1 2 3 4 5 6	XAVIER BECERRA Attorney General of California MARK R. BECKINGTON Supervising Deputy Attorney General PETER H. CHANG Deputy Attorney General State Bar No. 241467 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000 San Francisco, CA 94102-7004 Telephone: (415) 510-3776 Fax: (415) 703-1234 E-mail: Peter.Chang@doj.ca.gov	Exempt from Filing Fee Pursuant to	
7	Attorneys for Respondents and Defendants	Gov. Code, § 6103	
8			
9	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
10	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO		
11		•	
12	MAURO CAMPOS; et al.,	Case No. 37-2020-00030178-CU-MC-CTL	
13	Petitioners and Plaintiffs,	RESPONDENTS AND DEFENDANTS' ANSWER TO VERIFIED PETITION FOR	
14	V.	WRIT OF MANDATE AND COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY, INJUNCTIVE,	
15	XAVIER BECERRA, Attorney General of California, et al.,	AND OTHER RELIEF	
16	Respondents and Defendants.	Courtroom: C-64 Judge: The Honorable John S. Meyer	
17	reosponacino una 2 stonauna.	Action Filed: 08/27/2020	
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			

Answer to Petition for Writ of Mandate and Complaint for Declaratory Relief (37-2020-00030178-CU-MC-CTL)

## ANSWER TO VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE

Respondents and Defendants Xavier Becerra, Attorney General of California, the Director of California Department of Justice Bureau of Firearms, <sup>1</sup> and the California Department of Justice (collectively, Defendants), answer the Petition and Complaint, in the same numbered paragraphs as those in the Petition and Complaint, as follows:

- 1. Defendants deny the allegations in the first and third sentences of paragraph 1.

  Defendants lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in the second sentence of paragraph 1, and on that basis deny them. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of paragraph 1.
- 2. Defendants admit that the cited statutory provisions restrict, among other things, the delivery of a firearm within 10 days of an application to purchase (Cal. Pen. Code §§ 26815(a), 27540(a)). Defendants admit that the 10-day waiting period is imposed, in part, so a background check can be conducted on the purchasers or transferee of the firearm before the firearm is delivered. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of paragraph 2.
  - 3. Defendants admit the allegations in paragraph 3.
- 4. Defendants admit that California Code of Regulations, title 11, § 4230 became operative on January 1, 2014. The regulation speaks for itself. Defendants deny the remaining allegations in paragraph 4.
- 5. California Code of Regulations, title 11, § 4230(b)(2)(A) speaks for itself. Paragraph 5 consists of conclusions of law and no answer is required. To the extent any part of Paragraph 5 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
- 6. California Code of Regulations, title 11, § 4230(a) speaks for itself. Paragraph 6 consists of conclusions of law and no answer is required. To the extent any part of Paragraph 6 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Brent E. Orick left his position as the Director of the Bureau of Firearms before this lawsuit was filed and was misnamed as a defendant in the Petition and Complaint.

- 7. California Code of Regulations, title 11, § 4230(b)(2)(C) speaks for itself. Paragraph 7 consists of conclusions of law and no answer is required. To the extent any part of Paragraph 7 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
- 8. California Code of Regulations, title 11, § 4230(b)(2)(B) speaks for itself. Paragraph 8 consists of conclusions of law and no answer is required. To the extent any part of Paragraph 8 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
- 9. California Code of Regulations, title 11, § 4230 speaks for itself. Paragraph 9 consists of conclusions of law and no answer is required. To the extent any part of Paragraph 9 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
- 10. Defendants admit that it provided a statement on its website with the heading "Firearms and Ammunition Purchaser Information." The statement speaks for itself. Defendants lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in the last two sentences of Paragraph 10, and on that basis deny them. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 10.
- 11. Defendants admit that, in response to the current COVID-19 pandemic, the Governor has utilized the Emergency Services Act to suspend the operation of certain laws and has issued emergency orders. Defendants admit that the Governor did not suspend Penal Code section 28220. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 11.
- 12. Paragraph 12 consists of conclusions of law and no answer is required. To the extent any part of Paragraph 12 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
- 13. Defendants deny the allegations in the first sentence of Paragraph 13. Defendants lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in the second sentences of Paragraph 13, and on that basis deny them.
- 14-25. Defendants lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in Paragraphs 14-25, inclusive, and on that basis deny them.
- 26. Defendants admit that Respondent Becerra is the Attorney General of the State of California and the chief law officer of the state, responsible for ensuring that the laws of the state

are uniformly and adequately enforced. Defendants admit that the California Attorney General is vested with broad powers and carries out his responsibilities through the California Department of Justice. Defendants admit that the Department of Justice and its Bureau of Firearms enforce state laws relating to firearms. Defendants admit that Respondent Becerra has been sued in his official capacity as the California Attorney General. Defendants admit that the Department of Justice maintains an office in San Diego. Except as specifically admitted, Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 26.

- 27. Defendants deny that Brent E. Orick is the Chief of the Bureau of Firearms.
- 28. Defendants admit that the California Department of Justice and its Bureau of Firearms enforce state laws relating to firearms. Defendants admit that the Department of Justice maintains an office in San Diego. Except as specifically admitted, Defendants deny the allegations in paragraph 28.
- 29. Paragraph 29 consists of recitations and conclusions of law and no answer is required. The cited statutes speak for themselves. To the extent any part of Paragraph 29 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
- 30. Paragraph 30 consists of conclusions of law and no answer is required. To the extent any part of Paragraph 30 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
- 31. Defendants admit that the cited statutory provisions (Cal. Pen. Code §§ 26815(a), 27540(a)) restrict, among other things, the delivery of a firearm within 10 days of an application to purchase, including the delivery of a firearm by dealers.
- 32. Defendants admit that the 10-day waiting period is imposed, in part, so a background check can be conducted on the purchasers or transferee of the firearm before the firearm is delivered. Defendants admit that firearm-purchase applications are processed through the Dealer Record of Sale Entry System, or "DES," an electronic system that firearms dealers used to submit firearm-purchase applications to the Bureau of Firearms. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of paragraph 32.

- 33. Paragraph 33 consists of recitations and conclusions of law and no answer is required. The cited statutes speak for themselves. To the extent any part of Paragraph 33 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
- 34. Defendants admit that a significant percentage of background checks are completed within the first day of the waiting period and automatically approved. The remainder of Paragraph 34 consists of recitations and conclusions of law and no answer is required. The cited statutes speak for themselves. To the extent any part of Paragraph 34 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
- 35. Paragraph 35 consists of recitations and conclusions of law and no answer is required. The cited statutes speak for themselves. To the extent any part of Paragraph 35 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
- 36. Paragraph 36 consists of recitations and conclusions of law and no answer is required. The cited statutes speak for themselves. To the extent any part of Paragraph 36 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
- 37. Paragraph 37 consists of recitations and conclusions of law and no answer is required. The cited statutes speak for themselves. To the extent any part of Paragraph 37 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
- 38. Paragraph 38 consists of recitations and conclusions of law and no answer is required. The cited statutes speak for themselves. To the extent any part of Paragraph 38 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
- 39. Paragraph 39 consists of recitations and conclusions of law and no answer is required. The cited statutes speak for themselves. To the extent any part of Paragraph 39 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
- 40. Defendants admit that the Department of Justice may delay a transaction if it is unable to determine whether the applicant is eligible to receive a firearm after performing an initial background check within the first 10 days of receiving a firearms-transaction application. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 40.

- 41. Defendants admit that, in or about April 2020, it provided a statement on its website with the heading "Firearms and Ammunition Purchaser Information." The statement speaks for itself. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 41.
- 42. (The Petition and Complaint contains two Paragraph 42s. This paragraph responds to the first Paragraph 42.) Defendants admit that, in or about April 2020, it provided a statement on its website with the heading "Firearms and Ammunition Purchaser Information." The statement speaks for itself. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 42.
- 42. (The Petition and Complaint contains two Paragraph 42s. This paragraph responds to the second Paragraph 42.) Paragraph 42 does not contain any allegation to admit or deny. The quoted statement speaks for itself. To the extent any part of Paragraph 42 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
- 43. Defendants admit that the Department of Justice may delay a transaction if it is unable to determine whether the applicant is eligible to receive a firearm after performing an initial background check within the first 10 days of receiving a firearms-transaction application. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 43.
  - 44. Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 44.
- 45. Defendants admit that the Department of Justice has delayed firearm-purchase transactions beyond the first 10 days of receiving a firearms-transaction application when it has been unable to determine whether the applicant is eligible to receive a firearm after performing an initial background check within that time period. Defendants admit that firearms dealers may not complete delivery of a firearm until either the Department of Justice approves the transaction or 30 days after the initial submission of the DROS application, whichever occurs first. The remainder of Paragraph 45 consists of recitations and conclusions of law and no answer is required. The cited statutes speak for themselves. To the extent any part of the remainder of Paragraph 45 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
  - 46. Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 46.
- 47. Defendants admit that the Department of Justice received two DROS applications for Plaintiff Campos through Firearms Unknown on April 10, 2020. Defendants admit that both

applications were approved on April 28, 2020. Defendants admit that, as of the date of the filing of this Answer, Plaintiff Campos holds a Certificate of Eligibility, has firearms registered in the Automated Firearms System and is a Department of Justice certified firearms-safety instructor. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 47.

- 48. Defendants admit that the Department of Justice received two DROS applications for Plaintiff Callahan-Miller through Firearms Unknown on April 9, 2020. Defendants admit that both applications were approved on April 25, 2020. Defendants lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations in the second sentence of Paragraph 48, and on that basis denies them. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 48.
- 49. Defendants admit that the Department of Justice has delayed firearm-purchase transactions beyond the first 10 days of receiving a firearms-transaction application when it has been unable to determine whether the applicant is eligible to receive a firearm after performing an initial background check within that time period. Defendants lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding the frequency in which Plaintiff Firearms Unknown checks the DES, and on that basis denies them. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 49.
- 50. Defendants admit that the Department of Justice has delayed firearm-purchase transactions beyond the first 10 days of receiving a firearms-transaction application when it has been unable to determine whether the applicant is eligible to receive a firearm after performing an initial background check within that time period. Defendants lack sufficient knowledge or information to form a belief as to the truth of the allegations regarding the Plaintiff PWG and its customers, and on that basis denies them. Defendants deny the remaining allegations of Paragraph 50.
  - 51. Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 51.
- 52. Paragraph 52 consists of recitations and conclusions of law and no answer is required. The cited statutes speak for themselves. To the extent any part of Paragraph 52 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.

- 53. The first sentence of Paragraph 53 consists of recitations and conclusions of law and no answer is required. The cited statutes speak for themselves. To the extent that sentence is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them. Defendants deny the allegations in the second sentence of Paragraph 53.
- 54. Paragraph 54 consists of recitations and conclusions of law and no answer is required. The cited statutes speak for themselves. To the extent any part of Paragraph 54 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
- 55. Paragraph 55 consists of recitations and conclusions of law and no answer is required. The cited statutes speak for themselves. To the extent any part of Paragraph 55 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
- 56. Paragraph 56 consists of conclusions of law and Plaintiffs' request for relief, and no answer is required. To the extent any part of Paragraph 56 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
- 57. Defendants incorporate here by reference their responses to Paragraph 1 through 56 as if fully set forth herein.
  - 58. Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 58.
- 59. Paragraph 59 consists of recitations and conclusions of law and no answer is required. The cited statutes speak for themselves. To the extent any part of Paragraph 59 is construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.
  - 60. Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 60.
  - 61. Defendants deny the allegations in Paragraph 61.
- 62. Defendants incorporate here by reference their responses to Paragraph 1 through 56 as if fully set forth herein.
- 63. Defendants deny the allegations in the last three sentences of paragraph 64. The remainder of Paragraph 63 consists of recitations and conclusions of law and no answer is required. The cited statutes and regulations speak for themselves. To the extent they are construed as allegations to be admitted or denied, Defendants deny them.

1	WHEREFORE, Defendants respectfully request that:	
2	1. The Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate and Complaint for Declaratory, Injunctive	
3	and Other Relief, and all claims and prayers therein, be denied in their entirety;	
4	2. Plaintiffs take nothing from Defendants by this action;	
5	3. Defendants be awarded co	sts in defending this action; and
6	4. Defendants be awarded su	ch further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.
7		
8		
9	Dated: October 5, 2020	Respectfully submitted,
10		XAVIER BECERRA
11		Attorney General of California
12		Da-Manne
13	,	Poter Cleary
14		Degree II Curvia
15		PETER H. CHANG Deputy Attorney General
16		Attorneys for Respondents and Defendants
17	SA2020303123	
18	42373760.docx	
19	2	
20		
21		
22		
23	,	
24		
25		
26		
27		

## **DECLARATION OF SERVICE BY U.S. MAIL**

Case Name: Mauro Campos, et al. v. Xavier Becerra, et al.

Case No.: 37-2020-00030178-CU-MC-CTL

I declare:

I am employed in the Office of the Attorney General, which is the office of a member of the California State Bar, at which member's direction this service is made. I am 18 years of age or older and not a party to this matter; my business address is 455 Golden Gate Avenue, Suite 11000, San Francisco, CA 94102-7004.

On October 5, 2020, I served the attached DEFENDANTS'ANSWER TO VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE AND COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY, INJUNCTIVE, AND OTHER RELIEF by placing a true copy thereof enclosed in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States Mail at San Francisco, California, addressed as follows:

Bradley A. Benbrook and Steve M. Duvernay Attorneys at Law Benbrook Law Group, PC 400 Capitol Mall, Suite 2530 Sacramento, CA 95814

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States of America the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on October 5, 2020, at San Francisco, California.

Robert Hallsey	/s/ Robert Hallsey
Declarant	Signature

SA2020303123 42372420.docx