

1 C.D. Michel-SBN 144258  
Anna M. Barvir-SBN 268728  
2 Tiffany D. Chevront-SBN 317144  
MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.  
3 180 East Ocean Blvd., Suite 200  
Long Beach, CA 90802  
4 Telephone: (562) 216-4444  
Email: [cmichel@michellawyers.com](mailto:cmichel@michellawyers.com)

5 Attorneys for Plaintiffs B&L Productions, Inc., California Rifle & Pistol Association,  
6 Incorporated, Gerald Clark, Eric Johnson, Chad Littrell, Jan Steven Merson, Asian  
Pacific American Gun Owner Association, Second Amendment Law Center, Inc.

7 Donald Kilmer-SBN 179986  
Law Offices of Donald Kilmer, APC  
8 14085 Silver Ridge Road  
Caldwell, Idaho 83607  
9 Telephone: (408) 264-8489  
Email: [Don@DKLawOffice.com](mailto:Don@DKLawOffice.com)

10 Attorney for Plaintiff Second Amendment Foundation

11 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
12 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

13 B&L PRODUCTIONS, INC., d/b/a  
14 CROSSROADS OF THE WEST;  
GERALD CLARK; ERIC JOHNSON;  
15 CHAD LITRELL; JAN STEVEN  
MERSON; CALIFORNIA RIFLE &  
16 PISTOAL ASSOCIATION,  
INCORPORATED; ASIAN PACIIC  
17 AMERICAN GUN OWNERS  
ASSOCIATION; SECOND  
18 AMENDMENT LAW CENTER, INC.;  
and SECOND AMENDMENT  
19 FOUNDATION,

20 Plaintiffs,

21 v.

22 GAVIN NEWSOM, in his official  
capacity as Governor of the State of  
23 California; ROB BONTA, in his official  
capacity as Attorney General of the  
State of California; KAREN ROSS, in  
24 her official capacity as Secretary of  
California Department of Food &  
25 Agriculture and in his personal capacity;  
TODD SPITZER, in his official capacity  
26 as District Attorney of Orange County;  
32nd DISTRICT AGRICULTURAL  
27 ASSOCIATION; DOES 1-10;

28 Defendants.

**CASE NO:**

**COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY  
& INJUNCTIVE RELIEF**

**(1) VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 1983  
[FREE SPEECH - POLITICAL];**

**(2) VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 1983  
[FREE SPEECH-MIXED POLITICAL/  
COMMERCIAL];**

**(3) VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 1983  
[FREE SPEECH-COMMERCIAL];**

**(4) VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 1983  
[PRIOR RESTRAINT ON SPEECH];**

**(5) VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 1983  
[RIGHT TO ASSEMBLY];**

**(6) VIOLATION OF 42 U.S.C. § 1983  
[EQUAL PROTECTION]**

**DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

**NOTICE OF  
UNCONSTITUTIONALITY OF  
STATE STATUTE**

**INTRODUCTION**

1  
2 1. Plaintiff B & L PRODUCTIONS, INC., d/b/a CROSSROADS OF THE  
3 WEST has operated popular, safe, heavily regulated, legal, and family-friendly gun  
4 shows as a business in California for over 30 years, including at the Orange County  
5 Fair & Event Center (“the Fairgrounds”).

6 2. Crossroads produces gun shows at the Fairgrounds where like-minded  
7 individuals gather to engage in commerce related to, and necessary for, the lawful  
8 and regulated exercise of Second Amendment rights for themselves, their exhibitors,  
9 their patrons, their customers, and the general public. This safe and regulated  
10 marketplace promotes public safety, even for people who do not attend gun shows  
11 because it will tend to reduce the unregulated transfer of firearms within Orange  
12 County. Furthermore, by providing a convenient forum for Californians to exercise  
13 their right to acquire firearms locally, gun shows at the Fairgrounds will have the  
14 tendency to discourage the sale and importation of firearms from other states with  
15 less strict gun laws than California.

16 3. Plaintiffs Gerald Clark, Eric Johnson, Chad Littrell, Jan Steven Merson,  
17 California Rifle & Pistol Association, Incorporated, Second Amendment Law  
18 Center, Inc., Asian Pacific American Gun Owners Association, and Second  
19 Amendment Foundation, Inc., attend and participate in the Crossroads gun show to  
20 engage in First Amendment activities that are both necessary and essential to the  
21 open, robust, and lawful exercise of their Second Amendment rights. CRPA also has  
22 members who attend gun shows and sell ammunition, firearms, and precursor parts.

23 4. At the gun show, Plaintiffs associate with like-minded people,  
24 participate in public discussions, attend informational forums, distribute and collect  
25 information, provide training, make offers for sale, make offers to buy, and engage  
26 in legal and political discussions related to the Second Amendment, which are all  
27 forms of speech protected by the First Amendment. Discussions include, but are not  
28 limited to, firearms and ammunition, firearm technology, firearm safety, and firearm

1 law and politics. Participants also exchange information about where to hunt and  
2 where to practice shooting, where and from whom to receive training, gunsmithing,  
3 gun repair, gun art, and many other topics that arise from the right to acquire, own,  
4 possess, enjoy, and celebrate arms as a quintessentially American artifact with  
5 constitutional significance.

6 5. Defendants are government actors who, through the adoption and  
7 enforcement of Senate Bill 264 (Min), codified at California Penal Code section  
8 27575,<sup>1</sup> which prohibits the sale of firearms, ammunition, and “firearm precursor  
9 parts” at the Fairgrounds with the intention and effect of shuttering gun show events  
10 altogether, have engaged in and will continue to engage in action that violates  
11 Plaintiffs’ constitutional rights to free speech, assembly, and equal protection. Their  
12 actions also constitute prior restraint.

13 6. This action seeks declaratory and injunctive relief against Defendants  
14 for violating the United States Constitution. It also seeks damages for lost profits,  
15 lost opportunities, and diminished marketing value, and reimbursement for  
16 reasonable attorney’s fees, costs, and other expenses in bringing this action.

### 17 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

18 7. The Court has original jurisdiction of this civil action under 28 U.S.C. §  
19 1331 because the action arises under the Constitution and laws of the United States,  
20 thus raising federal questions. The Court also has jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. §  
21 1343(a)(3) and 42 U.S.C. § 1983 since this action seeks to redress the deprivation,  
22 under color of the laws, statutes, ordinances, regulations, customs and usages of the  
23 State of California and political subdivisions thereof, of rights, privileges or  
24 immunities secured by the United States Constitution and by Acts of Congress

25 8. Plaintiffs’ claims for declaratory and injunctive relief are authorized by  
26 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, respectively, and their claim for attorneys’ fees is

27 \_\_\_\_\_  
28 <sup>1</sup> Plaintiffs refer to the challenged law, California Penal Code section 27575, as  
SB 264 throughout this complaint.

1 authorized by 42 U.S.C. § 1988.

2 9. Venue is proper in this Court under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because the  
3 32nd District Agricultural Association is located within this district and a substantial  
4 part of the events or omissions giving rise to Plaintiffs' claims occurred in this  
5 district. Further, the state of California maintains an office for service of process on  
6 the Attorney General in Los Angeles County at 300 South Spring Street, Los  
7 Angeles, CA 90013-1230.

8 **PARTIES**

9 **[Plaintiffs]**

10 10. Plaintiff B&L PRODUCTIONS, INC., d/b/a CROSSROADS OF THE  
11 WEST, is a for-profit event promoter operating in several western states. Crossroads  
12 is in the business of promoting and organizing trade shows throughout the state of  
13 California and other western states, including their long-running gun show events  
14 held at the Orange County Fair & Event Center ("the Fairgrounds") operated under  
15 the d/b/a Crossroads of the West ("Crossroads"). Before the adoption and  
16 enforcement of SB 264, Crossroads was the largest vendor of gun show events in  
17 California and at the Fairgrounds. Typically, thousands of people attend the gun  
18 show on each of the weekends they are held. Crossroads provides the space for these  
19 like-minded people to assemble. They have successfully produced and operated  
20 multiple safe, legal, and family-friendly gun show events in California and at the  
21 Fairgrounds every year for over 30 years. But for Defendants' adoption and  
22 enforcement of SB 264, Plaintiff Crossroads would immediately resume producing  
23 and promoting gun show events at the Fairgrounds.

24 11. Plaintiff GERALD CLARK is a resident of Santa Ana, California, and  
25 he is an NRA certified instructor. Before the implementation of SB 264, he regularly  
26 attended gun shows at the Fairgrounds to purchase firearms, ammunition, parts for  
27 firearms already owned, and materials to help him with his training and as a gun  
28 owner to be more proficient. He has taught gun safety and training courses for 12

1 years and has taught those courses at the Crossroads gun show at the Fairgrounds as  
2 a Chief Range Safety Officer and Certified Trainer. During the training courses, he  
3 talks to others about their rights, the importance of membership in the CRPA, and  
4 the Second Amendment. SB 264 burdens his right to engage in otherwise lawful  
5 commercial speech in a public forum and restricts his ability to purchase  
6 ammunition, firearms, and parts for lawful purposes. And because the ban is  
7 intended to make gun shows less profitable and effectively shutter them, it also  
8 restricts his right to engage in the unique types of political, educational, and  
9 commercial speech that takes place at the gun show. But for Defendants' adoption  
10 and enforcement of SB 264, Plaintiff Clark would continue attending and  
11 participating in the Crossroads gun show events at the Fairgrounds.

12 12. Plaintiff ERIC JOHNSON is a resident of Whittier, California, and he  
13 is a Certified Trainer, Range Safety Expert, retired coach, and Chief Range Safety  
14 Officer. Before the implementation of SB 264, he regularly attended gun shows at  
15 the Fairgrounds to purchase firearms, ammunition reloading supplies, ammunition,  
16 parts for the firearms he owns, materials for caring for his firearms, and much more.  
17 Plaintiff Johnson also attended the Crossroads gun show at the Fairgrounds to  
18 engage in expressive activities with like-minded people, including discussions  
19 related to firearms, ammunition, and firearm accessories, the shooting sports,  
20 politics, and the Second Amendment. He regularly sets up and works the CRPA  
21 booths at gun shows. SB 264 burdens his right to engage in otherwise lawful  
22 commercial speech in a public forum and restricts his ability to purchase  
23 ammunition, firearms, and parts for lawful purposes. And because the ban is  
24 intended to make gun shows less profitable and effectively shutter them, it also  
25 restricts his right to engage in the unique types of political, educational, and  
26 commercial speech that takes place at the gun show. But for Defendants' adoption  
27 and enforcement of SB 264, Plaintiff Johnson would continue attending and  
28 participating in the Crossroads gun show events at the Fairgrounds.

1           13. Plaintiff CHAD LITTRELL is a resident of La Habra, CA and owns  
2 Vytamenc 22 Tactical. Before the implementation of SB 264, his company was a  
3 regular vendor at the Crossroads gun shows at the Fairgrounds. At these events, he  
4 would sell uppers, precursor parts and AR-15 rifles and discuss issues regarding  
5 firearms, ammunition, and gun safety with customers of the gun show. Plaintiff  
6 Littrell also attended the Crossroads gun show at the Fairgrounds to engage in  
7 expressive activities with like-minded people, including discussions related to  
8 firearms, ammunition, and firearm accessories, the shooting sports, politics, and the  
9 Second Amendment. SB 264 burdens his right to engage in otherwise lawful  
10 commercial speech in a public forum and restricts his ability to purchase  
11 ammunition, firearms, and parts for lawful purposes. And because the ban is  
12 intended to make gun shows less profitable and effectively shutter them, it also  
13 restricts his right to engage in the unique types of political, educational, and  
14 commercial speech that takes place at the gun show. Because of the essential  
15 shutting down of gun shows at the Fairgrounds, Plaintiff Littrell had to close his  
16 business. But for Defendants' adoption and enforcement of SB 264, Plaintiff Clark  
17 would re-open his business and continue attending and participating in the  
18 Crossroads gun show events at the Fairgrounds.

19           14. Plaintiff JAN STEVEN MERSON is a resident of Fullerton, California,  
20 and he owns Merson's Machining Tool Making and Gunsmithing. Before the  
21 implementation of SB 264, his company (then known as Merson's Custom Tooling  
22 & Gunsmith) was a regular vendor at the Crossroads gun shows at the Fairgrounds.  
23 At these events, he would sell "firearm precursor parts"—which are legal products  
24 in California and are not considered firearms by legal definition. Plaintiff Merson  
25 also attended the Crossroads gun show at the Fairgrounds to engage in expressive  
26 activities with like-minded people, including discussions related to firearms,  
27 ammunition, and firearm accessories, the shooting sports, politics, and the Second  
28 Amendment. SB 264 burdens his right to engage in otherwise lawful commercial

1 speech in a public forum and restricts his ability to purchase ammunition, firearms,  
2 and parts for lawful purposes. And because the ban is intended to make gun shows  
3 less profitable and effectively shutter them, it also restricts his right to engage in the  
4 unique types of political, educational, and commercial speech that takes place at the  
5 gun show. But for Defendants' adoption and enforcement of SB 264, Plaintiff  
6 Merson would continue attending and participating in the Crossroads gun show  
7 events at the Fairgrounds.

8       15. Plaintiff ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN GUN OWNERS  
9 ASSOCIATION ("APAGOA") is a nonprofit organization incorporated under the  
10 laws of Texas and registered with the California Secretary of State to do business in  
11 the state of California. APAGOA is a community of gun owners with an Asian  
12 Pacific American ("APA") heritage. It's core focus is to promote safe and  
13 responsible gun ownership within the APA community by providing educational  
14 materials and other resources to its members and other interested parties. APAGOA  
15 advocates for firearm safety, education, and community-building initiatives. And it  
16 strives to educate and empower the APA gun owner community so they can use  
17 their firearms safely and responsibly. It brings this action on behalf of its  
18 approximately 270 members and supporters who reside in California and, but for the  
19 implementation of SB 264, would attend and participate in the Crossroads gun show  
20 events at the Fairgrounds.

21       16. Plaintiff CALIFORNIA RIFLE & PISTOL ASSOCIATION,  
22 INCORPORATED ("CRPA") is a nonprofit membership organization incorporated  
23 under the laws of California, with headquarters in Fullerton, California. Among its  
24 other activities, CRPA works to preserve and expand constitutional and statutory  
25 rights of gun ownership, including the right to self-defense and the right to keep and  
26 bear arms. CRPA accomplishes this through its educational offerings, publications,  
27 member engagement events, and legislative advocacy and initiatives. CRPA has  
28 individual members and business affiliates that attend gun shows. Before the

1 implementation of SB 264, CRPA and some of its members were regular vendors at  
2 the Crossroads gun shows at the Fairgrounds, where they engaged the public in  
3 discussions about the organization and its purposes, the shooting sports, firearms  
4 and firearm safety, and the Second Amendment and other political issues. CRPA  
5 also attended gun shows at the Fairgrounds to sell organization memberships,  
6 advertise its events, distribute its publications, and sell its merchandise, some of  
7 which includes expressly pro-gun messaging. Members of CRPA would attend to  
8 advertise events, distribute publications, sell merchandise, ammunition, and  
9 firearms, some of which includes expressly pro-gun messaging. CRPA has also  
10 hosted political rallies, educational seminars, and range safety officer training at gun  
11 shows throughout the state, including those at the Fairgrounds. SB 264 directly  
12 burdens the right of CRPA, its officers, employees, volunteers, members, and  
13 supporters, to engage in otherwise lawful commercial speech in a public forum and  
14 to access firearms, ammunition, and parts for lawful purposes. And because the ban  
15 on sales of firearms, ammunition, and parts is intended to make gun shows less  
16 profitable and effectively shutter them, it restricts the right of CRPA, its officers,  
17 employees, volunteers, members, and supporters, to engage in the unique types of  
18 political, educational, and commercial speech that takes place at the gun show. But  
19 for Defendants' adoption and enforcement of SB 264, Plaintiff CRPA would  
20 continue attending and participating in the Crossroads gun show events at the  
21 Fairgrounds. Through this lawsuit, CRPA represents not only its own interests as a  
22 gun show vendor, but also the interests of its members as gun show vendors and  
23 attendees and supporters of the right to keep and bear arms for lawful purposes.

24 17. Plaintiff SECOND AMENDMENT LAW CENTER, INC. ("2ALC"),  
25 is a nonprofit organization, incorporated under the laws of Nevada with headquarters  
26 in Henderson, Nevada, and registered with the California Secretary of State to do  
27 business in the state of California. 2ALC works to advance Second Amendment  
28 jurisprudence across the country while educating the public, participating in

1 scholarly research, and providing thought-provoking writings and content to help  
2 advance the Second Amendment. 2LC works to support and protect Second  
3 Amendment rights across the country, and they distribute materials at gun shows in  
4 California to inform the public about their work. Because the ban on sales of  
5 firearms and ammunition at the Fairgrounds is intended to make gun shows less  
6 profitable and effectively shutter them, it restricts the rights of 2ALC to share  
7 education and training materials with gun owners and those that attend gun show  
8 events. In this lawsuit, 2ALC represents its interests as a gun show attendee and  
9 purveyor of educational materials.

10 18. Plaintiff SECOND AMENDMENT FOUNDATION, INC. (“SAF”) is a  
11 non-profit membership organization. It is incorporated under the laws of the state of  
12 Washington and was founded in 1974. SAF has over 700,000 members and  
13 supporters nationwide, including thousands of members in California. The purposes  
14 of SAF include education, research, publishing, and litigation. It is critical to the  
15 success of SAF that its promotional material, publications, and messages about the  
16 “right to keep and bear arms” reach demographic groups that are saturated with gun  
17 owners, gun buyers, and people of the “gun culture.” Gun Shows like the one  
18 threatened by the Defendants’ actions interfere with this effort. SAF is dedicated to  
19 promoting a better understanding about our constitutional heritage to privately own  
20 and possess firearms through educational and legal action programs designed to  
21 better inform the public about gun control issues. SAF has been a pioneer in  
22 innovative defense of the right to keep and bear arms, through its publications and  
23 public education programs like the Gun Rights Policy Conference. Those  
24 publications and other SAF materials and information are offered at gun show  
25 events. Second Amendment Foundation also expends significant sums of money  
26 sponsoring public interest litigation to defend its own interests to disseminate  
27 information to like-minded individuals, in an individualized setting like a gun show,  
28 but SAF also seeks to defend the interests of its member in lawsuits like this present

1 effort.

2 **[Defendants]**

3 19. Defendant GAVIN NEWSOM is the Governor of the State of  
4 California. As Governor, he is vested with “the supreme executive power” of the  
5 state and “shall see that the law is faithfully executed.” Cal. Const. art. 5, §1.  
6 Defendant Newsom is sued in his official capacity.

7 20. Defendant ROB BONTA is the Attorney General of the State of  
8 California. He is the “chief law officer” of the state and has the duty to ‘see that the  
9 laws of the State are uniformly and adequately enforced.” Cal. Const. art. 5, § 1.  
10 Additionally, Defendant Bonta has “direct supervision over every district attorney”  
11 within the State. *Id.* If, at any point a district attorney of the State fails to enforce  
12 adequately “any law of the State,” Defendant Bonta must “prosecute any violations  
13 of the law.” *Id.* Finally, Defendant Bonta, as Attorney General of the State of  
14 California, “shall assist any district attorney in the discharge” of duties when  
15 “required by the public interest or directed by the Governor. . . .” *Id.* Defendant  
16 Bonta is sued in his official capacity.

17 21. Defendant TODD SPITZER is the District Attorney responsible for  
18 enforcing the law within the county of Orange. Under the California Government  
19 Code, the district attorney must prosecute “all actions for the recovery” of fines and  
20 penalties. Cal. Gov’t Code § 26521. Defendant Spitzer is sued in his official  
21 capacity.

22 22. Defendant KAREN ROSS is the Secretary of the California Department  
23 of Food & Agriculture—the entity responsible for the policy oversight of the  
24 network of California fair venues, which includes the Orange County Fair & Event  
25 Center. Through the Department, Defendant Ross issues guidance for governance  
26 and contracting to all agricultural districts throughout California (including  
27 Defendant District) and requires reporting from the districts on operational issues.  
28 The Department maintains an office of legal counsel for any actions brought against

1 Agricultural Association Districts in the state. Defendant Ross is sued in her official  
2 capacity.

3 23. Defendant 32nd DISTRICT AGRICULTURAL ASSOCIATION  
4 (“District”) is a Governor-appointed Board of Directors that manages the state-  
5 owned Orange County Fair & Event Center public venue. The District is governed  
6 by a nine-member board, each member serving a four-year term. The District Board  
7 of Directors appoints a CEO charged with the daily operations of the facilities but  
8 maintains control over activities not delegated to the CEO, including contracting  
9 with those seeking to host events, including gun shows, at the Fairgrounds. It is  
10 responsible for ensuring that all state laws governing gun shows at the Fairgrounds,  
11 including SB 264, are faithfully enforced. Defendant District refused to consider  
12 contracts for the gun show by refusing to place the question of contract approval on  
13 monthly meeting agendas when considering other similar contracts.

14 24. The true names and capacities of Defendants named as DOES 1  
15 through 10, inclusive, are individual, corporate, associate or otherwise, and are  
16 unknown to Plaintiffs. They are, however, believed to be responsible in some way  
17 for Plaintiffs’ loss and damages. Each Doe Defendant is, and at all times mentioned  
18 here was, a partner, agent, principal, co-conspirator, or are otherwise vicariously or  
19 directly responsible for the acts or omissions of the other defendants or themselves.  
20 They are each sued individually and are joined as party defendants. Plaintiffs thus  
21 sue each Doe Defendant under rules 15 and 21 of the Federal Rules of Civil  
22 Procedure. Plaintiffs are informed and believed that the Doe Defendants are all  
23 California residents. Plaintiffs will amend this complaint to show such true names  
24 and capacities of Doe Defendants when they have been ascertained.

### 25 **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

#### 26 **[The First Amendment Rights to Free Speech, Association, & Assembly]**

27 25. The First Amendment provides, in part, that “Congress shall make no  
28 law . . . abridging the freedom of speech,” U.S. Const. amend. I. It is incorporated

1 and made applicable to the states by the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States  
2 Constitution and by 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

3 26. Political and ideological speech—including speech concerning  
4 “politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion”—has long been  
5 considered the core of the First Amendment. *W. Va. State Bd. of Educ. v. Barnette*,  
6 319 U.S. 624, 642 (1943).

7 27. Public property made available for lease by community groups to  
8 engage in expressive activity must thus be available without regard to the viewpoint  
9 sought to be expressed *Cinevision Corp. v. City of Burbank*, 745 F.2d 560 (9th Cir.  
10 1984). Such venues cannot be opened to some and closed to others, suppressing  
11 protected expression, absent a compelling government interest. *Id.* at 571.

12 28. The First Amendment does not tolerate the suppression of speech based  
13 on what some may label an unpopular viewpoint of the speaker. *John J. Hurley and*  
14 *S. Boston Allied War Vets. Council v. Irish-Am. Gay, Lesbian & Bisexual Group of*  
15 *Boston*, 515 U.S. 557 (1995). Indeed, “*above all else*, the First Amendment means  
16 that the government has no power to restrict expression because of its message, its  
17 ideas, its subject matter, or its content.” *Mosley*, 408 U.S. at 95 (emphasis added);  
18 *see also Ashcroft*, 535 U.S. at 573.

19 29. A content-based restriction that implicates political or ideological  
20 speech must generally survive “strict scrutiny,” where the government must show  
21 that the law is narrowly tailored to achieve a compelling government interest. *See*  
22 *Reed v. Town of Gilbert*, 576 U.S. 155 (2015); *see also Lorillard Tobacco Co. v.*  
23 *Reilly*, 533 U.S. 525 (2001) (holding that tobacco marketing restrictions – even  
24 those purposed to protecting minors -- must be the narrowest means of achieving an  
25 asserted state interest); *Brown v. Entm’t Merchs. Ass’n*, 564 U.S. 786 (2011)  
26 (overturing California law banning sale or rental of “violent video games” to  
27 minors); *see also Tracy Rifle & Pistol LLC v. Harris*, 339 F. Supp. 3d 1007, 1018  
28 (E.D. Cal. 2018) (holding that a California law prohibiting the display of a handgun,

1 an imitation handgun, or a placard advertising the sale of a handgun in a manner that  
2 is visible from the outside of a gun dealer’s premises is unconstitutional).

3 30. Even purely commercial speech—speech that “does no more than  
4 propose a commercial transaction” or relates solely to the economic interests of the  
5 speaker and audience—receives First Amendment protection if it is not misleading  
6 and concerns a lawful activity. *Cent. Hudson Gas & Elec. Corp. v. Public Serv.*  
7 *Comm’n*, 447 U.S. 557 (1980).

8 31. “An offer to sell firearms or ammunition” is constitutionally protected  
9 commercial speech. *Nordyke v. Santa Clara*, 110 F.3d 707, 710 (9th Cir. 2009).

10 32. Government restrictions on protected commercial speech are  
11 constitutional *only* if they directly advance a substantial government interest and are  
12 not broader than necessary to serve that interest. *Cent. Hudson*, 447 U.S. 557.<sup>2</sup>

13 33. The First Amendment protects not only the right of free speech, but  
14 also “the right of the people peaceably to assemble.” U.S. Const., amend. I. The  
15 right to assemble often merges with the right to free expression. For “[e]ffective  
16 advocacy of both public and private points of view, particularly controversial ones,  
17 is undeniably enhanced by group association.” *NAACP v. Patterson*, 357 U.S. 449,  
18 462 (1958). “Governmental action which may have the effect of curtailing the  
19 freedom to associate is subject to the *closest* scrutiny.” *Id.* at 461-62.

20 **[The Fourteenth Amendment Right to Equal Protection Under the Law]**

21 34. The Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution,  
22 enforceable under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, provides that no state shall deny to any person  
23

24 <sup>2</sup> Though this is currently the controlling test for so-called “commercial speech,”  
25 modern case law is trending toward extending *full* First Amendment protection to all  
26 speech, including “commercial speech.” See *Sorrell v. IMS Health, Inc.*, 564 U.S.  
27 552 (moving toward providing commercial speech the same level of heightened  
28 protection long accorded to political speech); see also *44 Liquormart, Inc. v. Rhode  
Island*, 517 U.S. 484, 523 (1996) (Thomas, J., concurring in part and concurring in  
judgment) (“I do not see a philosophical or historical basis for asserting that  
‘commercial’ speech is of ‘lower value’ than ‘noncommercial’ speech. Indeed, some  
historical materials suggest to the contrary.”).

1 within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

2 35. Singling out speakers because of the content of their speech also  
3 violates their fundamental rights under the Equal Protection Clause. U.S. Const.  
4 amend. XIV.

5 36. If unequal treatment occurs in the context of exercising a fundamental  
6 right, or the government is motivated by animus toward a disfavored group, courts  
7 apply heightened scrutiny. *See Loving v. Virginia*, 388 U.S. 1, 11 (1967); *see also*  
8 *Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Center, Inc.*, 473 U.S. 432 (1985); *Romer v. Evans*, 517  
9 U.S. 620 (1996). Indeed, “[b]ecause the right to engage in political expression is  
10 fundamental to our constitutional system, statutory classifications impinging upon  
11 that right must be narrowly tailored to serve a compelling governmental interest.”  
12 *Austin v. Mich. Chamber of Commerce*, 494 U.S. 652, 666 (1990), *rev’d on other*  
13 *grounds, Citzs. United v. Fed. Elec. Comm’n*, 558 U.S. 310, 130 S. Ct. 876 (2010).

14 **[Regulation of Gun Show Events in California]**

15 37. The state of California has the most rigorous regulatory regime for  
16 commerce in firearms and ammunition in the United States. That regulatory regime  
17 applies to the operation of gun show events throughout California. The laws related  
18 to the acquisition and sale of firearms are arguably stricter at gun shows than at  
19 brick-and-mortar stores or internet sales.

20 38. Only state approved, licensed gun show producers may operate gun  
21 shows in California.

22 39. All gun show producers, including Plaintiff Crossroads, must have an  
23 individual (the “promoter”) who holds a valid Certificate of Eligibility issued by the  
24 California Department of Justice.

25 40. Gun show producers must also, among other things:

- 26 a. Certify that they are familiar with all California laws regarding  
27 gun shows, Cal. Penal Code § 27200;  
28 b. Possess a minimum of \$1,000,000 liability insurance, *id.*;

- 1 c. Provide an annual list of shows or events to be held to the
- 2 California Department of Justice, *id.*; and
- 3 d. Notify the California Department of Justice no later than 30 days
- 4 prior to the gun show or event of any changes to the above, *id.*
- 5 e. Make available to law enforcement a complete and accurate list
- 6 of all vendors that will participate in the show to sell, lease, or
- 7 transfer firearms. Cal. Penal Code § 27205.

8 41. Gun show producers must submit an annual event and security plan and  
9 schedule to the California Department of Justice and any local law enforcement  
10 agency. The plan must include:

- 11 a. Type of show or event;
- 12 b. Estimated number of vendors offering for sale or display
- 13 firearms;
- 14 c. Estimated number of attendees;
- 15 d. Number of entrances and exits at the event;
- 16 e. Location, dates, and times of the event;
- 17 f. Contact person and telephone number for both promoter and
- 18 facility;
- 19 g. Number of sworn peace officers employed by the producer or
- 20 facility who will be present at the event;
- 21 h. Number of non-sworn security personnel employed by the
- 22 producer or the facility who will be present at the event; and
- 23 i. Promoters must inform all prospective vendors of all California
- 24 laws regarding gun shows.

25 Cal. Penal Code §§ 27210, 27215.

26 42. Gun show producers must also provide a list of all prospective vendors  
27 and designated firearm transfer agents who are licensed firearm dealers to the  
28 California Department of Justice no later than seven days prior to the event for the

1 purpose of determining whether the vendor possess a valid license and are thus  
2 eligible to participate in the event. Cal. Penal Code § 27220.

3 43. If a vendor is not approved by the California Department of Justice or  
4 fails to comply with all applicable California laws, they cannot participate. Cal.  
5 Penal Code § 27220.

6 44. If a gun show producers fails to inform all prospective vendors of  
7 California's state laws or fails to submit a list of all prospective vendors to the  
8 California Department of Justice, the event cannot commence. Cal. Penal Code §  
9 27230.

10 45. Gun show producers must have written contracts with each vendor  
11 selling firearms at the event. Cal. Penal Code § 27235.

12 46. Gun show producers must post signs in a readily visible location at  
13 each public entrance to the event that includes all of the following notices:

- 14 • "This gun show follows all federal, state, and local firearms and  
15 weapons laws, without exception."
- 16 • "Any firearm carried onto the premises by any member of the public  
17 will be checked, cleared of any ammunition, and secured in a manner  
18 that prevents it from being operated, and an identification tag or sticker  
19 will be attached to the firearm before the person is allowed admittance  
20 to the show."
- 21 • "No member of the public under the age of 18 years shall be admitted  
22 to the show unless accompanied by a parent, grandparent, or legal  
23 guardian."
- 24 • "All firearm transfers between private parties at the show shall be  
25 conducted through a licensed dealer in accordance with applicable state  
26 and federal laws."
- 27 • "Persons possessing firearms in this facility must have in their  
28 immediate possession government-issued photo identification and

1 display it upon the request to any security officer or any peace officer,  
2 as defined in Section 830.”

3 Cal. Penal Code § 27240(a).

4 47. Gun show producers must also post signs in a readily visible location at  
5 each entrance to the parking lot stating: “The transfer of firearms on the parking lot  
6 of this facility is a crime.” Cal. Penal Code § 27240(b).

7 48. A willful failure of a producer to comply with any of California’s  
8 applicable laws is a misdemeanor punishable with a fine of up to \$2,000 dollars and  
9 would render the producer ineligible for a gun show producer license for up to one  
10 year, which could cost a producer hundreds of thousands of dollars in lost revenue  
11 for a willful infraction. Cal. Penal Code § 27245(c).

12 49. Except in very limited exceptions applicable only to law enforcement,  
13 actual firearm transfers are already prohibited from taking place at any gun show in  
14 California.<sup>3</sup> The firearm sale can be started through an on-site licensed “transfer  
15 dealer,” but it cannot be completed on site. Instead, purchasers must pick up their  
16 purchase at a licensed firearm retailer at a different licensed location--but only after  
17 a 10-day waiting period and background check. There is no “Gun Show Loophole”  
18 at gun shows operated in accordance with California Law.

19 50. The Gun Show Act of 2000, California Penal Code sections 27200-  
20 27245, places even more restrictions on the operation of a gun show in California by  
21 requiring that:

22 a. Vendors do not display, possess, or offer for sale any firearms,  
23 knives, or weapons for which possession or sale is prohibited;

24  
25 <sup>3</sup> Cal. Penal Code § 27310 (requiring all firearm transfers at gun shows to comply  
26 with state and federal law); *id.* § 26805 (prohibiting the sale and transfer of a firearm  
27 by a licensed dealer at any location other than the dealer’s premises as listed on their  
28 license but allowing dealer to prepare documents at a gun show in preparation for  
completion of the sale at the dealer’s premises); *id.* § 27545 (requiring all firearm  
transactions to be processed through a licensed dealer when neither party is a  
licensed firearm dealer).

- 1           b. Vendors acknowledge that they are responsible for knowing and
- 2           complying with all applicable federal, state, and local laws
- 3           dealing with the possession and transfer of firearms;
- 4           c. Vendors will not engage in activities that incite or encourage hate
- 5           crimes;
- 6           d. Vendors will process all transfers of firearms through licensed
- 7           firearms dealers as required by state law;
- 8           e. Vendors will verify that all firearms in their possession will be
- 9           unloaded and that the firearms will be secured in a manner that
- 10          prevents them from being operated except for brief periods, when
- 11          the mechanical condition of the firearm is being demonstrated to
- 12          prospective buyer;
- 13          f. Vendors provide all required information under Penal Code §
- 14          27320;
- 15          g. Vendors will not display or possess black powder or offer it for
- 16          sale;
- 17          h. Ammunition only be displayed in closed original factory boxes
- 18          or other closed containers, with the only exception for showing
- 19          the ammunition to a prospective buyer. On July 1, 2019,
- 20          additional state-law restrictions on the sale of ammunition will
- 21          become effective and gun shows must comply;
- 22          i. No member of the public under 18 years old may enter a gun
- 23          show unless accompanied by a parent or legal guardian;
- 24          j. No person other than security personnel or law enforcement
- 25          possess both a firearm and ammunition for that firearm at the
- 26          same time, with the exception of vendors who are selling both.

27           51. Plaintiff Crossroads diligently operates all of its gun shows in  
28 accordance with state law, and it takes immediate remedial measures if irregularities

1 are discovered.

2 52. Vendors at Crossroads gun shows are some of the same licensed  
3 vendors that have brick and mortar stores in the community or operate legally over  
4 the internet and are registered with the state as lawful businesses.

5 53. Vendors at Crossroads gun shows sell legal products and enjoy being  
6 able to attend gun shows so they can better interact with customers in a more  
7 meaningful and intimate way.

8 54. Even with all of the state and federal regulations that promoters and  
9 vendors must abide, through the adoption and enforcement of SB 264, Defendants  
10 now seek to wholly prohibit constitutionally protected, highly regulated, and  
11 otherwise perfectly legal activity.

12 **[The Gun Show Cultural Experience]**

13 55. Gun shows are a modern bazaar—a convention of like-minded  
14 individuals who meet in this unique public forum that has been set aside by state and  
15 local governments for all manner of commerce. This convention-like setting is of  
16 incalculable benefit to the gun-buying consumer and promotes public safety.

17 56. Gun shows, in general, and the Orange County show, in particular, are  
18 a celebration of America’s “gun culture” that is a natural and essential outgrowth of  
19 the constitutional rights that flow from the Second Amendment to the United States  
20 Constitution.

21 57. Gun shows, in general, and the Orange County show, in particular, are  
22 a First Amendment forum where literature and information are shared, speakers  
23 provide valuable lectures, classes are conducted, political forums are held where gun  
24 rights discussions take place, and candidates for political office can meet to discuss  
25 political issues, the government, and the constitution with constituents who are part  
26 of the California gun culture.

27 58. Thousands of people attend gun shows on the weekends they are held at  
28 the Fairgrounds. Many attend as new gun owners seeking information and

1 instruction. With over 1 million new gun owners in California in the past year, gun  
2 shows offer the opportunity for these new gun owners to learn about firearms,  
3 safety, and speak to expert firearm enthusiasts.

4 59. Gun shows place a huge emphasis on safety as citizens come together.  
5 Gun shows are designed to offer a communal atmosphere of like-minded people that  
6 one does not find in a store where people are running in to pick up one or two items.  
7 Gun shows are designed so that people will congregate, take their time, engage each  
8 other and the vendors, and learn in a way that they do not otherwise engage.

9 60. Gun shows also happen to include the exchange of products and ideas,  
10 knowledge, services, education, entertainment, and recreation related to the lawful  
11 uses of firearms. Those lawful uses include (but are not limited to): firearm safety  
12 training; defense of self and others; defense community, state, and nation; hunting;  
13 target shooting; gunsmithing; admiration of guns as art; appreciation of guns as  
14 technological artifacts; and the study of guns as historical objects.

15 61. Gun shows, in general, and the Orange County show, in particular, are  
16 cultural marketplaces for those members of the “gun culture” who attend to  
17 celebrate their constitutional rights and to pass their beliefs in patriotism and the  
18 rights of the individual on to the next generation. It is a place where parents take  
19 their children and grandparents take their grandchildren to share with them, among  
20 other things, a love of historic firearms, stories of American war heroes, and their  
21 love of hunting.

22 62. Gun shows, in general, and the Orange County show, in particular, are  
23 places where parents can learn to protect their families and their homes, and how to  
24 stay in compliance with California’s ever-changing gun laws.

25 63. Gun shows, in general, and the Orange County show, in particular, are  
26 places where people can discuss the positions of political candidates and whether  
27 those values line up with their own beliefs in protecting the Second Amendment.

28 64. Gun shows, in general, and the Orange County show, in particular, are

1 held and promoted, and considerable investment is made, precisely to promote and  
2 “normalize” the “gun culture” and the constitutional principles that gun show  
3 participants hold dear.

4 65. This forum is vitally important especially in California where  
5 government actors at all levels of government (federal, state, and local) are openly  
6 hostile to the cultural values of the Second Amendment and where supporters of  
7 those cultural values are not considered “mainstream.”

8 66. Participating in “gun culture” is an important reason people attend  
9 Crossroads gun shows as vendors, exhibitors, customers, and guests (even if  
10 particular vendors or attendees are not in the firearm business or in the market to  
11 buy a gun at a particular event).

12 67. While less than 40% of vendors at Crossroads’ events offer firearms or  
13 ammunition for sale (the remaining vendors offer accessories, collectibles, home  
14 goods, lifestyle products, educational information, food, and other refreshments), the  
15 principle draw of gun shows is the availability of firearms, ammunition, and firearm  
16 parts and accessories for sale, as well as the ability to handle and inspect firearms  
17 while in the presence of knowledgeable vendors.

18 68. Indeed, many people attend gun shows to learn about the technology  
19 and use of various firearms and ammunition when they are considering whether to  
20 buy or sell a firearm and to exchange knowledge with experienced dealers and  
21 firearm enthusiasts that they cannot get anywhere else. *Teixeira v. County of*  
22 *Alameda*, No. 13-17132 (9th Cir. 2017).<sup>4</sup>

23 69. Without the ability to buy and sell firearms and ammunition at gun  
24 shows at the Fairgrounds, the events will no longer be able to draw many of its  
25 vendors and attendees, making the events unprofitable and economically infeasible.

26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 <sup>4</sup> The *Teixeira* court did not answer whether the Second Amendment includes a  
28 right to purchase a firearm. Plaintiffs allege, in good faith, that the right to keep and  
bear arms *necessarily* includes the rights to purchase and sell them. Indeed, those  
rights are a necessary predicate to the exercise of the Second Amendment.

1 When events are no longer profitable, producers and vendors cannot afford to attend  
2 and host the shows or maintain the speech components of gun show.

3 70. Defendants wish to end this celebration of “gun culture” and Second  
4 Amendment rights because they do not understand the culture or the people. To that  
5 end, Defendants have attempted, through SB 264’s ban on sales of firearms,  
6 ammunition, and “firearm precursor parts” at the Fairgrounds, to permanently  
7 deprive Plaintiffs of their right to engage in constitutionally protected conduct at the  
8 Fairgrounds.

9 **[The Orange County Fair & Event Center]**

10 71. The Fairgrounds is owned by the state of California and managed by  
11 the Board of Directors of Defendant District, which must regularly report its  
12 activities to the California Department of Food & Agriculture.

13 72. Among other things, Defendant District is charged with maintaining the  
14 Fairgrounds and ensuring that is used for public purposes.

15 73. Defendant Ross, as the Secretary of the California Department of Food  
16 & Agriculture, oversees the operation of the various agricultural districts in the state,  
17 including Defendant District.

18 74. The California Department of Food & Agriculture, under Secretary  
19 Ross, provides policies and guidance for the operation of all agricultural districts in  
20 the state, including the use of facilities as directed by Department policy.

21 75. The California Department of Food & Agriculture maintains a *CDFA*  
22 *Contracts Manual for Agricultural Districts* (“Manual”). Section 6.25 of the Manual  
23 states that “[w]hether or not a fair rents out their facilities for gun shows is a policy  
24 decision to be made by the fair board and their community.”

25 76. The Fairgrounds is a state-owned property maintained and opened for  
26 use by the public. By virtue of being opened by the state for use by the public, it is a  
27 “public forum,” from which the government may not generally exclude expressive  
28 activity. *Cinevision*, 745 F.2d at 569 (quoting *Perry Educ. Ass’n v. Perry Local*

1 *Educators' Assn*, 460 U.S. 37, 45-46 (1983)).

2 77. The Fairgrounds is used by many different groups and is a major event  
3 venue for large gatherings of people to engage in expressive activities, including  
4 concerts, festivals, and industry shows. Indeed, "OC Fair & Event Center is a 150-  
5 acre event venue that hosts over 150 events and attracts approximately 4.3 million  
6 visitors annually. [Its] versatile multi-use property can be transformed to fit a variety  
7 of events from small private events to large-scale trade shows and festivals." OC  
8 Fair & Event Center, Event Space Sales, [https://ocfair.com/venue-rentals/venue-](https://ocfair.com/venue-rentals/venue-options/rental-property-brochure/)  
9 [options/rental-property-brochure/](https://ocfair.com/venue-rentals/venue-options/rental-property-brochure/) (last visited Aug. 4, 2022) (attached as Exhibit 1).

10 78. The Fairgrounds actively promotes the use of the property by the public  
11 through contracting for available space at the Fairgrounds. *Id.*; *see also* OC Fair &  
12 Event Center, Venue Rentals, <https://ocfair.com/venue-rentals/> (last visited Aug. 4,  
13 2022).

14 79. The Fairgrounds' Board of Directors Governing Manual states that  
15 Defendant District's purpose is "(1) to hold fairs, expositions and exhibitions in  
16 Orange County to exhibit the industries and industrial enterprises, resources, and  
17 products of every kind or nature of the state, with a view toward improving,  
18 exploiting, encouraging, and stimulating them; and (2) to construct, maintain, and  
19 operate recreational and cultural facilities of general public interest in Orange  
20 County. The 32nd DAA has adopted a mission statement to effectuate these  
21 purposes, which is the celebration of Orange County's communities, interests,  
22 agriculture and heritage." 32nd District Agricultural District, *Board of Directors*  
23 *Governing Manual*, Introduction at 1, available at [https://s3.us-west-](https://s3.us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ocfair.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/02141413/Policy-Combo-All.pdf)  
24 [1.amazonaws.com/ocfair.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/02141413/Policy-](https://s3.us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ocfair.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/02141413/Policy-Combo-All.pdf)  
25 [Combo-All.pdf](https://s3.us-west-1.amazonaws.com/ocfair.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/02141413/Policy-Combo-All.pdf) (last visited Aug. 4, 2022).

26 80. The Fairgrounds has held non-gun-show events in which criminal  
27 activity has taken place. These criminal incidents are no more likely to happen at a  
28 gun show than at other types of events, but the Defendants have not banned these

1 promoters or their events.

2 **[Contracting for Use of the Fairgrounds]**

3 81. Defendant District has a process for securing returning contractors who  
4 would like to secure specific dates into future years before the contracts can be  
5 drafted and executed.

6 82. Each year, returning and regular contractors, including Plaintiff  
7 Crossroads, submit preferred dates for the next calendar year, so Defendant District  
8 can confirm availability and so that Plaintiff Crossroads can begin to reserve  
9 vendors and materials for the show weekends.

10 83. Due to the size and extensive planning that goes into producing gun  
11 show events, Defendant District has—for decades—provided and held preferred  
12 dates for Plaintiff Crossroads, a long-time contractor, until the contracts can fully be  
13 executed.

14 84. Defendant District’s “hold” system essentially operates as a right of  
15 first refusal to the benefit of returning contractors. For example, if another contractor  
16 wanted the same preferred dates as Plaintiff Crossroads, Defendant District would  
17 not allow another vendor to come in and take those dates from Plaintiff Crossroads  
18 even though there is no official contract in place yet.

19 85. The “hold” system also provides Defendant District with the security of  
20 knowing its venue is booked with experienced and knowledgeable repeat contractors  
21 that have a demonstrated record of running safe and profitable events at the  
22 Fairgrounds.

23 86. The “hold” system also permits the promoter to spend advertising  
24 dollars to promote its events, but when governments announce plans to ban gun  
25 shows at particular venues, vendors and patrons rationally make plans to attend gun  
26 show events at other venues or seek other states to conduct their commerce.

27 87. Defendant District also considers the “hold” dates and shows during  
28 budget discussions which are typically held in the year before the contracts are

1 commenced.

2 88. Upon information and belief, Plaintiffs allege that the “hold” system is  
3 widely used by similar state fair board venues and is standard industry practice.

4 89. Plaintiff Crossroads, after doing business in this customary manner for  
5 more than 30 years, had no reason to doubt that Defendant District would continue  
6 to honor such relationship with Plaintiff Crossroads.

7 **[Ban on Gun Shows at Other Fairgrounds & Resulting Litigation]**

8 90. Despite the long history that Plaintiff Crossroads has had in California,  
9 operating safe and legal events, the political environment has become hostile toward  
10 gun show events and (more generally) toward the “gun culture” in recent years.

11 91. Indeed, gun-show-banning activists are at work throughout the state  
12 and the country to ban *all* gun shows *everywhere*, not because they are “dangerous  
13 for the community,” but because they do not subscribe to the same values as gun  
14 show promoters, vendors, and participants.

15 92. With increasing regularity, the same activists are making appearances  
16 on Zoom board meetings held by fair boards across the state, and during each  
17 appearance, they make the same claims in order to shut down lawful gun shows.

18 93. These activists rely on unfounded fears about the security of gun show  
19 events, false claims that gun shows are inherently dangerous because they normalize  
20 the “gun culture,” and peddle in false stereotypes about the people that attend gun  
21 shows. *See City of Cleburne v. Cleburne Living Ctr.*, 473 U.S. 432 (1985) (striking  
22 an ordinance requiring a special permit for a group home for the intellectually  
23 disabled and citing direct evidence of negative attitudes toward persons with  
24 disabilities expressed by community members and recorded in the legislative  
25 history).

26 94. In 2017, gun-show-banning activists using the same tactics described  
27 above began pressuring the 22nd District Agricultural Association (“22nd DAA”),  
28 which manages the Del Mar Fairgrounds in San Diego, to prohibit gun show events

1 at the Del Mar Fairgrounds. In response, the 22nd DAA began a series of meetings  
2 and comment periods to determine whether it would continue to contract with  
3 Plaintiff Crossroads or other gun show producers for the use of the Del Mar  
4 Fairgrounds to host gun show events.

5 95. The 22nd DAA also engaged in communications with other  
6 government agencies and with Crossroads to determine whether gun shows at the  
7 Fairgrounds were operated in full compliance with state and federal law, and if the  
8 events pose any real danger to the community.

9 96. On April 23, 2018, Defendant Newsom sent a letter to the 22nd DAA,  
10 urging the Board to ban gun shows at the Fairgrounds, citing his concerns that  
11 “[p]ermitting the sale of firearms and ammunition on state-owned property only  
12 perpetuates America’s gun culture.” Letter from Governor Gavin Newsom to Board  
13 Members of 22nd District Agricultural Association (April 23, 2018) (attached as  
14 Exhibit 2).

15 97. On September 10, 2018, Assembly member Todd Gloria (D) sent a  
16 letter to the 22nd DAA, stating his “firm belief that the State of California should in  
17 no way help to facilitate the sale of firearms.” He also expressed his support for the  
18 22nd DAA “willingness to consider options for limiting or eliminating these gun  
19 shows” and vowed to “act by way of legislation should the 22nd DAA Board be  
20 unable to take meaningful action.” Letter from Assembly Member Todd Gloria to  
21 Board Members of 22nd District Agricultural Association (Sept. 10, 2018) (attached  
22 as Exhibit 3).

23 98. At a public hearing on September 11, 2018, a fair board ad hoc  
24 “Contracts Committee” recommended that the 22nd DAA “not consider any  
25 contracts with the producers of gun shows beyond December 31st, 2018, until such  
26 time as the [22nd DAA] has put into place a more thorough policy regarding the  
27 conduct of gun shows.”

28 99. In testimony before the 22nd DAA at the September 11, 2018 hearing,

1 Patrick Kerins, who was then the Public Safety Director for the 22nd DAA, reported  
2 on the laws that apply to gun shows in California, as well as Plaintiff Crossroads  
3 history of events at the Fairgrounds.

4 100. During his comments at the September 11, 2018 hearing, Mr. Kerins  
5 referenced a memorandum that he prepared for the 22nd DAA's Board of Directors  
6 in 2016. In that memorandum, he reported that:

7 As Chief of Security for the 22nd DAA, I routinely inspect the  
8 gun show and on a regular basis communicate with the San Diego  
9 Sheriff's Department re: compliance with all the applicable laws and  
10 regulations and the Security Plan required by the California  
11 Department of Justice Firearms Division. I recently spoke to  
12 Detective Jaime Rodriguez of the Sheriff's North Coastal Station  
13 who supervises the four Deputies assigned to the gun show security  
14 detail and Detective Stacey Smith who is assigned to the Sheriff's  
15 Licensing Division. Both Detectives said the Crossroads of the West  
16 Gun Show is in complete compliance with all the local, State and  
17 Federal laws that govern gun shows and that there have not been any  
18 violations of law. Both Detectives had high praise for the show  
19 promoters and the 22 DAA staff.

20 Memorandum of Patrick Kerins, Public Safety Director, 22nd District Agricultural  
21 Association, to Board of Directors, 22nd District Agricultural Association, at 17  
22 (2016) (attached as Exhibit 4).

23 101. Mr. Kerins' 2016 memorandum continued:

24 In my considered opinion, as Chief of Security for the 22 DAA for  
25 the last 17 years, the CROSSROADS OF THE WEST GUN  
26 SHOWS (5 per year) are in compliance with all the local, state and  
27 federal regulatory statutes and have operated without any violations  
28 of those laws Under the laws of the State of California you must  
comply with all the laws of purchasing, selling and/or transferring of  
firearms at a gun show as you would at licensed gun dealer's store  
Due to the strict California gun show regulations there are no so  
called loop holes that you so often hear about in the media.

Ex. 4 at 17.

102. Ultimately, the lengthy process of meetings, public comment, and  
communications with stakeholders resulted in **no finding** that allowing the (already  
heavily regulated) gun show events to continue at the Del Mar Fairgrounds posed a  
definite or unique risk to public safety. Indeed, the 22nd DAA presented *no*  
evidence of any safety concerns within the community that could be linked to the

1 over-30-year-old gun show at the Del Mar Fairgrounds.

2 103. Nonetheless, relying on contrived possibilities of unknown dangers and  
3 unfounded claims that prohibiting gun shows might prevent suicide and violent  
4 crime because the “gun culture” would be censored, the 22nd DAA voted to impose  
5 a one-year moratorium on gun show events at the Del Mar Fairgrounds.

6 104. Plaintiffs Crossroads, CRPA, SAF, and others sued the 22nd DAA,  
7 Defendant Ross, and others in federal court under to prevent enforcement of the  
8 moratorium, alleging violations of various constitutional rights, including the rights  
9 to free speech, assembly, and equal protection. *See B&L Prods. v. 22nd Dist. Agric.*  
10 *Ass’n*, 394 F. Supp. 3d 1226 (S.D. Cal. 2019) (“*B&L I*”) (attached as Exhibit 5).

11 105. Denying the 22nd DAA’s motion to dismiss and granting plaintiffs a  
12 preliminary injunction—*sua sponte*—on the ground that plaintiffs were exceedingly  
13 likely to succeed on the merits of their constitutional claims, the court in *B&L*  
14 *Productions* temporarily enjoined the enforcement of the 22nd DAA’s gun show  
15 moratorium and ordered the 22nd DAA to contract with Crossroads as it would any  
16 other similar event promoter at the Fairgrounds. *Id.*

17 106. Shortly thereafter, the *B&L Productions* plaintiffs negotiated a  
18 settlement with the 22nd DAA, represented by attorneys for the California  
19 Department of Justice, permanently terminating the gun show moratorium,  
20 reinstating Crossroads’ right to promote gun show events at the Fairgrounds, and  
21 permanently barring the 22nd DAA from unilaterally halting B&L’s gun show  
22 events at the Del mar Fairgrounds.

23 **[California’s Assembly Bill 893 (Gloria)]**

24 107. Making good on previous threats, and fully aware of the court’s  
25 decision in *B&L I*, Assemblymember Gloria introduced Assembly Bill 893 (“AB  
26 893”) on or about February 20, 2019. Assem. Bill 893, 2019-2020 Reg. Sess. (Cal.  
27 2019) (attached as Exhibit 6).

28 108. AB 893, which added Section 4158 to the California Food &

1 Agricultural Code, bars any “officer, employee, operator, lessee, or licensee of the  
2 [District]” from “contract[ing] for, authoriz[ing], or allow[ing] the sale of any  
3 firearm or ammunition on the property or in the buildings that comprise the Del Mar  
4 Fairgrounds.” Violation of the law is a misdemeanor. *Id.*

5 109. AB 893 does not bar the possession of firearms or ammunition on the  
6 property or in the buildings that comprise the Del Mar Fairgrounds. *Id.*

7 110. The text of AB 893 expressly identifies the ongoing presence at the Del  
8 Mar Fairgrounds of “marketplaces popularly known as ‘gun shows,’ at which  
9 firearms and ammunition and other items are sold to the public approximately five  
10 times a year.” *Id.*

11 111. AB 893 also clearly recognizes that “[p]romoters maintain relationships  
12 with a core group of vendors, some selling guns and some selling other  
13 merchandise, who travel as the schedule dictates from city to city and state to state  
14 and in the West, for example, many of the same vendors can be seen at Crossroads  
15 of the West Gun Shows from San Francisco, California, to Tucson, Arizona.” *Id.*

16 112. AB 893 failed to identify, however, any real public safety or security  
17 concern specifically related to the existence of gun show events at the Fairgrounds.

18 113. To be sure, AB 893 claims, without support, that “[g]un shows bring  
19 grave danger to a community” and that “dangerous incidents” have taken place at  
20 guns shows at the Fairgrounds, including “an official vendor accused of trafficking  
21 illegal firearms, sales of firearms to individuals registered in the Department of  
22 Justice Bureau of Firearms Armed Prohibited Persons System, and illegal  
23 importation of large-capacity magazines.” But AB 893 makes no effort to show that  
24 these incidents are any more likely to occur at gun shows in California, which are  
25 regulated at least as heavily as retailers operating out of brick-and-mortar stores.

26 114. Instead, AB 893’s legislative history reveals only general concerns  
27 about gun violence occurring all over the country and legislators’ beliefs that the  
28 state should not profit from sales of firearms and ammunition. *See* Matthew

1 Fleming, Assem. Comm. Pub. Safety, Bill Analysis Re: AB 893 (Gloria), 2019-2020  
2 Reg. Sess., at 3 (Cal. 2019) (attached as Exhibit 7).

3 115. Indeed, AB 893 opens with a list of tragedies, including the horrific  
4 mass murders that took place at Columbine High School, Sandy Hook Elementary  
5 School, and Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School—none of which were carried  
6 out with firearms traced to gun show events at the Fairgrounds. Ex. 6.

7 116. What’s more, a March 26, 2019, analysis of AB 893 presented to the  
8 Assembly Committee on Public Safety quoted claims by Assemblymember Gloria,  
9 the bill’s sponsor, that “[t]here is an ever-apparent link between the gun violence we  
10 see virtually every week and the number of guns in our communities.” These  
11 statements, however, made no attempt to link gun violence to gun shows, generally,  
12 or to gun shows at the Fairgrounds, specifically. Ex. 7 at 2.

13 117. The Public Safety Committee’s March 26, 2019, analysis also quoted  
14 Gloria as lamenting that “the State of California should not be profiting or  
15 benefitting from the sale of firearms.” He continued, “[f]undamentally, I believe it is  
16 wrong for the state of California to profit or to benefit from the sale of firearms and  
17 ammunition.” Ex. 7 at 2.

18 118. The Public Safety Committee’s March 26, 2019, analysis also cited a  
19 decade-old report from the Violence Prevention Research Program (VPRP) at the  
20 UC Davis School of Medicine, identifying gun shows as a source of illegally  
21 trafficked firearms. Ex. 7 at 3.

22 119. But neither the VPRP report nor AB 893’s legislative history links any  
23 illegally trafficked firearm or gun used in crime to gun shows at the Fairgrounds (or  
24 even to gun shows in California). *See* Garen Wintemute, MD, *Inside Gun Shows:  
25 What Goes on When Everybody Thinks Nobody’s Watching*, ch. 1 (2009) (attached  
26 as Exhibit 8). This is unsurprising because, as the study states, “[m]uch of the  
27 concern about gun shows as a source of crime guns focuses on private party gun  
28 sales, *since no background checks are conducted and no records are kept.*” *Id.* at 32.

1 But such concerns are simply irrelevant in California where private party transfers—  
2 *even those initiated at gun shows*—must be processed by a licensed firearm dealer  
3 and are subject to background checks and registration under state law.

4 120. The VPRP report cited by the Public Safety Committee’s analysis of  
5 AB 893 also attempts to implicate licensed firearm retailers operating at gun shows  
6 as sources of crime guns in America, claiming that “30% of dealers with gun show  
7 sales, but 22% of all dealers, had previously had a crime gun traced to them.” But it  
8 expressly recognizes that “in California, where both gun shows themselves and gun  
9 commerce generally are regulated, *sales at gun shows are not a risk factor among*  
10 *licensed retailers for disproportionate sales of crime guns.*” Ex. 8 at 33 (emphasis  
11 added).

12 121. The Public Safety Committee’s March 26, 2019, analysis also cited a  
13 report from the Government Accountability Office, claiming that a GAO report  
14 “regarding gun trafficking to Mexico confirmed that many traffickers buy guns at  
15 gun shows.” Ex. 7 at 3. But again, neither the BATFE report nor AB 893’s  
16 legislative history links any illegally trafficked firearm to gun shows at the Del Mar  
17 Fairgrounds (or even to gun shows in California). *See* U.S. Gov’t Accountability  
18 Off., GAO-16-223, *Firearms Trafficking: U.S. Efforts to Combat Firearms*  
19 *Trafficking to Mexico Have Improved, but Some Collaboration Challenges Remain*  
20 (2016) (attached as Exhibit 9). To be sure, the GAO report identifies U.S. Southwest  
21 border states, including Texas (41%), California (19%), and Arizona (15%), as the  
22 largest sources of firearms illegally trafficked into Mexico from the United States.  
23 Ex. 9 at 14. But it does not trace these illegally trafficked guns to licensed dealers,  
24 generally, or to those operating at gun shows, specifically. Rather, it says only that  
25 “there were about 10,134 licensed dealers and pawnbrokers in the four Southwest  
26 border states, many of them along the border,” and that “these licensed dealers and  
27 pawnbrokers can operate in locations such as gun shops, pawn shops, their own  
28 homes, or gun shows.” *Id.*

1 122. The Public Safety Committee’s March 26, 2019, analysis did concede  
2 that “less than one percent of inmates incarcerated in state prisons for gun crimes  
3 acquired their firearms at a gun show”—though it transparently tries to diminish that  
4 fact by citing only a website of the National Rifle Association as the source of the  
5 statistic, instead of the U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics  
6 reports from which the NRA drew it. Ex. 7 at 2-3 (citing NRA-ILA, *Background*  
7 *Checks/NICS*, <https://www.nraila.org/get-the-facts/background-checks-nics> (last  
8 visited Sept. 29, 2021)); *but see* Caroline Wolf Harlow, Ph.D., Bureau of Justice  
9 Statistics, *Firearm Use by Offenders* (Nov. 2001) attached as Exhibit 10.

10 123. While the Public Safety Committee’s March 26, 2019, analysis also  
11 concedes that “violent criminals do not appear to regularly purchase their guns  
12 directly from gun shows,” the analysis immediately shifts to “criticism” (from the  
13 partisan Center for American Progress) that gun shows are somehow “the critical  
14 moment in the chain of custody for many guns, the point at which they move from  
15 the somewhat-regulated legal market to the shadowy, no-questions-asked illegal  
16 market.” Ex. 7 at 3 (citing Arkadi Gerney, Center for American Progress, *The Gun*  
17 *Debate 1 Year After Newtown: Assessing Six Key Claims About Gun Background*  
18 *Checks* (Dec. 2013), available at [https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/guns-](https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/guns-crime/reports/2013/12/13/80795/the-gun-debate-1-year-after-newtown/)  
19 [crime/reports/2013/12/13/80795/the-gun-debate-1-year-after-newtown/](https://www.americanprogress.org/issues/guns-crime/reports/2013/12/13/80795/the-gun-debate-1-year-after-newtown/) (last visited  
20 Sept. 29, 2021). Neither the Center for American Progress editorial nor AB 893’s  
21 bill analysis show how, in California where sales at gun shows are regulated *at least*  
22 as heavily as sales at brick-and-mortar retailers, guns originating at gun shows are  
23 any more likely to enter the “shadowy, no-questions-asked illegal market” than  
24 those sold at gun stores.

25 **[California’s Senate Bill 264 (Min)]**

26 124. Not to be outdone and following the encouragement from both  
27 Defendant Newsom and Assemblymember Gloria, Senator Dave Min sought early  
28 on to rid the state of gun shows on all state fairground properties. Indeed, Senator

1 Min promised “in my first 100 days in office, I promise to author legislation for a  
2 *ban* on these gun shows at the OC Fair and Events Center once and for all.”  
3 Anthony Pignataro, *SD-37 Candidate Min: Ban Gun Shows from OC Fair & Event*  
4 *Center*, OC Weekly (Aug. 6, 2019), [https://www.ocweekly.com/sd-37-candidate-](https://www.ocweekly.com/sd-37-candidate-min-ban-gun-shows-from-oc-fair-event-center/)  
5 [min-ban-gun-shows-from-oc-fair-event-center/](https://www.ocweekly.com/sd-37-candidate-min-ban-gun-shows-from-oc-fair-event-center/) (emphasis added). And he called on  
6 the “governing board of the OC Fair to *end its contract* with Crossroads of the West  
7 and other gun show marketers.” *Id.*

8 125. In response, Board Member Ashleigh Aitken, advocating for the known  
9 safety of the Fairgrounds, noted that “[t]he gun show loophole does not exist in  
10 California. No citizen can purchase a firearm at the gun show and walk off property  
11 with it. The purchases are subject to the same background checks and waiting  
12 periods as any other store purchase.” Aitken went on to note that “California’s legal  
13 gun shows are not a priority as our state has the strictest gun laws in the country.”  
14 Anthony Pignataro, *OC Fair Board Member Responds to Min’s Gun Show Ban Idea*  
15 (Aug. 7, 2019), available at [https://www.ocweekly.com/oc-fair-board-member-](https://www.ocweekly.com/oc-fair-board-member-responds-to-mins-gun-show-ban-idea/)  
16 [responds-to-mins-gun-show-ban-idea/](https://www.ocweekly.com/oc-fair-board-member-responds-to-mins-gun-show-ban-idea/).

17 126. Nevertheless, Senator Min introduced Senate Bill 264 (“SB 264”) on  
18 January 27, 2021. Sen. B. 264, 2020-2021 Reg. Sess. (Cal. 2020) (attached as  
19 Exhibit 11). SB 264, which added section 27575 to the California Penal Code, bars  
20 any “officer, employee, operator, lessee, or licensee of the [District]” from  
21 “contract[ing] for, authoriz[ing], or allow[ing] the sale of any firearm, firearm  
22 precursor part, or ammunition on the property or in the buildings that comprise the  
23 OC Fair and Events Center.” Violation of the law is a misdemeanor. *Id.*

24 127. SB 264 does not bar the possession of firearms, ammunition, or firearm  
25 precursor parts on the property or in the buildings that comprise the Orange County  
26 Fairgrounds. Ex. 10. And it provides exceptions for (1) gun buyback events held by  
27 law enforcement, (2) the sale of a firearm by a public administrator, public  
28 conservator, or public guardian in the course of their duties, (3) the sale of a firearm,

1 firearm precursor part, or ammunition on state property that occurs pursuant to a  
2 contract that was entered into before January 1, 2022, and (4) the purchase of  
3 ammunition on state property by a law enforcement agency in the course of its  
4 regular duties. *Id.*

5 128. Like AB 893, SB 264 clearly recognizes that “[p]romoters maintain  
6 relationships with a core group of vendors, some selling guns and some selling other  
7 merchandise, who travel as the schedule dictates from city to city and state to state  
8 and in the West, for example, many of the same vendors can be seen at Crossroads  
9 of the West Gun Shows from San Francisco, California, to Tucson, Arizona.” *Id.*

10 129. SB 264 failed to identify, however, any real public safety or security  
11 concern specifically related to the existence of gun show events at the Fairgrounds.  
12 Indeed, without citing specific safety concerns related to the *Orange County*  
13 Fairgrounds, the authors of SB 264 literally copied and pasted the same vague  
14 “security concerns” related to the *Del Mar* Fairgrounds from the language of AB  
15 893 to label the Orange County events a threat to the local community. *Id.*

16 130. To be sure, SB 264 claims that “[g]un shows bring grave danger to a  
17 community” and that “dangerous incidents” have taken place at guns shows at the  
18 Fairgrounds, including “*an official vendor accused of trafficking illegal firearms,*  
19 *sales of firearms to individuals registered in the Department of Justice Bureau of*  
20 *Firearms Armed Prohibited Persons System, and illegal importation of large-*  
21 *capacity magazines.”* *Id.* But SB 264 makes no effort to show that these incidents  
22 are any more likely to occur at the Orange County gun show or gun shows in  
23 California in general, which are regulated at least as heavily as retailers operating  
24 out of brick-and-mortar stores. What’s more, these incidents are identical to the  
25 crimes alleged to have taken place at the Del Mar Fairgrounds—an odd coincidence  
26 to be sure.

27 131. Instead, SB 264’s legislative history reveals only general concerns  
28 about gun violence occurring all over the country, unrelated to California gun

1 shows, and legislators’ beliefs that the state should not profit from sales of firearms  
2 and ammunition.

3 132. Indeed, SB 264 opens with a list of tragedies, including the horrific  
4 mass murders that took place at Columbine High School, Sandy Hook Elementary  
5 School, and Marjory Stoneman Douglas High School—none of which were carried  
6 out with firearms traced to gun show events at the Fairgrounds. *Id.*

7 133. The Senate Committee on Public Safety’s March 15, 2021, analysis  
8 cited a report from the Government Accountability Office, claiming that a GAO  
9 report “regarding gun trafficking to Mexico confirmed that many traffickers buy  
10 guns at gun shows.” Sen. Comm. Pub. Safety, Bill Analysis Re: SB 264 (Min),  
11 2021-2022 Reg. Sess., at 4 (Cal. 2021) (attached as Exhibit 12). But again, neither  
12 the BATFE report nor SB 264’s legislative history links any illegally trafficked  
13 firearm to gun shows at the Orange County Fairgrounds (or even to gun shows in  
14 California). *See* Ex. 9.

15 134. In comments to the Senate Public Safety Committee on March 16,  
16 2021, Senator Min claimed that “SB 264 will ensure that the state is not profiting  
17 from the sale of firearms and ammunition on state property or facilitating gun shows  
18 that would undermine California’s strong firearm regulations.” Sen. Pub. Safety  
19 Committee Hrg., Mar. 16, 2021, at 3:20:18, *available at*  
20 [https://www.senate.ca.gov/media-archive/default?title=Public+Safety&startdate=](https://www.senate.ca.gov/media-archive/default?title=Public+Safety&startdate=03%2F16%2F2021&enddate=03%2F17%2F2021)  
21 [03%2F16%2F2021&enddate=03%2F17%2F2021](https://www.senate.ca.gov/media-archive/default?title=Public+Safety&startdate=03%2F16%2F2021&enddate=03%2F17%2F2021) (last accessed Aug. 4, 2022).

22 135. In his remarks to the Senate Public Safety Committee, Senator Min  
23 claimed that the carnival-like atmosphere of gun shows lends itself to “lots of gun  
24 sales in the parking lot or by Venmo where the gun is delivered later.” No data was  
25 presented to support these claims even when asked by Senator Bogh. Senator Min  
26 ultimately conceded that he does not know how many firearms from gun shows  
27 actually move into the stream of illegal commerce. *Id.* at 4:05:36. He went on to  
28 state that even if there have zero unlawful acts at guns shows, “there is a principal

1 that taxpayers should not be utilized, and taxpayer venues should not be utilized to  
2 promulgate the distribution of more guns in our communities.” *Id.* at 4:09:40.

3 136. Senator Min’s closing remarks to the Senate Public Safety Committee  
4 recognized that SB 264 is “symbolic” and makes a statement that the state does not  
5 want to give an endorsement of “our taxpayer venues being used to sell more guns  
6 in our communities. *Id.* at 4:12:59.

7 137. Similarly, in his remarks to the Assembly Committee on Public Safety  
8 on July 13, 2021, Senator Min said that ending gun shows and banning the sale of  
9 firearms, ammunition, and precursor parts at state-owned properties is a value  
10 statement that the state of California must make. *See* Assem. Pub. Safety Committee  
11 Hrg., Mar. 16, 2021, at 4:01:22, *available at*  
12 [https://www.assembly.ca.gov/media/assembly-public-safety-committee-](https://www.assembly.ca.gov/media/assembly-public-safety-committee-20210713/video)  
13 [20210713/video](https://www.assembly.ca.gov/media/assembly-public-safety-committee-20210713/video) (last accessed Aug. 4, 2022). “Value statements” are made about  
14 likes and dislikes, not about issues of public safety. Min’s candid remarks about the  
15 intention of SB 264 clearly illustrate a commitment to end gun shows not for safety  
16 reasons, but to restrict the lawful speech and activities of a culture that he does not  
17 understand and does not support.

18 **[The Impact of SB 264 on the Orange County Gun Show]**

19 138. The sale of firearms and ammunition is an essential function of gun  
20 shows, and it is one of the main reasons people attend these events; if gun shows are  
21 not economically viable because they have been stripped of an essential function,  
22 they will cease to exist.

23 139. SB 264 thus has the same practical effect as Del Mar’s unconstitutional  
24 gun show moratorium which was enjoined by federal court—that is, by permanently  
25 banning the commercial sale of firearms and ammunition at the Fairgrounds, it has  
26 the effect of banning gun shows at the Fairgrounds.

27 140. The Legislature was well-aware when it passed SB 264 that a “gunless”  
28 gun show would not survive financially. Indeed, the intended purpose of SB 264

1 was to end gun shows at the Fairgrounds as noted by bill sponsor Senator Min in  
2 numerous committee testimonies and public comments.

3 141. The July 12, 2021, Assembly Committee on Public Safety’s bill  
4 analysis references other similar legislative attempts to ban gun shows on state  
5 agricultural land. Assem. Comm. Pub. Safety, Bill Analysis Re: SB 264 (Min),  
6 2021-2022 Reg. Sess., at 3 (Cal. 2021) (attached as Exhibit 13). The analysis notes  
7 that:

8  
9 AB 893 (Gloria) Chapter 731, Statutes of 2019, added a section to  
10 the Food and Agricultural Code that prohibits the sale of firearms  
11 and ammunition at the Del Mar Fairgrounds, **effectively terminating**  
12 **the possibility for future gun shows** at the Del Mar Fairgrounds.  
13 AB 893 was signed into law by Governor Newsom. This bill would  
14 expand the provisions of AB 893 by including all state property  
15 within the prohibition on the sale or transfer of firearms and  
16 ammunition.<sup>5</sup>

17 142. Senator Min knew that the intended and practical effect of SB 264 was  
18 to end gun shows. His official Senate press release notes “[i]f signed into law, SB  
19 264 would effectively put a stop to most gun shows on county fairgrounds.” Press  
20 Release, *Senator Dave Min’s Gun Violence Prevention Bill Advances from Assembly*  
21 *Public Safety Committee* (July 13, 2021), available at  
22 [https://sd37.senate.ca.gov/news/senator-dave-mins-gun-violence-prevention-bill-](https://sd37.senate.ca.gov/news/senator-dave-mins-gun-violence-prevention-bill-advances-assembly-public-safety-committee)  
23 [advances-assembly-public-safety-committee](https://sd37.senate.ca.gov/news/senator-dave-mins-gun-violence-prevention-bill-advances-assembly-public-safety-committee) (last accessed Aug. 4, 2022).

24 143. And further evidencing the Legislature’s intended effect of SB 264,  
25 Senator Min wrote to Defendant District, warning members not to stand in the way  
26 of his bill that would ban sales of firearms, ammunition, and firearm precursor parts  
27 at the Fairgrounds. Letter from Senator Dave Min to Board Members of 32nd  
28 District Agricultural Association (on or about Sept. 13, 2021) (attached as Exhibit  
14).

26  
27 <sup>5</sup> SB 264 was initially introduced as a bill to end sales of firearms, ammunition,  
28 and firearm precursor parts on *all* state-owned property. But Min failed to garner  
enough support for such a ban and agreed to limit the scope of SB 264 to the OC  
Fair & Event Center.

1           144. In his letter dated on or about September 13, 2021, Min addressed the  
2 District’s concerns that its venue was being unfairly and exclusively targeted,  
3 responding that SB 264 was no different from earlier attempts to ban gun shows at a  
4 single fairground:

5                   While Item 6A expresses a concern that SB 264 “exclusively targets  
6 the 32nd DAA,” such action to ban gun shows at a single fairground  
7 site has recent precedent. In 2019, Gov. Newsom signed Assembly  
8 Bill 893 (Gloria) into law, ending the sale of firearms and  
ammunition at the Del Mar Fairgrounds, operated by the 22nd  
District Agricultural Association.

9 *Id.* (emphasis added).

10           145. In that same letter, Senator Min also threatened the District’s board  
11 members with individual liability lawsuits should they move to approve contracts  
12 for the gun shows even before Governor Newsom had signed SB 264 into law. *Id.*

13           146. Nonetheless, Plaintiff Crossroads has repeatedly reached out to  
14 Defendant District to request dates for events at the Fairground in 2021 and 2022.  
15 But Defendant District refused to place the contracts for gun shows on the agenda  
16 for October, November, or December 2021, stating instead that they would revisit  
17 the issue again in January 2022 after SB 264 would go into effect.

18           147. Plaintiff Crossroads was unable to secure dates and enter into new  
19 contracts for events at the Fairgrounds in 2022 due to the Defendants’ intentional act  
20 of adopting and enforcing SB 264 and refusing to consider their contracts in the  
21 same way they would any other member of the public seeking to rent the  
22 Fairgrounds venue.

23           148. Indeed, in compliance with SB 264, Defendant District cannot and will  
24 not enter into contracts for gun shows at the Fairgrounds if firearms, ammunition, or  
25 firearm precursor parts will be sold.

26           149. Even though Plaintiff Crossroads has offered to attempt to hold events  
27 without sales of firearms, ammunition, or firearm precursor parts to preserve its  
28 longstanding relationship with the District, mitigate damages, and continue planning

1 and promoting its family-friendly events until its claims can be heard, Defendant  
2 District dragged its feet and refused to provide dates for events for 2022.

3 150. Because of the time and resources needed to plan and implement its  
4 gun show events, Plaintiff Crossroads must plan its shows about one year in  
5 advance, but Defendant District has not allowed Plaintiff Crossroads to secure dates  
6 in 2023 either.

7 151. What's more, Defendant District seems to have stripped Plaintiff  
8 Crossroads of its effective right of first refusal under the District's "hold" system  
9 described above. Indeed, it failed to give Crossroads first (or any) choice of its dates  
10 in 2021 or 2022.

11 152. Defendants' adoption and enforcement of SB 264, which has the  
12 intended and practical effect of banning gun shows at the Fairgrounds, has and will  
13 continue to cause Plaintiff Crossroads significant economic damages, including loss  
14 of event revenue, breakdown of relationships and agreements with long-time event  
15 vendors and companies used as suppliers for gun show events, relinquishment of  
16 future show dates, and loss of business reputation and goodwill that has been built  
17 by Plaintiff Crossroads for more than 30 years.

18 153. Plaintiff Crossroads has already lost revenue for gun show events at the  
19 Fairgrounds in December 2021 and 2022 because the Fair Board will not finalize  
20 event dates, citing SB 264 as the reason along with the threats from Senator Min for  
21 personal liability should they act. If shows do not return to the Fairgrounds in 2022,  
22 Plaintiff Crossroads will lose all revenue for gun show events at the Fairgrounds in  
23 2022.

24 154. Even if Plaintiff Crossroads could secure dates, plan, promote, and host  
25 gun shows in 2022, SB 264 stands in the way of Crossroads generating the profits  
26 the events typically generate because the ban on firearm and ammunition sales will  
27 significantly impact paid event attendance and the types and numbers of paid  
28 vendors who will do business with Crossroads at the Orange County gun show.

1           155. Plaintiff Crossroads has and will continue to suffer loss of business  
2 goodwill resulting from Defendants’ adoption and enforcement of SB 264 under the  
3 (unsupported) pretense that gun shows, generally, and Crossroads’ shows, in  
4 particular, threaten public safety. The message this sends to other venues, attendees,  
5 and vendors that do business with Crossroads will no doubt affect Crossroads for  
6 years.

7           156. Defendants’ adoption and enforcement of SB 264, which has the  
8 intended and practical effect of banning gun shows at the Fairgrounds, prohibits  
9 Plaintiffs and all those similarly situated from making use of a state-owned “public  
10 assembly facility” to host gun show events, a lawful business activity, in violation of  
11 Plaintiffs’ rights to engage in free speech and peaceful assembly, and their right to  
12 equal protection under the law.

13           157. Specifically, Defendants’ conduct complained of here strips Plaintiffs  
14 Clark, Johnson, Littrell, and Merson, as well as the organizational plaintiffs, CRPA,  
15 APAGOA, 2ALC, and SAF, of a vital opportunity to assemble and engage in pure  
16 speech about, among other things, the rights and responsibilities of gun owners, the  
17 Second Amendment, patriotism, and political activism with like-minded individuals.

18           158. Defendants’ conduct complained of here also strips Plaintiff Crossroads  
19 of the right to promote gun show events, acting as a “clearinghouse” for both  
20 political speech and commercial speech.

21           159. Defendants’ conduct complained of here also strips Plaintiffs Littrell  
22 and Merson, as well as business members of CRPA that participate as vendors at  
23 gun shows at the Fairgrounds, of a vital opportunity to assemble and engage in  
24 lawful commercial speech, including the offer and acceptance of sales of firearms,  
25 ammunition, and related accessories.

26           160. Furthermore, even if the Court grants injunctive relief, Plaintiff  
27 Crossroads will have incurred damages in having to devote extraordinary advertising  
28 dollars to inform the public that gun shows will continue to be held and have not

1 been banned at the Fairgrounds.

2 161. The economic and non-economic harms and injuries to Plaintiffs are of  
3 a continuing nature; they continue to compound everyday SB 264 remains the law.

4  
5 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
6 **Violation of Right to Free Speech Under U.S. Const., amend. I**  
7 **42 U.S.C. § 1983**

8 (By Plaintiffs Clark, Johnson, Littrell, Merson, CRPA, APAGOA, 2ALC, SAF  
9 Against All Defendants)

10 162. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 161 of this  
11 Complaint as though fully set forth herein in their entirety.

12 163. The state of California owns the Fairgrounds, a public venue. It is  
13 rented to the public, including community-based organizations and businesses, for  
14 its use and enjoyment, including for concerts, festivals, and industry shows.

15 164. Plaintiffs Clark, Johnson, Littrell, Merson, CRPA, APAGOA, 2ALC ,  
16 and SAF have attended in the past and wish to again attend Crossroads gun shows at  
17 the Fairgrounds so they may exchange ideas, information, and knowledge, as well  
18 discuss political issues and the importance of protecting and defending the Second  
19 Amendment.

20 165. Plaintiffs Clark, Johnson, Littrell, Merson, CRPA, APAGOA, 2ALC,  
21 and SAF have a right under the First Amendment to use the Fairgrounds for their  
22 expressive activity on the same basis as other members of the public without regard  
23 to the viewpoints they seek to express.

24 166. Defendants Newsom, Bonta, and Spitzer, acting under color of state  
25 law, are the state and local actors responsible for enforcing SB 264, which deprives  
26 Plaintiffs of free speech rights secured by the First Amendment of the United States  
27 Constitution in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

28 167. Defendants Ross and District interpret, implement, and enforce state  
laws and policies in regard to the Fairgrounds, including SB 264, which deprives  
Plaintiffs of free speech rights secured by the First Amendment of the United States

1 Constitution in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

2 168. Defendants’ enforcement of SB 264, which prohibits the sale of  
3 firearms, ammunition, and firearm precursor parts at the Fairgrounds with the  
4 purpose and intention (or at least the effect) of banning gun show events at the  
5 Fairgrounds, is an impermissible content-based restriction of speech. Such  
6 enforcement constitutes a direct violation of the free speech rights of Plaintiffs  
7 Clark, Johnson, Littrell, Merson, CRPA, APAGOA, 2ALC, and SAF.

8 169. Defendants have no compelling (or even legitimate) governmental  
9 interest in banning the otherwise lawful (and constitutionally protected) sale of  
10 lawful firearms, ammunition, and firearm precursor parts at the Fairgrounds, or in  
11 banning gun show events and the unique expression and exchange of ideas related to  
12 promoting and preserving the “gun culture” that takes place at those events. Any  
13 purported interest in “public safety” is betrayed by the fact that SB 264 does not ban  
14 the possession of firearms, ammunition, or firearms precursor parts on Fairgrounds  
15 property and state law already governs sales at gun shows *at least* as strictly as it  
16 governs sales at “brick-and-mortar” stores.

17 170. Further, SB 264 is neither narrowly tailored to nor the least restrictive  
18 means of achieving the state’s dubious interests. Indeed, by intentionally and  
19 effectively banning gun shows at the Fairgrounds, it sweeps up *all* forms of speech  
20 and expressive conduct that occurs at such events and banishes from a public venue.

21 171. Similarly, SB 264 is unconstitutionally overbroad because, in an effort  
22 to restrict the commercial sale of firearms, ammunition, and firearm precursor parts,  
23 the law effectively and intentionally bans gun shows events altogether, seriously and  
24 deliberately burdening a vast amount of speech that does not constitute such a  
25 communication and is fully protected by the First Amendment.

26 172. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ conduct, Plaintiffs  
27 Clark, Johnson, Littrell, Merson, CRPA, APAGOA, 2ALC, and SAF have suffered  
28 irreparable harm, including the violation of their constitutional right to free speech,

1 entitling them to declaratory and injunctive relief. Absent intervention by this Court,  
2 through declaratory and injunctive relief, Plaintiffs will continue to suffer this  
3 irreparable harm.

4 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
5 **Violation of Right to Free Speech Under U.S. Const., amend. I**  
6 **Mixed Political - Commercial**  
7 **42 U.S.C. § 1983**  
8 (By Plaintiff Crossroads Against All Defendants)

9 173. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 172 of this  
10 Complaint as though fully set forth herein in their entirety.

11 174. The state of California owns the Fairgrounds, a public venue. It is  
12 rented to the public, including community-based organizations and businesses, for  
13 its use and enjoyment, including for concerts, festivals, and industry shows.

14 175. Plaintiff Crossroads seeks to engage in protected speech at the  
15 Fairgrounds, a noted “public assembly facility,” through the promotion and  
16 production of events for lawful expressive activity, including events that bring  
17 together like-minded individuals to engage in pure political and educational speech,  
18 as well as commercial speech of vendor and individual participants to communicate  
19 offer and acceptance for the sale of legal goods and services.

20 176. Event promoters, though they generally promote events for profit, “still  
21 enjoy the protections of the First Amendment.” *Id.* at 567. For “[t]he role of a  
22 promoter in ensuring access to the public is at least as critical as the role of a  
23 bookseller or theater owner and . . . is in a far better position than a concert goer or  
24 individual performers to vindicate First Amendment rights and ensure public  
25 access.” *Id.* at 568. The conduct they engage in is protected expression.

26 177. Plaintiff Crossroads has a right under the First Amendment to use the  
27 Fairgrounds for its expressive activity on the same basis as other members of the  
28 public without regard to the content or viewpoint it seeks to express and promote.

178. Defendants Newsom, Bonta, and Spitzer, acting under color of state  
law, are the state and local actors responsible for enforcing SB 264, which deprives

1 Plaintiffs of free speech rights secured by the First Amendment of the United States  
2 Constitution in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

3 179. Defendants Ross and District interpret, implement, and enforce state  
4 laws and policies in regard to the Fairgrounds, including SB 264, which deprives  
5 Plaintiffs of free speech rights secured by the First Amendment of the United States  
6 Constitution in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

7 180. Defendants' enforcement of SB 264, which prohibits the sale of  
8 firearms, ammunition, and precursor parts at the Fairgrounds with the purpose and  
9 intention (or at least the effect) of banning gun show events at the Fairgrounds, is an  
10 impermissible content-based restriction of speech. Such enforcement constitutes a  
11 direct violation of the free speech rights of Plaintiff Crossroads.

12 181. Defendants have no compelling (or even legitimate) governmental  
13 interest in banning the otherwise lawful (and constitutionally protected) sale of  
14 lawful firearms, ammunition, and firearm precursor parts at the Fairgrounds, or in  
15 banning gun show events and the unique expression and exchange of ideas related to  
16 promoting and preserving the "gun culture" that takes place at those events. Any  
17 purported interest in "public safety" is betrayed by the fact that SB 264 does not ban  
18 the possession of firearms, ammunition, or firearms precursor parts on Fairgrounds  
19 property and state law already governs sales at gun shows *at least* as strictly as it  
20 governs sales at "brick-and-mortar" stores.

21 182. Further, SB 264 is neither narrowly tailored to nor the least restrictive  
22 means of achieving the state's dubious interests. Indeed, by intentionally and  
23 effectively banning gun shows at the Fairgrounds, it sweeps up *all* forms of speech  
24 and expressive conduct that occurs at such events and banishes from a public venue.

25 183. Similarly, SB 264 is unconstitutionally overbroad because, in an effort  
26 to restrict the commercial sale of firearms, ammunition, and firearm precursor parts,  
27 the law effectively and intentionally bans gun shows events altogether, seriously and  
28 deliberately burdening a vast amount of speech that does not constitute such a

1 communication and is fully protected by the First Amendment.

2 184. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiff  
3 Crossroads has suffered irreparable harm, including the violation of its constitutional  
4 right to free speech, entitling Crossroads to declaratory and injunctive relief. Absent  
5 intervention by this Court, through declaratory and injunctive relief, Plaintiffs will  
6 continue to suffer this irreparable harm.

7  
8 **THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**  
9 **Violation of Right to Commercial Speech Under U.S. Const., amend. I**  
10 **42 U.S.C. § 1983**  
11 (By Plaintiffs Littrell, Merson, and CRPA Against All Defendants)

12 185. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 184 of this  
13 Complaint as though fully set forth herein in their entirety.

14 186. The state of California owns the Fairgrounds, a public venue. It is  
15 rented to the public, including community-based organizations and businesses, for  
16 its use and enjoyment, including for concerts, festivals, and industry shows.

17 187. Plaintiffs Littrell and Merson, as well as business members of CRPA,  
18 have attended in the past and wish to again attend Crossroads gun shows at the  
19 Fairgrounds as vendors to engage in lawful commercial speech with individual  
20 attendees.

21 188. Plaintiffs Littrell, Merson, and CRPA members have a right under the  
22 First Amendment to use the Fairgrounds for expressive activity on the same basis as  
23 other members of the public without regard to the viewpoints they seek to express  
24 and promote.

25 189. Defendants Newsom, Bonta, and Spitzer, acting under color of state  
26 law, are the state and local actors responsible for enforcing SB 264, which deprives  
27 Plaintiffs of free speech rights secured by the First Amendment of the United States  
28 Constitution in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

190. Defendants Ross and District interpret, implement, and enforce state  
laws and policies in regard to the Fairgrounds, including SB 264, which deprives

1 Plaintiffs of free speech rights secured by the First Amendment of the United States  
2 Constitution in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

3 191. Defendants' enforcement of SB 264, which prohibits the sale of  
4 firearms, ammunition, and precursor parts at the Fairgrounds with the purpose and  
5 intention (or at least the effect) of banning gun show events at the Fairgrounds, is an  
6 impermissible content-based restriction of speech. Such enforcement constitutes a  
7 direct violation of the First Amendment commercial speech rights of the Plaintiffs.

8 192. Further, by directly barring the rights of vendors, like Plaintiffs Littrell,  
9 Merson, and CRPA members, to sell firearms and ammunition (which necessarily  
10 involves commercial speech), SB 264 defies existing case law in the Ninth Circuit  
11 protecting the commercial speech associated with firearm sales on public property.  
12 *See Nordyke v. Santa Clara Cty.*, 110 F. 3d 707 (9th Cir. 1997).

13 193. Defendants have no substantial (or even legitimate) governmental  
14 interest in banning the otherwise lawful (and constitutionally protected) sale of  
15 lawful firearms, ammunition, and firearm precursor parts at the Fairgrounds, or in  
16 banning gun show events and the unique expression and exchange of ideas related to  
17 promoting and preserving the "gun culture" that takes place at those events. Any  
18 purported interest in "public safety" is betrayed by the fact that SB 264 does not ban  
19 the possession of firearms, ammunition, or firearms precursor parts on Fairgrounds  
20 property and state law already governs sales at gun shows *at least* as strictly as it  
21 governs sales at "brick-and-mortar" stores.

22 194. Even if there were a substantial governmental interest in restricting gun  
23 shows and the commercial speech that occurs at such events, it would not be directly  
24 served by a ban on sales of firearms, ammunition, and firearm precursor parts at the  
25 Fairgrounds.

26 195. Even if there were a substantial governmental interest in restricting gun  
27 shows and the commercial speech that occurs at such events, banning commercial  
28 speech about firearms and ammunition at the Fairgrounds altogether is more

1 extensive than necessary to serve any such interest. *See Nordyke*, 110 F.3d 707  
2 (holding that a ban on the sale of firearms on county-owned land was overbroad as  
3 abridging commercial speech associated with the sale of lawful products).

4 196. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct, Plaintiffs  
5 Littrell, Merson, and CRPA have suffered irreparable harm, including the violation  
6 of their constitutional right to free speech, entitling them to declaratory and  
7 injunctive relief. Absent intervention by this Court, through declaratory and  
8 injunctive relief, Plaintiffs will continue to suffer this irreparable harm.

9  
10 **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
11 **Prior Restraint on Right to Free Speech Under U.S. Const., amend. I**  
12 **42 U.S.C. § 1983**  
13 (By All Plaintiffs Against All Defendants)

14 197. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 196 of this  
15 Complaint as though fully set forth herein in their entirety.

16 198. The First Amendment affords special protection against policies or  
17 orders that impose a previous or prior restraint on speech. “[P]rior restraints on  
18 speech and publication are the most serious and least tolerable infringement on First  
19 Amendment Rights.” *Ass’n for L.A. Deputy Sheriffs*, 239 Cal. App. 4th at 811 (citing  
20 *Neb. Press Ass’n*, 427 U.S. at 559. A prior restraint is particularly egregious when it  
21 falls upon the communication of news, commentary, current events, political speech,  
22 and association. *N.Y. Times Co.*, 403 U.S. at 715.

23 199. Prior restraint also involves the “unbridled discretion doctrine” where a  
24 policy, or lack thereof, allows for a single person or body to act at their sole  
25 discretion, without regard for any constitutional rights possessed by the person upon  
26 which the action is taken, and where there is no remedy for challenging the  
27 discretion of the decision makers. *Lakewood*, 486 U.S. at 757.

28 200. The Defendants are the state and local actors responsible for enforcing  
SB 264, which is a content-based restriction of speech that will have a chilling effect  
on Plaintiffs' First Amendment rights, thus acting as a de facto prior restraint on

1 Plaintiffs’ rights (including a refusal to place contract approval on board agendas or  
2 to offer available dates to begin the process of renting the venue).

3 201. Under SB 264, Defendant District has unfettered discretion to  
4 determine what constitutes a “sale” under the law and is thereby prohibited at the  
5 Fairgrounds.

6 202. Defendants’ policies and practices complained of here impose an  
7 unconstitutional prior restraint because they vest the District with unbridled  
8 discretion to permit or refuse protected expression by members of the public,  
9 including Plaintiffs.

10 203. Defendants’ policies and practices complained of here give unbridled  
11 discretion to local agricultural district boards and board members to decide what  
12 forms of expression members of the public may engage in on at the Fairgrounds and  
13 to ban any other expression at the whim of those boards and board members in  
14 violation of the First Amendment.

15 204. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ conduct, Plaintiffs have  
16 suffered and will continue to suffer irreparable harm, including the violation of their  
17 constitutional right to freedom of expression, entitling them to declaratory and  
18 injunctive relief and nominal damages.

19  
20 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
21 **Violation of Right to Assembly and Association Under U.S. Const., amend. I**  
22 **42 U.S.C. § 1983**  
23 (By All Plaintiffs Against All Defendants)

24 205. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 204 of this  
25 Complaint as though fully set forth herein in their entirety.

26 206. The state of California owns the Fairgrounds, a public venue. It is  
27 rented to the public, including community-based organizations and businesses, for  
28 its use and enjoyment, including for concerts, festivals, and industry shows.

207. Plaintiffs have promoted and/or attended in the past and wish to again  
promote and/or attend Crossroads gun shows at the Fairgrounds so they may

1 assemble and associate with one another to engage in lawful commerce, fellowship,  
2 and expressive activities, including political and educational speech regarding the  
3 lawful ownership, possession, and use of firearms and related products.

4 208. Plaintiffs have a right under the First Amendment to use the  
5 Fairgrounds to assemble and associate on the same basis as other members of the  
6 public without regard to the content or viewpoint it seeks to express and promote.

7 209. Defendants Newsom, Bonta, and Spitzer, acting under color of state  
8 law, are the state and local actors responsible for enforcing SB 264, which deprives  
9 Plaintiffs of free speech rights secured by the First Amendment of the United States  
10 Constitution in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

11 210. Defendants Ross and District interpret, implement, and enforce state  
12 laws and policies in regard to the Fairgrounds, including SB 264, which deprives  
13 Plaintiffs of free speech rights secured by the First Amendment of the United States  
14 Constitution in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

15 211. Defendants' enforcement of SB 264, which prohibits the sale of  
16 firearms, ammunition, and precursor parts at the Fairgrounds with the purpose and  
17 intention (or at least the effect) of banning gun show events at the Fairgrounds,  
18 violates Plaintiffs' rights to assembly and association by denying them the right to  
19 use the Fairgrounds, a "public assembly facility," to assemble and engage in  
20 political and other types of expression—a right Defendants extend to other members  
21 of the public so long as they are not meeting for the purposes of holding a gun show  
22 event.

23 212. Defendants have no compelling (or even legitimate) governmental  
24 interest in banning the otherwise lawful (and constitutionally protected) sale of  
25 lawful firearms, ammunition, and firearm precursor parts at the Fairgrounds, or in  
26 banning gun show events and, by extension, the rights of Plaintiffs to assemble and  
27 associate at the Fairgrounds. Any purported interest in "public safety" is betrayed by  
28 the fact that SB 264 does not ban the possession of firearms, ammunition, or

1 firearms precursor parts on Fairgrounds property and state law already governs sales  
2 at gun shows *at least* as strictly as it governs sales at “brick-and-mortar” stores.

3 213. Even if SB 264 served some sufficient government purpose, it is neither  
4 narrowly tailored nor the least restrictive means to serve that end.

5 214. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ conduct, all Plaintiffs  
6 have suffered irreparable harm, including the violation of their constitutional right to  
7 free association and assembly, entitling them to declaratory and injunctive relief.  
8 Absent intervention by this Court, through declaratory and injunctive relief,  
9 Plaintiffs will continue to suffer this irreparable harm.

10  
11 **SIXTH CAUSE OF ACTION**  
12 **Violation of the Right to Equal Protection Under U.S. Const., amend. XIV**  
13 **42 U.S.C. § 1983**  
14 (By All Plaintiffs Against All Defendants)

15 215. Plaintiffs incorporate by reference paragraphs 1 through 214 of this  
16 Complaint as if fully set forth herein in their entirety.

17 216. Defendants, acting under color of state law, are enforcing SB 264,  
18 which deprives Plaintiffs of right to equal protection under the law secured by the  
19 Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution in violation of 42 U.S.C. §  
20 1983.

21 217. On its face and as applied, SB 264 is an unconstitutional abridgement  
22 of Plaintiffs’ right to equal protection under the law guaranteed by the Fourteenth  
23 Amendment because it is a viewpoint-discriminatory and/or animus-based  
24 restriction on Plaintiffs’ protected speech that serves no compelling governmental  
25 interest

26 218. On its face and as evidenced by the legislative history of AB 2571, it is  
27 clear that the law’s purpose and intention is to make a “symbolic” gesture and a  
28 “value statement” about the otherwise lawful sale of firearms and related products  
and of the proliferation of the “gun culture” in California and elsewhere.

219. Defendants have no compelling (or even legitimate) governmental

1 interest in banning Plaintiffs’ speech. Indeed, any purported interest in “public  
2 safety” is betrayed by the fact that SB 264 does not ban the possession of firearms,  
3 ammunition, or firearms precursor parts on Fairgrounds property and state law  
4 already governs sales at gun shows *at least* as strictly as it governs sales at “brick-  
5 and-mortar” stores.

6 220. Defendants’ refusal to allow Plaintiffs equal use of the public facility  
7 while continuing to allow contracts for the use of the facility with other similarly  
8 situated legal and legitimate businesses is a violation of Plaintiffs’ right to equal  
9 protection under the law because it is based on a “bare desire to harm a politically  
10 unpopular group.” *Moreno*, 413 U.S. at 534.

11 221. Further, AB 2571 is not narrowly tailored to achieving the state’s  
12 dubious interests.

13 222. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants’ conduct, all Plaintiffs  
14 have suffered irreparable harm, including the violation of their constitutional right to  
15 equal protection under the law, entitling them to declaratory and injunctive relief.  
16 Absent intervention by this Court, through declaratory and injunctive relief,  
17 Plaintiffs will continue to suffer this irreparable harm.

18 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

19 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for:

20 1. A declaration that SB 264, codified at California Penal Code section  
21 27575, violates the free speech rights of Plaintiffs Clark, Johnson, Littrell, Merson,  
22 CRPA, APAGOA, 2ALC, and SAF under the First Amendment to the United States  
23 Constitution, on its face and as applied;

24 2. A declaration that SB 264, codified at California Penal Code section  
25 27575, violates the free speech rights of Plaintiff Crossroads under the First  
26 Amendment to the United States Constitution, on its face and as applied;

27 3. A declaration that SB 264, codified at California Penal Code section  
28 27575, violates the commercial speech rights of Plaintiffs Littrell, Merson, and

1 CRPA under the First Amendment to the United States Constitution, on its face and  
2 as applied;

3 4. A declaration that SB 264, codified at California Penal Code section  
4 27575, violates the free speech rights of all Plaintiffs under the First Amendment to  
5 the United States Constitution because it imposes a prior restraint on their speech;

6 5. A declaration that SB 264, codified at California Penal Code section  
7 27575, violates Plaintiffs' rights of assembly and association under the First  
8 Amendment to the United States Constitution, on its face and as applied;

9 6. A declaration that SB 264, codified at California Penal Code section  
10 27575, violates the rights of all Plaintiffs to equal protection under the law per the  
11 Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution, on its face and as applied;

12 7. Defendants, their employees, agents, successors in office, and all  
13 District Attorneys, County Counsel, and City Attorneys holding office in the state of  
14 California, as well as their successors in office, from enforcing SB 264, codified at  
15 California Penal Code section 27575;

16 8. An order for damages, including nominal damages, according to proof;

17 9. An award of costs and expenses, including attorney's fees, pursuant to  
18 42 U.S.C. § 1988 or other appropriate state or federal law; and

19 10. Any such other relief the Court deems just and equitable.

20  
21 Dated: August 12, 2022

**MICHEL & ASSOCIATES, P.C.**

22 *s/ Anna M. Barvir*

23 Anna M. Barvir  
24 Counsel for Plaintiffs B&L Productions, Inc.,  
25 California Rifle & Pistol Association,  
26 Incorporated, Gerald Clark, Eric Johnson, Chad  
27 Littrell, Jan Steven Merson, Asian Pacific  
28 American Gun Owner Association, Second  
Amendment Law Center, Inc.

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

Dated: August 12, 2022

**LAW OFFICES OF DONALD KILMER, APC**

*s/ Donald Kilmer*

---

Donald Kilmer  
Counsel for Plaintiff Second Amendment  
Foundation