Ca	se 2:09-cv-01185-FCD-KJM	Document 15-2	2 Filed 09/0	9/2009	Page 1 of 3		
1	EDMUND G. BROWN JR., State Bar No. 37100 Attorney General of California STEPHEN P. ACQUISTO, State Bar No. 172527						
2							
3	Supervising Deputy Attorney General ANTHONY R. HAKL, State Bar No. 197335 Deputy Attorney General 1300 I Street, Suite 125						
4							
5	P.O. Box 944255 Sacramento, CA 94244-2550						
6	Telephone: (916) 322-9041 Fax: (916) 324-8835						
7	E-mail: Anthony.Hakl@doj.ca.gov						
8	Attorneys for Defendant Wilfredo Cid						
9	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT						
10	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA						
11							
12	IVAN PEÑA, ROY VARGAS,	DOÑA	2:09-cv-01185	-FCD-KIN	Л		
13	CROSTON, BRETT THOMAS AMENDMENT FOUNDATIO	S, SECOND	DECLARATION OF ANTHONY R.				
14	THE CALGUNS FOUNDATIO		HAKL IN SU	PPORT O	F DEFENDANT LICATION FOR		
15		Plaintiffs,	ORDER SHO				
16	v.		Date: Time:	To be det To be det			
17	WILFREDO CID,		Dept: Judge:	No. 2, 15 Frank C.	th Floor Damrell, Jr.		
18)	Defendant.	Trial Date: Action Filed:	None April 30,	,		
19		2					
20							
21	I, Anthony R. Hakl, declare as follows:						
22	1. I am counsel of record for Defendant Wilfredo Cid in this matter. I am making this						
23	declaration in support of Cid's ex parte application for an order shortening time for briefing and,						
24	if necessary, a hearing on his motion for relief under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 56(f). I am						
25	a resident of the State of California and over eighteen years of age. I have personal knowledge of						
26	the matters stated in this declaration and if called as a witness I could and would testify						
27	competently to such matters.						
28		1	l				
	Declaration of Anthony R. Hakl in Support Defendant Cid's Ex Parte Application for Order Shortening Time (2:09-cv-01185-FCD-KJM)						

1 2. On July 6, Defendant Cid filed a motion to dismiss, noticing it for hearing on October 2, 2 a date which Defendant selected after conferring with all counsel regarding convenient dates. 3 3. Plaintiffs filed a motion for summary judgment on September 2, noticing it for hearing 4 on the same day as the hearing on Defendant's motion to dismiss. 5 4. On September 4, I contacted Donald Kilmer, counsel of record for Plaintiffs in this case, 6 by e-mail and requested that he stipulate to a shortened briefing schedule, and if necessary a 7 hearing date, to be set by the Court regarding Defendant's Rule 56(f) motion. I informed him that 8 I would be filing a Rule 56(f) motion along with this exparte application on September 9. 9 5. Mr. Kilmer responded with a telephone call on September 8, at which time he declined 10 to stipulate to an order shortening time and proposed a continuance of the hearings on both 11 Defendant's motion to dismiss and Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment. I declined Mr. 12 Kilmer's proposal. 13 6. Following the telephone call, Mr. Kilmer re-stated his position to me in an e-mail, to 14 which I also responded. A true and correct copy of our complete e-mail exchange on September 15 4 and 8 is attached as Exhibit A to this declaration. 16 7. Under the Local Rules, Defendant Cid's opposition to Plaintiffs' motion for summary 17 judgment is due no later than September 18, if he personally serves the opposition. 18 8. Given the current hearing date for Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment, and the due 19 date for Defendant's opposition brief, Defendant does not have sufficient time to regularly notice 20 a Rule 56(f) motion under the Local Rules and obtain resolution of that motion without being 21 prejudiced in otherwise opposing the summary judgment motion. 22 9. As explained more fully in Cid's Rule 56(f) motion, Defendant Cid cannot adequately 23 oppose Plaintiffs' motion for summary judgment due to this case being in its infancy and the 24 absence of discovery in this case involving facial and as-applied challenges to California Unsafe 25 Handgun Act brought by four individual and two organizational plaintiffs. Any summary 26 judgment motion and discovery will also be unnecessary in the event the Court grants Cid's 27 motion to dismiss. 28 /// 2

1	1 10. Defendant Cid has filed his Rule 5	6(f) motion at the same time as this application.			
2	I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on				
3					
4		/s/ Anthony R. Hakl			
5		ANTHONY R. HAKL			
6		ANTHONY K. HAKL			
7	10487074.doc				
8					
9					
10					
10					
11					
12					
13					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
20					
22					
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28					
_0		3 Defendent Cid's Ex Porte Application for Order Shortening Time			
	Declaration of Anthony K. Haki in Support L	Defendant Cid's Ex Parte Application for Order Shortening Time (2:09-cv-01185-FCD-KJM)			