyond the home. These Constitutional violations, both
10 within the home and outside the home, are supported by the following facts:

11 I am a holder of valid California Certificates of Eligibility and am, per se, not in a class of
12 persons described within Penal Code sections 29800, *et seq.*, 29900, *et seq.*, or Welfare and
13 Institutions Code sections 8100 or 8103, or Title 27 Part 178.32 of the Code of Federal
14 Regulations. 11 C.C.R. §4036(b). In other words, I and other holders of a valid California
15 Certificate of Eligibility represented by CGF and SAF are known by the State of California, at all
16 times certified, to not be prohibited from possessing firearms under federal or state law.

17 Additionally, I am a holder of a valid license to carry a concealed firearm. As a holder of
18 a valid license to carry pursuant to Penal Code section 26150 *et seq.* I and other such holders
19 represented by CGF and SAF are, per se, not in a class of persons described in Penal Code
20 sections 29800, *et seq.*, 29900, *et seq.* or Welfare and Institutions Code 8100 or 8103. Penal
21 Code section 26195(a)-(b). In other words, I and other holders of a valid license to carry
22 pursuant to Penal Code section 26150, *et seq.* represented by CGF and SAF are not prohibited
23 from possessing firearms under federal or state law and may often be armed with a loaded
24 concealed firearm, including while purchasing firearms for which they are subjected to a 10-day
25 ban on possessing.

26 I already have at least one firearm, but I seek to have additional firearms for protection of
27 myself and my family, *inter alia*, pursuant to my Second Amendment right to "keep and bear
28 arms." (Emphasis added to note the use of the plural.) I can otherwise demonstrate proof of

1 ownership and lawful possession of a firearm. For example, some firearms are registered in the
2 California Automated Firearms System database pursuant to, *inter alia*, Penal Code section
3 28200, *et seq.* In purchasing my firearms, I was at least once subjected to the 10-day waiting
4 period prior to physically receiving my firearms. As a result of the 10-day waiting period, I was
5 obligated to endure a 10-day ban on the acquisition of my constitutionally protected firearms and
6 incur additional expense and burden by being forced to make a second visit to the firearms dealer
7 that sold me my firearm.

8 Though I must wait 10 days to acquire possession of each firearm I purchase for self-
9 defense, others seeking commercial, professional, and personal acquisition of firearms, such as
10 destructive device collectors, movie prop houses, auction purchasers, and "consultants-
11 evaluators," are permitted instant access to firearms.

12 The National Instant Check System, located at the FBI's Criminal Justice Information
13 Services Division in Clarksburg, West Virginia, provides full and instant service to FFLs in 30
14 states, five U.S. territories, and the District of Columbia. California voluntarily opted out of the
15 NICS instant background check and maintains its own background check system with an
16 extended 10-day waiting period against purchasers of firearms in California, including myself.
17 Moreover, the Attorney General has established and maintains an online database known as the
18 Prohibited Armed Persons File. The purpose of the file is to cross-reference persons who have
19 ownership or possession of a firearm as indicated by a record in the Consolidated Firearm
20 Information System and who, subsequent to the date of that ownership or possession of a
21 firearm, fall within a class of persons who are prohibited from owning or possessing a firearm.
22 Penal Code §30000, *et seq.*

23 The information contained in the PAPF is available for the purpose of determining if
24 persons are armed and prohibited from possessing firearms. Penal Code §30000, *et seq.*
25 Conversely, the PAPF is also available for the purpose of determining if persons are armed and
26 not prohibited by the very nature of the individual not appearing in the PAPF – but appearing in
27 the Automated Firearm System as the registered owner of a firearm.

28 In fact, the California Department of Justice had determined alternative methods that

1 eliminate delays upon law-abiding firearm owners while ensuring public safety as early as 1991.
2 In its AB 497 Alternative Feasibility Studies: Report of Findings (1991), the Department of
3 Justice identified multiple methods of performing proper background checks such that the
4 persons in prohibited categories would not be allowed to purchase a firearm from a licensed
5 California firearm dealer while imposing minimal infringement on gun owners' rights to
6 purchase and possess firearms. As I am a verifiable law-abiding firearm owner, there is no
7 justifiable reason to delay my acquisition of a firearm I already own.

8 If I were required to wait 3 days between purchasing a firearm and taking delivery of a
9 firearm, I would thereby be deprived of the use, custody, and control of my personal property.
10 The delay would also deny me the ability to defend self, family, and home with said firearm that
11 I already own; the hypothetical waiting period mandates a brief window of 27 days from which I
12 must return to obtain physical possession of property that I already own, causing an additional
13 increased 3 day delay and added expenses of Dealer Record of Sale fees, storage fees, and
14 transportation fees when I am unavailable to take physical possession of the firearm within the
15 27 day window; causes increased travel expenses upon firearm purchases coinciding with
16 distance from my home to the licensed firearm dealer premises due to the requirement that I must
17 make a second trip to receive custody of the firearm purchased; limits my out-of-town purchases
18 and gun show purchases; and limits the market of firearms available to areas I am willing to
19 travel to twice during a period of at least 3 days and at most 30 days; causes added burden and
20 expense of locating and paying another more local dealer who may be willing, but is not
21 statutorily obligated, to process a firearms transfer originating at a competitor's licensed firearm
22 dealer; and causes me to lose the opportunity cost of the time spent on the second trip to receive
23 a firearm I already own.

24
25 **INTERROGATORY NO. 12**

26 If you contend that California Penal Code section 26815(a) would be unconstitutional if
27 that law's "waiting period" (between purchase and delivery of a firearm) was five days, state all
28 facts supporting this contention.

1 In fact, the California Department of Justice had determined alternative methods that
2 eliminate delays upon law abiding firearm owners while ensuring public safety as early as 1991.
3 In its AB 497 Alternative Feasibility Studies: Report of Findings (1991), the Department of
4 Justice identified multiple methods of performing proper background checks such that the
5 persons in prohibited categories would not be allowed to purchase a firearm from a licensed
6 California firearm dealer while imposing minimal infringement on gun owners' rights to
7 purchase and possess firearms. As I am a verifiable law-abiding firearm owner, there is no
8 justifiable reason to delay my acquisition of a firearm I already own.

9 If I were required to wait 5 days between purchasing a firearm and taking delivery of a
10 firearm, I would thereby be deprived of the use, custody, and control of my personal property.
11 The delay would also deny me the ability to defend self, family, and home with said firearm that
12 I already own; the hypothetical waiting period mandates a brief window of 25 days from which I
13 must return to obtain physical possession of property that I already own, causing an additional
14 increased 5 day delay and added expenses of Dealer Record of Sale fees, storage fees, and
15 transportation fees when I am unavailable to take physical possession of the firearm within the
16 25 day window; causes increased travel expenses upon firearm purchases coinciding with
17 distance from my home to the licensed firearm dealer premises due to the requirement that I must
18 make a second trip to receive custody of the firearm purchased; limits my out-of-town purchases
19 and gun show purchases; and limits the market of firearms available to areas I am willing to
20 travel to twice during a period of at least 5 days and at most 30 days; causes added burden and
21 expense of locating and paying another more local dealer who may be willing, but is not
22 statutorily obligated, to process a firearms transfer originating at a competitor's licensed firearm
23 dealer; and causes me to lose the opportunity cost of the time spent on the second trip to receive
24 a firearm I already own.

25
26 **INTERROGATORY NO. 16**

27 Describe in full and complete detail all expenses that you have incurred to acquire
28 firearms because of California Penal Code section 26815(a) and its "waiting period" (between

1 purchase and delivery of a firearm).

2 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 16**

3 RESPONSE: I have lost the opportunity costs to engage in business and other activities
4 during the time it took me for each and every second trip to the licensed firearms dealer to take
5 possession, custody, and control of each firearm I own.

6 I have lost the opportunity to purchase firearms due to an inability to make a second trip.

7 I have incurred expenses, including shipping expenses, additional dealer transfer fees,
8 increased firearm prices due to lack of local competition, additional fuel costs, wear and tear on
9 my vehicle[s] necessary for a return trip to the licensed dealer to receive my firearm. On
10 information and belief, I have spent approximately \$1,500.00 on such expenses.

11 I have incurred additional costs of having to resubmit a Dealer Record of Sale application
12 due to scheduling conflicts preventing me from returning to the store to receive my firearm
13 within the temporary window of availability. Upon information and belief, I have spent
14 approximately \$100.00 on resubmission fees.

15
16 **INTERROGATORY NO. 17**

17 Describe in full and complete detail all expenses that you have incurred to acquire
18 firearms because of California Penal Code section 27540 and its "waiting period" (between
19 purchase and delivery of a firearm).

20 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 17**

21 RESPONSE: I have lost the opportunity costs to engage in business and other activities
22 during the time it took me for each and every second trip to the licensed firearms dealer to take
23 possession, custody, and control of each firearm I own.

24 I have lost the opportunity to purchase firearms due to an inability to make a second trip.

25 I have incurred expenses, including shipping expenses, additional dealer transfer fees,
26 increased firearm prices due to lack of local competition, additional fuel costs, wear and tear on
27 my vehicle[s] necessary for a return trip to the licensed dealer to receive my firearm. On
28 information and belief, I have spent approximately \$1,500.00 on such expenses.

1 I have incurred additional costs of having to resubmit a Dealer Record of Sale application
2 due to scheduling conflicts preventing me from returning to the store to receive my firearm
3 within the temporary window of availability. Upon information and belief, I have spent
4 approximately \$100.00 on resubmission fees.
5

6 **INTERROGATORY NO. 18**

7 State the longest distance you have traveled, in the last 10 years, from your home to a
8 licensed firearms retailer to acquire a firearm.

9 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 18**

10 RESPONSE: Approximately 764 miles.

11 **INTERROGATORY NO. 19**

12 State the distances from your home, in miles, of the three licensed firearms dealers that
13 are presently closest to your home.

14 **RESPONSE TO INTERROGATORY NO. 19**

15 OBJECTION: This request is so vague or ambiguous as to be burdensome or oppressive
16 as to the meaning of "licensed firearm dealers." Moreover, Plaintiff would have to speculate as
17 to the meaning of the phrase "licensed firearm dealers." This interrogatory provides no definition
18 of what "licenses" or which category of "firearm dealers" this interrogatory refers to. Neither
19 Department of Justice nor any other entity publishes a list or makes a list available of persons
20 who are licensed under California law to transfer firearms – therefore it is impossible for me to
21 know with any certainty who the three licensed firearm dealers that are presently closest to my
22 home.

23 RESPONSE: Without waiving the above referenced objection, Plaintiff responds: To the
24 best of my knowledge, and on information and belief, the three firearm retailers open to the
25 public that are presently closest to my home are: PRK Arms, Spencer's Firearms, and Herb
26 Bauer's Sporting Goods. The distances from these locations to my home are unknown.

27 **INTERROGATORY NO. 20**

28 State the name and World Wide Web address of each Internet seller of firearms from

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

VERIFICATION

BRANDON COMBS declares:

1. I am a plaintiff in the above-captioned action;
2. I have read the foregoing "PLAINTIFF BRANDON COMBS'S RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT KAMALA D. HARRIS'S FIRST SET OF INTERROGATORIES" ("The Response") and know its contents. I am informed and believed that the matters set forth in the Response are true and accurate, and on that ground I allege, to the best of my knowledge and information, that the matters therein stated are true and accurate.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct and that this Verification was executed on January 30, 2013, at

MADERA, California.



BRANDON COMBS