

# **EXHIBIT A**

Quentin M. Rhoades  
State Bar No. 3969  
**SULLIVAN, TABARACCI & RHOADES, P.C.**  
1821 South Avenue West  
Third Floor  
Missoula, Montana 59801  
Telephone: (406) 721-9700  
Facsimile: (406) 721-5838  
[qmr@montanalawyer.com](mailto:qmr@montanalawyer.com)

*Pro Querente*

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MONTANA  
MISSOULA DIVISION**

**MONTANA SHOOTING SPORTS  
ASSOCIATION, SECOND  
AMENDMENT FOUNDATION,  
Inc., and GARY MARBUT,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

**ERIC H. HOLDER, JR.,  
ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE  
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,**

Defendant.

Cause No. **CV-09-147-M-DWM**

***PLAINTIFFS' SURREPLY IN  
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANT'S  
MOTION TO DISMISS  
[PROPOSED]***

Plaintiffs Montana Shooting Sports Association, Second Amendment  
Foundation, Inc., and Gary Marbut ("Plaintiffs"), by and through their

counsel of record, and submits in opposition to Defendant's motion to dismiss the following:

***SURREPLY BRIEF***

In this case, Defendant Eric H. Holder, Jr., Attorney General of the United States of America ("Defendant") filed a Motion to Dismiss the first amended complaint. (Dkt. No. 10.) Subsequently, Plaintiffs filed a second amended complaint (Dkt. No. 33.) and a brief in opposition to the motion to dismiss (Dkt. No. 48). Defendant then filed a reply that raised two new issues:

1. Whether Plaintiffs' second amended complaint was filed in violation FED. R. CIV. P. 15(a). (Dkt. No. 70, fn. 2.)
2. Whether Plaintiffs intend in fact to manufacture the Montana Buckaroo youth rifle and certain "less than legal" ammunition, including whether:
  - A. Plaintiffs have "material plans" to take part "in any activity threatened by Federal law enforcement." (Dkt. No. 70, p. 6.)
  - B. Plaintiff Marbut has not claimed he has the means to manufacture MFFA-firearms, nor has he taken any steps toward realizing this commercial venture. (*Id.*)
  - C. Purchases by the hundreds of customers who have placed orders with Marbut for the Montana Buckaroo rifle is speculative. (*Id.*)

- D. Plaintiffs have not decided to manufacture and sell MSSA firearms. (*Id.*, p. 8.)
- E. Marbut has provided no details to describe production costs and pricing for the firearms he plans to sell; customers have provided no compensation or any assurances that they will complete their alleged orders. (*Id.*, p. 10.)
- F. ATF's letter prohibiting Marbut from taking advantage of the MFFA has no effect on his day-to-day business. (*Id.*, p. 16.)
- G. ATF's letter prohibiting Marbut from taking advantage of the MFFA has no effect on his day-to-day business. (*Id.*, p. 16.)

Plaintiffs therefore have not had an opportunity to address these issues.

Turning to them now, first, the Second Amended Complaint was filed in compliance with the Court's Case Scheduling Order (Dkt. No. 17), entered pursuant to FED. R. CIV. P. 16. Once the Scheduling Order was entered in this case, Plaintiffs' ability to amend their pleadings "was governed by Rule 16(b), not Rule 15(a)." *Johnson v. Mammoth Recreations, Inc.*, 975 F.2d 604, 608 (9th Cir. 1992). The deadline for filing amended pleadings was April 12, 2010. Plaintiffs' Second Amended Complaint complied with that deadline. Given that Rule 16(b) governs, the filing of the amended complaint was appropriate.

Second, the factual allegations regarding standing and the consent of the United States to be sued are set forth in the Second Amended Complaint. For the purposes of the Government's motion to dismiss under FED. R. CIV. P. 12(b)(6), the Court should assume all facts plead in the Second Amended Complaint to be true, should resolve all doubts and inference in the pleader's favor, and should view the pleading in the light most favorable to the non-moving party. *Tellabs, Inc. Makor Issues & Rights, Ltd.*, 551 U.S. 308, 322 (2007). The pleading of tediously detailed factual allegations is not required. *Ashcroft v. Iqbal*, \_\_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_\_, 129 S.Ct. 1937, 1949 (2009). Moreover, the pleader's memorandum or brief can be used to clarify allegations of the pleading to flesh out inferences that can be reasonably drawn from the pleadings.

*Pegram v. Herdich*, 530 U.S. 211, 229 (2000).

Defendant argues that the factual allegations of the Second Amended Complaint are insufficient to confer standing. In *Friends of the Earth v. Laidlaw Environmental Services*, 405 U.S. 727, 734 (1972), the U.S. Supreme Court upheld a standing based on claims that plaintiffs had chosen to forego recreational opportunities on the river in question, out of mere fear of exposure to pollution, even though the Court accepted the

finding that there was, in fact, no basis for that fear. Thus, fear of prosecution, like a fear of pollution, results in standing. *See, United States v. SCRAP*, 412 U.S. 669, 689 & n.14 (1973) and *Japan Whaling Ass'n v. American Cetacean Soc.*, 478 U.S. 221, 231 n.4 (1986).

In this case, the fear of prosecution arises from the factual circumstances which Plaintiffs have pled, and which underlay those facts. (*See*, Sworn Declaration of Gary Marbut dated May 25, 2010, Exhibit B, attached to Plaintiff's Motion to Strike Portions of Defendant's Reply Memorandum and To Allow for Leave to File Surreply.) Review of the declaration, and attached Exhibits, makes clear that Plaintiff Marbut has the means and opportunity to manufacture firearms and ammunition under the MFFA. The correspondence he has received from the U.S. Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms and Explosives make clear that his fear has an objective basis. (*See*, Second Amended Complaint, Dkt. No. 33; Exhibits A and B.) It arises not only from his subjective reading of U.S. statutes, but from the reading of the executive agency charged with enforcement of the statutes, which has taken the time to communicate its views on prosecution of the actions he proposes to undertake.

These factual issues including the fear of prosecution, confer

standing. *Friends of the Earth*, 405 U.S. at 727. For example, *In Compassion in Dying v. Washington*, 79 F.3d 790 (9th Cir. 1996) (rev'd on other grounds *sub nom. Washington v. Gluckburg*, 521 U.S. 702 (1997)), it was held that physicians had standing to contest an anti-euthanasia statute – even though there had been no threats to prosecute whatsoever. The physician cited *Doe v. Bolton*, 410 U.S. 179, 188 (1973) and *Babbitt v. United Farm Workers*, 442 U.S. 289 198-99 & 302 (1979), correctly, for the proposition that no such threat was necessary. Finally, in this case, as the Declaration of Marbut establishes, there is indisputable economic injury. This is also always enough to confer standing: “When such tangible economic injury is alleged, we need not rely on the three factor test applied in *Thomas* and *San Diego Guns*.<sup>1</sup> *National Audubon Society v. Davis*, 307 F.3d 835, 855 (9th Cir. 2002). Given both the fear of prosecution and the economic harm, facts the Court must assume to be true, Plaintiffs have standing to sue.

///

///

---

<sup>1</sup> Note that *San Diego Guns* is the principal authority upon which the Government relies to support its standing arguments.

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated herein, Defendant's motion to dismiss should be denied.

Dated this 2<sup>nd</sup> day of June, 2010.

Respectfully Submitted,  
SULLIVAN, TABARACCI & RHOADES, P.C.

By: /s/ Quentin M. Rhoades  
Quentin M. Rhoades  
*Pro Querente*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on the 2<sup>nd</sup> day of June, 2010, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing on the following persons by the following means:

- 1       CM/ECF
- Hand Delivery
- Mail
- Overnight Delivery Service
- Fax
- E-Mail

1.     Jessica B. Leinwand  
       U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE  
       Civil Division, Federal Programs  
       P.O. Box 883  
       Washington, D.C. 20044  
       20 Massachusetts Avenue, NW  
       Washington, D.C. 20530  
       *Representing Defendant Eric H. Holder, Jr.*

1.     James Edward Brown  
       John E. Bloomquist  
       DONEY CROWLEY BLOOMQUIST & PAYNE UDA, P.C.  
       Diamond Block ,Suite 200  
       44 West Sixth Avenue  
       P.O. Box 1185  
       Helena, MT 59624  
       *Representing Weapons Collectors Society of MT (Amicus)*  
       *Representing Western Tradition Partnership (Amicus)*

1.     Mark L. Shurtleff  
       OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL  
       P.O. Box 142320  
       Salt Lake City, UT 84114-2320  
       *Representing State of Utah & Other States (Amicus)*

1. Patrick T. Fox  
DOUBEK & PYFER  
P.O. Box 236  
Helena, MT 59624  
*Representing State of Utah & Other States (Amicus)*
  
1. Jeffrey T. Renz  
CRIMINAL DEFENSE CLINIC  
School of Law  
32 Campus Drive  
University of Montana  
Missoula, MT 59812  
*Representing Montana Legislators (Amicus)*
  
1. Jennifer W. Bordy  
ATTORNEY AT LAW  
7720 A Shedhorn Drive  
PMB 132  
Bozeman, MT 59718  
*Representing Montana Legislators (Amicus)*
  
1. Duncan Scott  
SCOTT & KIENZEL  
1001 South Main Street  
Kalispell, MT 59901  
*Representing Paragon Foundation, Inc. (Amicus)*
  
1. Arthur V. Wittich  
WITTICH LAW OFFICE  
602 Ferguson Avenue  
Suite 5  
Bozeman, MT 59718  
*Representing Center for Constitutional Jurisprudence  
& Lawmakers from 17 States (Amicus)*

///

1. Anthony T. Caso  
LAW OFFICE OF ANTHONY T. CASO  
8001 Folsom Blvd  
Suite 100  
Sacramento, CA 95826  
*Representing Center for Constitutional Jurisprudence  
& Lawmakers from 17 States (Amicus)*
  
1. Nicholas C. Dranias  
GOLDWATER INSTITUTE  
500 East Coronado Road  
Phoenix, AZ 85004  
*Representing Goldwater Institute Scharf-Norton  
Center for Constitutional Gov't., et al. (Amicus)*
  
1. Timothy C. Fox  
GOUGH SHANAHAN JOHNSON & WATERMAN  
P.O. Box 1715  
Helena, MT 59624-1715  
*Representing Goldwater Institute Scharf-Norton  
Center for Constitutional Gov't., et al. (Amicus)*
  
1. Chris D. Tweeten  
OFFICE OF THE MONTANA ATTORNEY GENERAL  
P.O. Box 201401  
Helena, MT 59620-1401  
*Representing Montana Attorney Gen  
Steve Bullock (Intervenor)*
  
1. Gregory A. Jackson  
JACKSON LAW FIRM, P.C.  
320 - 11<sup>th</sup> Avenue  
Helena, MT 59601  
*Representing Gun Owners Foundation, Gun Owners  
of America, Inc. & Virginia Citizens Defense League*

1. Herbert W. Titus  
William J. Olson  
John S. Miles  
Jeremiah L. Morgan  
WILLIAM J. OLSON, P.C.  
370 Maple Avenue West  
Suite 4  
Vienna, VA 22180-5615  
*Representing Gun Owners Foundation, Gun Owners  
of America, Inc. & Virginia Citizens Defense League*
  
1. Cynthia L. Wolken  
P.O. Box 1222  
Helena, MT 59624  
*Representing Brady Center to Prevent Gun Violence;  
& Int'l Brotherhood of Police Officers, et al.*
  
1. Gil N. Peles  
PROSKAUER ROSE, LLP  
2049 Century Park East  
32<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90067-3206  
*Representing Brady Center to Prevent Gun Violence*

By: /s/ Quentin M. Rhoades  
Quentin M. Rhoades