

**EXHIBIT “4”**

**CRPA v. LASD, 2:23-cv-10169****Exhibit 4 to Cramer Declaration: Appendix of Laws Misrepresented by Defendants or their Experts**

No.	Year	Jurisdiction	Citation	Description of Regulation by a Defendant or Their Experts	Why Description Is Misleading
1	1838	Virginia	1838 Virginia ch. 101, “An Act to prevent the carrying of concealed weapons,” 76 § 1	An 1838 Virginia statute prohibited “habitual” carrying of deadly weapons—its purpose was to penalize those who carried weapons as an everyday matter of course.  Rivas Decl., p. 11	The carry targeted specific weapons. Any pistols, Bowie-knives, or any other weapon of the like kind. The law also required “the same be hidden or concealed from common observation” and so would not prohibit open carry. The law did not prohibit the carry of other firearms, such as rifles or shotguns.  <a href="https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=IRwSAAAAYAAJ&amp;pg=GBS.PA76&amp;hl=en">https://play.google.com/books/reader?id=IRwSAAAAYAAJ&amp;pg=GBS.PA76&amp;hl=en</a>
2	1841	Iowa – City of Burlington [Territory]	Chas. Ben. Darwin, Ordinances of the City of Burlington, with Head Notes and an Analytic Index Page 149–50, Image 149–150 (1856)	The Duke Repository of Historical Gun Laws identifies more than one hundred “taxation/registration” laws across the colonial period to 1930.  Rivas Decl., p. 21	The cited Duke Law Repository page makes no mention of taxation. § 1 gives the council the power to advise on “internal improvements.” § 2 ordains that the shooting batteries shall be kept in good, safe condition. § 3 Prohibits persons other than the gunsmith to shoot at a mark or fire a gun at said battery.  <a href="https://firearmslaw.duke.edu/laws/chas-ben-darwin-ordinances-of-the-city-of-burlington-with-head-notes-and-an-analytic-index-page-149-150-image-149-150-1856-available-at-the-making-of-modern-law-primary-sources">https://firearmslaw.duke.edu/laws/chas-ben-darwin-ordinances-of-the-city-of-burlington-with-head-notes-and-an-analytic-index-page-149-150-image-149-150-1856-available-at-the-making-of-modern-law-primary-sources</a>
3	1861	Alabama – City of Montgomery	John W.A. Sanford, The Code of the City of Montgomery, Prepared in Pursuance of an Order of the City Council of Montgomery Page 7–9, Image 12 (1861) available at The Making of Modern Law: Primary Sources (levying an annual tax of unspecified value upon	(levying an annual tax of unspecified value upon pistol galleries within the city)  Rivas Decl., p. 22	The first tax listed, in the paragraph listing a tax on shooting galleries, is a poll tax based on race. The second tax listed in this paragraph is a tax on “free negroes or mulattos.”  <a href="https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=dul1.ark:/13960/t9b57bp77&amp;seq=17">https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=dul1.ark:/13960/t9b57bp77&amp;seq=17</a>

**CRPA v. LASD, 2:23-cv-10169****Exhibit 4 to Cramer Declaration: Appendix of Laws Misrepresented by Defendants or their Experts**

No.	Year	Jurisdiction	Citation	Description of Regulation by a Defendant or Their Experts	Why Description Is Misleading
			pistol galleries within the city).		
4	1870	Tennessee	1869-1870 Tenn. Pub. Acts, 2d. Sess., An Act to Preserve the Peace and Prevent Homicide, ch. 13, § 1	In Arkansas and Tennessee, post-Civil War public carry restrictions were part of a back-and-forth between legislatures and appellate courts, illustrating a commitment to restricting public carry that understood open-carry to be primarily related to militia service and secondarily reserved for emergency situations. Both states enacted laws that prohibited the public carrying of pistols with very limited exceptions  Rivas Decl., p. 9	This law restricted only particular weapons from carry. Dirks, sword-canes, Spanish stielttos, belt pistols, pocket pistols, and revolvers. It did not bar the open carry of rifles or shotguns.  <a href="https://www.google.com/books/edition/Public_Statutes_of_the_State_of_Tennesse/ZttGAQAAMAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA95&amp;printsec=frontcover">https://www.google.com/books/edition/Public_Statutes_of_the_State_of_Tennesse/ZttGAQAAMAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA95&amp;printsec=frontcover</a>
5	1870	Tennessee	1870 Tenn. 13, p. 28-29	Some states specifically prohibited open carry, and others tailored open-carry exceptions to be as narrow as possible in order to prevent people engaging in everyday open carry as a mode of preemptive self-defense  Rivas Decl., p. 6	The carry ban targets specific weapons. Dirks, sword-canes, Spanish stiletos, belt pistols, pocket pistols, and revolvers. This law does not prohibit the complete carry of rifles or shotguns.  <a href="https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.b3693023&amp;view=1up&amp;seq=68">https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=uc1.b3693023&amp;view=1up&amp;seq=68</a>
6	1871	Tennessee	1871 Tenn. 90, p. 81-82	In response to appellate court decisions, lawmakers in Arkansas and Tennessee enacted public carry laws with an open-carry exception that was as tightly restricted as possible. Their “open in his hands” exception allowed open-carry only in a real emergency (not preemptive armed	The act prohibits the carry of dirks, sword canes, Spanish stilletos, belt pistols, pocket pistols, or revolvers. The act does not apply to rifles, shotguns, or revolvers “such as are commonly carried in the United States Army” and “openly in his hands.”  <a href="https://www.google.com/books/edition/Acts_of_the_State_of_Tennessee_Passed_at/6804AAAAIAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA81&amp;printsec=frontcover">https://www.google.com/books/edition/Acts_of_the_State_of_Tennessee_Passed_at/6804AAAAIAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA81&amp;printsec=frontcover</a>

*CRPA v. LASD, 2:23-cv-10169***Exhibit 4 to Cramer Declaration: Appendix of Laws Misrepresented by Defendants or their Experts**

No.	Year	Jurisdiction	Citation	Description of Regulation by a Defendant or Their Experts	Why Description Is Misleading
				self-defense as a matter of course) and only applied to certain kinds of firearms (not pocket pistols).  Rivas Decl., p. 6	
7	1871	Texas	1871 Texas ch. 34, “An Act to Regulate the Keeping and Bearing of Deadly Weapons,” 25–27	Some states specifically prohibited open carry, and others tailored open-carry exceptions to be as narrow as possible in order to prevent people engaging in everyday open carry as a mode of preemptive self-defense.  Rivas Decl., p. 6	The carry ban targets specific weapons. Pistols, dirks, daggers, slung-shots, sword-cane, spear, brass knuckles, Bowie-knives, or any other kind of knife manufactured or sold for the purpose for offense or defense. The law made exceptions for those who have “reasonable grounds for unlawful attack on his person.” The law does not prohibit the complete carry of rifles or shotguns.  <a href="https://www.google.com/books/edition/Laws_Passed_by_the_Legislature_of_the_St/Z6w4AAAAIAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA25&amp;printsec=frontcover">https://www.google.com/books/edition/Laws_Passed_by_the_Legislature_of_the_St/Z6w4AAAAIAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA25&amp;printsec=frontcover</a>
8	1872	Maryland - City of Annapolis	1872 Md. Laws 57, ch. 42, § 246	By 1883, in states with no public carry restrictions, a number of municipalities had nonetheless instituted carry restrictions in their local ordinances. These included . . . the Maryland city of Annapolis  Vorenberg Decl., p. 10	The law makes no reference to a licensing regime.  <a href="https://www.google.com/books/edition/Laws_of_the_State_of_Maryland/b29CAQAAMAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA57&amp;printsec=frontcover">https://www.google.com/books/edition/Laws_of_the_State_of_Maryland/b29CAQAAMAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA57&amp;printsec=frontcover</a>
9	1875	Arkansas	1874-1875 Acts of Ark., An Act to Prohibit the Carrying of Side-Arms, and Other Deadly Weapons, at p. 155, § 1	In Arkansas and Tennessee, post-Civil War public carry restrictions were part of a back-and-forth between legislatures and appellate courts, illustrating a commitment to restricting public carry that understood open-carry to be primarily related to militia service and secondarily reserved for	The act only prohibited the carry of pistols, dirks, butcher knives, Bowie-knives, sword-canes, spear-canes, metal knuckles, and razors used as weapons. The act does not prohibit the carry of rifles or shotguns.  <a href="https://www.google.com/books/edition/Acts/qbg3AAAIAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=RA1-">https://www.google.com/books/edition/Acts/qbg3AAAIAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=RA1-</a>

**CRPA v. LASD, 2:23-cv-10169****Exhibit 4 to Cramer Declaration: Appendix of Laws Misrepresented by Defendants or their Experts**

No.	Year	Jurisdiction	Citation	Description of Regulation by a Defendant or Their Experts	Why Description Is Misleading
				emergency situations. Both states enacted laws that prohibited the public carrying of pistols with very limited exceptions.  Rivas Decl., p. 9	<a href="#">PA155&amp;printsec=frontcover</a>
10	1876	California – City of Sacramento	Prohibiting the Carrying of Concealed Deadly Weapons, Ordinance no. 84, Charter and Ordinances of the City of Sacramento (1876)	Allowing police to issue a license to carry a concealed weapon to a “peaceable person, whose profession or occupation may require him to be out at late hours of the night, to carry concealed deadly weapons for his protection.”  LASD Survey, p. 10	The law exempts travelers, whereas the policy of CA and the LASD prohibits issuing licenses to individuals traveling from outside the state entirely.  <a href="https://www.google.com/books/edition/Charter_and_Ordinances_of_the_City_of_Sa/n3xJAAAAYAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA173&amp;printsec=frontcover">https://www.google.com/books/edition/Charter_and_Ordinances_of_the_City_of_Sa/n3xJAAAAYAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA173&amp;printsec=frontcover</a>
11	1878	California – City of Eureka	Ordinance No. 55— Prohibiting the Carrying of Concealed Weapons, §§ 1-4 in Charter and Revised Ordinances of the City of Eureka (1878)	Allowing police to issue a license to carry a concealed weapon to “any peaceable person, whose profession or occupation may require him to be out at late hours of the night, to carry concealed weapons for his own protection.”  LASD Survey, p. 10	The law exempts travelers, whereas the policy of CA and the LASD prohibits issuing licenses to individuals traveling from outside the state entirely.  <a href="https://firearmslaw.duke.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/1878-Eureka-CA-Charter-and-Revised-Ordinances-of-the-City-of-Eureka-Ordinance-No.-55-%C2%A7%C2%A7-1-4.pdf">https://firearmslaw.duke.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/1878-Eureka-CA-Charter-and-Revised-Ordinances-of-the-City-of-Eureka-Ordinance-No.-55-%C2%A7%C2%A7-1-4.pdf</a>
12	1880	New York - City of Brooklyn	Pistols Carrying Of Ordinance to Regulate the Carrying of Pistols, Oct. 25, 1880, reprinted in BROOKLYN DAILY EAGLE (N.Y.), Oct. 26, 1880, at 1	Permit to carry concealed weapon can be issued if “applicant is a proper and and law abiding person”  LASD Survey, p. 11	Unlike the CA regulations, this law allowed non-residents to apply for a permit.  <a href="https://bklyn.newspapers.com/article/the-brooklyn-daily-eagle-pistols-carryin/141945643/">https://bklyn.newspapers.com/article/the-brooklyn-daily-eagle-pistols-carryin/141945643/</a>

**CRPA v. LASD, 2:23-cv-10169****Exhibit 4 to Cramer Declaration: Appendix of Laws Misrepresented by Defendants or their Experts**

No.	Year	Jurisdiction	Citation	Description of Regulation by a Defendant or Their Experts	Why Description Is Misleading
13	1880	California – City of San Francisco	Prohibiting the Carrying of Concealed Deadly Weapons, § 22 of General Order no. 1,603—Relating to the Police Department, General Orders of the Board of Supervisors Providing Regulations for the Government of the City And County of San Francisco (1880)	Allowing police to issue a license to carry a concealed weapon to “any peaceable person, whose profession or occupation may require him to be out at late hours of the night, to carry concealed deadly weapons for his own protection.”  LASD Survey, p. 11	Unlike the CA regulations, this law made an exception for travelers from requiring a license.  <a href="https://firearmslaw.duke.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/1880-CA-General-Order-no.-1603%E2%80%94Relating-to-the-Police-Department-%C2%A7-22%E2%80%94Prohibiting-the-Carrying-of-Concealed-Deadly-Weapons.pdf">https://firearmslaw.duke.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/1880-CA-General-Order-no.-1603%E2%80%94Relating-to-the-Police-Department-%C2%A7-22%E2%80%94Prohibiting-the-Carrying-of-Concealed-Deadly-Weapons.pdf</a>
14	1880	Ohio - City of Massillon	Revised Ordinances of the City of Massillon (1893), 10 (1880), §§ 129- 130	By 1883, in states with no public carry restrictions, a number of municipalities had nonetheless instituted carry restrictions in their local ordinances. These included . . . the Ohio city of Massillon  Vorenberg Decl., p. 11	The law makes no reference to a licensing regime  <a href="https://www.google.com/books/edition/The_Revised_Ordinances_Comprising_the_Ge/VmFCAAAAYAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA50&amp;printsec=frontcover">https://www.google.com/books/edition/The_Revised_Ordinances_Comprising_the_Ge/VmFCAAAAYAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA50&amp;printsec=frontcover</a>
15	1881	Arkansas	Ark. 1881 ch. 96	In response to appellate court decisions, lawmakers in Arkansas and Tennessee enacted public carry laws with an open-carry exception that was as tightly restricted as possible. Their “open in his hands” exception allowed open-carry only in a real emergency (not preemptive armed self-defense as a matter of course) and only applied to certain kinds of firearms (not pocket pistols).  Rivas Decl., p. 6	The carry ban targets specific weapons. Dirks, Bowie-knives, sword, spear in a cane, metal knuckles, razors, and pistols of any kind. Does not ban the carry of rifles, shotguns, or pistols used in the Army or Navy of the United States.  <a href="https://www.google.com/books/edition/Acts/k8Y3AA_AAIAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA191&amp;printsec=frontcover">https://www.google.com/books/edition/Acts/k8Y3AA_AAIAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA191&amp;printsec=frontcover</a>

*CRPA v. LASD, 2:23-cv-10169***Exhibit 4 to Cramer Declaration: Appendix of Laws Misrepresented by Defendants or their Experts**

No.	Year	Jurisdiction	Citation	Description of Regulation by a Defendant or Their Experts	Why Description Is Misleading
16	1881	New York – City of New York	Carrying of Pistols, N.Y.C., ORDINANCES ch. 8, art. 27, §§ 264-267 (1881)	Permit to carry concealed weapon can be issued if “applicant is a proper and law abiding person.”  LASD Survey, p. 11	Unlike the CA regulations, this ordinance allowed non-residents to apply for permits. The law also only applied to pistols, and not all concealed weapons.  <a href="https://www.google.com/books/edition/Ordinances_of_the_Mayor_Aldermen_and_Com/IAFAAAAAAYAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA214&amp;printsec=frontcover">https://www.google.com/books/edition/Ordinances_of_the_Mayor_Aldermen_and_Com/IAFAAAAAAYAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA214&amp;printsec=frontcover</a>
17	1882	Delaware	1881 Delaware ch. 548 “Of Offenses Against Public Justice: An Act providing for the punishment of persons carrying concealed deadly weapons,” 716-717	There was some acceptance of the idea that a true emergency situation might justify the open carrying of a deadly weapon temporarily. A version of Delaware’s 1881 concealed carry law provides some insight into what nineteenthcentury Americans understood their concealed carry laws to allow in terms of open carry . . . This is the kind of open carry which certain drafters of the bill envisioned—one that prioritized public safety and precluded habitual open carry as an acceptable mode of preemptive self-defense.  Rivas Decl., p. 7	The final bill included no restrictions on open carry.  <a href="https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=nyp.33433009080312&amp;seq=776">https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=nyp.33433009080312&amp;seq=776</a>
18	1882	West Virginia	1882 West Virginia ch. 110, 317 § 8	Some states specifically prohibited open carry, and others tailored open-carry exceptions to be as narrow as possible in order to prevent people engaging in everyday open carry as a mode of preemptive self-defense	The carry ban only targets specific weapons. Revolvers, pistols, razors, slung-shots, billy, metal knuckles, “other dangerous or deadly weapon of like kind or character.” The law does not prohibit the complete carry of rifles or shotguns.  <a href="https://www.google.com/books/edition/Acts_of_the_Le">https://www.google.com/books/edition/Acts_of_the_Le</a>

**CRPA v. LASD, 2:23-cv-10169****Exhibit 4 to Cramer Declaration: Appendix of Laws Misrepresented by Defendants or their Experts**

No.	Year	Jurisdiction	Citation	Description of Regulation by a Defendant or Their Experts	Why Description Is Misleading
				Rivas Decl., p. 6	<a href="https://www.google.com/books/edition/Acts_of_the_Legislature_of_West_Virginia/WI9CAQAAMAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA317&amp;printsec=frontcover">https://www.google.com/books/edition/Acts_of_the_Legislature_of_West_Virginia/WI9CAQAAMAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA317&amp;printsec=frontcover</a>  <a href="https://www.google.com/books/edition/Acts_of_the_Legislature_of_West_Virginia/WI9CAQAAMAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA421&amp;printsec=frontcover">https://www.google.com/books/edition/Acts_of_the_Legislature_of_West_Virginia/WI9CAQAAMAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=PA421&amp;printsec=frontcover</a>
19	1885	New York	George R. Donnan, Annotated Code of Criminal Procedure and Penal Code of the State of New York as Amended 1882-5. Fourth Edition 298 (1885)	A year later, the law was extended to all cities in the state and included “any pistol or other firearms of any kind.”  Spitzer Decl., P. 11	The law in question only applied to minors, not to those who would be classified as “the People.”  <a href="https://www.google.com/books/edition/Annotated_Code_of_Criminal_Procedure_and_Penal_Code_of_the_State_of_New_York/csEXAAAAAYAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=RA1-PA298&amp;printsec=frontcover">https://www.google.com/books/edition/Annotated_Code_of_Criminal_Procedure_and_Penal_Code_of_the_State_of_New_York/csEXAAAAAYAAJ?hl=en&amp;gbpv=1&amp;pg=RA1-PA298&amp;printsec=frontcover</a>
20	2021	California	Saul Cornell, “The Right to Regulate Arms in the Era of the Fourteenth Amendment,” UC Davis Law Review Online 55 (September 2021), 84	The policy proved popular, and by the turn of the twentieth century a majority of California residents lived in municipalities that had implemented a permitting process for the public carry of concealed weapons.  Rivas Decl., p. 6	Rivas claims that a majority of California’s population lived in municipalities that had licensing requirements. The total from Saul Cornell’s table is approximately 706,514 residents. The census data shows that California’s population by 1900 was 1,485,053.  <a href="https://lawreview.law.ucdavis.edu/sites/g/files/dgvnsk15026/files/media/documents/55-online-Cornell.pdf">https://lawreview.law.ucdavis.edu/sites/g/files/dgvnsk15026/files/media/documents/55-online-Cornell.pdf</a>  <a href="https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/decennial/1900/bulletins/demographic/10-population-ca.pdf">https://www2.census.gov/library/publications/decennial/1900/bulletins/demographic/10-population-ca.pdf</a>