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THE CLERK: Calling the Case of Civil 11-00589ACK-BMK, Kirk Fisher versus Louis Kealoha, et al. This hearing has been called for plaintiff's permanent injunction and plaintiff's motion for summary judgment. Counsel, appearances, please.

MS. ICKES: Good morning, Your Honor. Te-Hina Ickes and Don Wilkerson on behalf of Plaintiff Kirk Fisher.

THE COURT: Good morning.
MR. DODD: Good morning, Your Honor. Scott Dodd on behalf of Defendants Kealoha and City and County of Honolulu.

THE COURT: Good morning.
MR. RUBIN: Good morning, Your Honor. Phillip Rubin and Mark Murakami on behalf of amicus Brady Center to Prevent Gun Violence.

THE COURT: Good morning. Please be seated.
THE CLERK: Judge, we also have Mr. Beck by phone. Should he identify --

MR. BECK: Alan Beck for the amicus curiae Hawaii Defense Foundation, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Good morning. The court is troubled that no defendant, no attorney has addressed the recent United States Supreme Court decision in Descamps versus United States regarding modified categorical approach, reversing the Ninth Circuit and resolving a circuit split.

This decision came down more than a month or around a
month before each attorney filed an additional pleading or brief in this case and yet none of you have referred to it. So you're obviously not prepared to argue this morning.

Ms. Ickes, do you wish to say anything more about the city's request to file plaintiff's deposition as an exhibit? MS. ICKES: Yes, Judge. Just -- well, I know the court is aware that I filed an opposition midday on Friday, unless the court has further questions.

THE COURT: I've seen the opposition and I sympathize with you, but I don't think you're going to suffer any prejudice as a result of it.

MS. ICKES: Well, if -- if the court doesn't have any questions, I'll just rest on my submission.

THE COURT: Very well.
MS. ICKES: Thank you.
THE COURT: I'm going to give you an opportunity to respond to it.

MS. ICKES: Should I just stay here, Judge --
THE COURT: Not today. I mean, by way of an
additional --
MS. ICKES: Briefing. Yes, understood, Judge.
THE COURT: Thank you. Also I wanted to ask you, in your amended complaint, you referred to the Fifth Amendment, the court, if you recall, already dismissed --

MS. ICKES: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: The Fifth Amendment.
MS. ICKES: I do recall that. And, unfortunately, I don't have that section of the file with me. I believe the due process claims if, as far as they related to the Fifth Amendment were dismissed by the court. And if I refer to them in the first amended complaint, that obviously would have been in error, and we would be proceeding on the Fourteenth Amendment only rather than the Fifth Amendment. And I think I may have continuously referred to it as the Fifth Amendment. But so far as the court dismissed those claims, I do recall that being the case.

THE COURT: I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you. So as I said, we're not going to proceed with argument today. All counsel have failed to address the United States Supreme Court decision of Descamps versus United States 133 S. Ct. 2276, 2281 (2013), which was filed June 20th, 2013. And this will likely be controlling in the determination of whether plaintiff was convicted for a crime of violence under 18 USC 922(g)(9) and HRS 134-7B. Particularly troubling to the court when you have amicus curiae and you don't keep up with the Supreme Court decisions.

Secondly, defendants have belatedly requested to file an additional exhibit consisting of a deposition of plaintiff taken on April 17th, 2013, which includes statements by plaintiff that he pushed his wife causing her to fall backwards
on the ground. Other statements regarding the counseling he received on the probation condition that he, "attend substance abuse assessment and shall participate in counseling and/or treatment until clinically discharged or as directed by the probation officer."

These are matters that this court will have to consider in this case. In view of the foregoing, the court will grant defendant's request to submit plaintiff's deposition as an exhibit. Additionally, the court will grant all counsel an opportunity to file supplemental briefs within 10 days that should address the foregoing, provided that counsel for plaintiff and defendants are limited to briefs of no more than 10 pages and counsel are limited to no more than five pages. Additionally, defendants, by providing the parties an opportunity to file additional briefs, the court finds that there's no prejudice to plaintiff with the allowance of plaintiff's deposition as an exhibit, as you will have an opportunity to respond to that. Actually, that was brought up last year in the court's motion for reconsideration so it should be no surprise, and it's questionable why the defendant waited until the last minute to make that request.

Additionally, defendant's motion for summary judgment under Local Rule $56.1(i)$ which was alluded to $I$ think on page three of their opposition and which I don't think the other parties were even aware of is denied without prejudice. Notice
of hearing requirements and Rule 56.1 (i) have not been met and the court declines to require the parties to address defendant's motion. It was submitted as part of their opposition three weeks before this hearing.

So the court will set another hearing for argument in this case on plaintiff's two motions, and that will be September 17, that's a Tuesday, at 10 a.m.

Does any party wish to say anything at this point?
MR. RUBIN: Your Honor, would it be possible for our amicus Brady Center to address our argument that the court need not rely on the modified categorical approach at all?

THE COURT: Yes.
MR. RUBIN: Thank you, Your Honor.
THE COURT: I think that's what you've already done. No, I'm not going to hear you now. You may argue that in your supplemental brief.

MR. RUBIN: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you.
THE COURT: Yes, ma'am.
MS. ICKES: Judge, can I clarify something on the supplemental briefing? Just to my understanding, I just want to make sure I submit precisely what the court wants and nothing -- nothing extra.

No more than 10 pages regarding whether or not there's no prejudice to the plaintiff as to the motion for leave to file the deposition transcript, is that what the supplemental

```
brief is limited to?
    THE COURT: No.
    MS. ICKES: As well as the new case.
    THE COURT: I want you to address the Supreme Court
    decision which you failed to address.
    MS. ICKES: Yes, Judge. Understood. Just wanted to
    clarify.
    THE COURT: As well as the matters in the deposition
    that might affect your client.
        MS. ICKES: Thank you.
        THE COURT: Thank you. We'll see you again on the
    17th.
    (The proceedings concluded at 10:16 a.m., August 12, 2013.)
```
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