

IN THE  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC.,  
DR. KATHRYN TYLER, VAN F. WELTON, and BRETT BENSON,  
Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

CITY OF CHICAGO,  
Defendant-Appellee.

---

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC.,  
ROBERT KLEIN ENGLER, and DR. GENE A. REISINGER,  
Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

VILLAGE OF OAK PARK and DAVID POPE, President,  
Defendants-Appellees.

---

OTIS McDONALD, ADAM ORLOV, COLLEEN LAWSON,  
DAVID LAWSON, SECOND AMENDMENT FOUNDATION,  
INC., and ILLINOIS STATE RIFLE ASSOCIATION,  
Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

CITY OF CHICAGO,  
Defendants-Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division  
Nos. 08 CV 3645, 08 CV 3696, 08 CV 3697  
The Honorable Milton I. Shadur, Judge Presiding

**BRIEF OF DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES CITY OF CHICAGO  
AND VILLAGE OF OAK PARK**

MARA S. GEORGES  
Corporation Counsel  
of the City of Chicago  
BENNA RUTH SOLOMON  
Deputy Corporation Counsel  
MYRIAM ZRECZNY KASPER  
Chief Assistant Corporation Counsel  
ANDREW WORSECK  
SUZANNE M. LOOSE  
Assistants Corporation Counsel  
30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 800  
Chicago, Illinois 60602  
(312) 744-8519  
Counsel for the City of Chicago

RAYMOND L. HEISE  
Village Attorney of Oak Park  
123 Madison Street  
Oak Park, Illinois 60302  
(708) 358-5660

HANS GERMANN  
ALEXANDRA SHEA  
RANJIT HAKIM  
Mayer Brown LLP  
71 South Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
(312) 782-0600  
Counsel for the Village Oak Park

IN THE  
UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE SEVENTH CIRCUIT

---

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC.,  
DR. KATHRYN TYLER, VAN F. WELTON, and BRETT BENSON,  
Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

CITY OF CHICAGO,  
Defendant-Appellee.

---

NATIONAL RIFLE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC.,  
ROBERT KLEIN ENGLER, and DR. GENE A. REISINGER,  
Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

VILLAGE OF OAK PARK and DAVID POPE, President,  
Defendants-Appellees.

---

OTIS McDONALD, ADAM ORLOV, COLLEEN LAWSON,  
DAVID LAWSON, SECOND AMENDMENT FOUNDATION,  
INC., and ILLINOIS STATE RIFLE ASSOCIATION,  
Plaintiffs-Appellants,

v.

CITY OF CHICAGO,  
Defendants-Appellees.

---

Appeals from the United States District Court  
for the Northern District of Illinois, Eastern Division  
Nos. 08 CV 3645, 08 CV 3696, 08 CV 3697  
The Honorable Milton I. Shadur, Judge Presiding

---

**BRIEF OF DEFENDANTS-APPELLEES CITY OF CHICAGO  
AND VILLAGE OF OAK PARK**

---

**CIRCUIT RULE 26.1 DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

Appellate Court No: 08-4244, 08-4241, 08-4243

Short Caption: NRA, et al. v. Chicago; NRA, et al. v. Village of Oak Park; McDonald, et al. v. Chicago

To enable the judges to determine whether recusal is necessary or appropriate, an attorney for a non-governmental party or amicus curiae, or a private attorney representing a government party, must furnish a disclosure statement providing the following information in compliance with Circuit Rule 26.1 and Fed. R. App. P. 26.1.

The Court prefers that the disclosure statement be filed immediately following docketing; but, the disclosure statement must be filed within 21 days of docketing or upon the filing of a motion, response, petition, or answer in this court, whichever occurs first. Attorneys are required to file an amended statement to reflect any material changes in the required information. The text of the statement must also be included in front of the table of contents of the party's main brief. **Counsel is required to complete the entire statement and to use N/A for any information that is not applicable if this form is used.**

**[ ] PLEASE CHECK HERE IF ANY INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS NEW OR REVISED AND INDICATE WHICH INFORMATION IS NEW OR REVISED.**

- (1) The full name of every party that the attorney represents in the case (if the party is a corporation, you must provide the corporate disclosure information required by Fed. R. App. P. 26.1 by completing the item #3):

Village of Oak Park

- (2) The names of all law firms whose partners or associates have appeared for the party in the case (including proceedings in the district court or before an administrative agency) or are expected to appear for the party in this court:

Mayer Brown LLP

Klein, Thorpe & Jenkins, Ltd.

- (3) If the party or amicus is a corporation:

i) Identify all its parent corporations, if any; and

ii) list any publicly held company that owns 10% or more of the party's or amicus' stock:

U.S.C.A. - 7th Circuit  
RECEIVED

APR X 6 2009 JIR

GINO J. AGNELLO  
CLERK

Attorney's Signature: Hans J. Germann Date: 4/6/09

Attorney's Printed Name: Hans J. Germann

Please indicate if you are *Counsel of Record* for the above listed parties pursuant to Cir. Rule 3(d). Yes \_\_\_ No X

Address: 71 S. Wacker Dr., Chicago IL 60611

Phone Number 312-701-8792 Fax Number: 312-706-8169

E-Mail Address: hgermann@mayerbrown.com

**CIRCUIT RULE 26.1 DISCLOSURE STATEMENT**

Appellate Court No: 08-4244, 08-4241, 08-4243

Short Caption: NRA, et al. v. Chicago; NRA, et al. v. Village of Oak Park; McDonald, et al. v. Chicago

To enable the judges to determine whether recusal is necessary or appropriate, an attorney for a non-governmental party or amicus curiae, or a private attorney representing a government party, must furnish a disclosure statement providing the following information in compliance with Circuit Rule 26.1 and Fed. R. App. P. 26.1.

The Court prefers that the disclosure statement be filed immediately following docketing; but, the disclosure statement must be filed within 21 days of docketing or upon the filing of a motion, response, petition, or answer in this court, whichever occurs first. Attorneys are required to file an amended statement to reflect any material changes in the required information. The text of the statement must also be included in front of the table of contents of the party's main brief. **Counsel is required to complete the entire statement and to use N/A for any information that is not applicable if this form is used.**

**PLEASE CHECK HERE IF ANY INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS NEW OR REVISED AND INDICATE WHICH INFORMATION IS NEW OR REVISED.**

- (1) The full name of every party that the attorney represents in the case (if the party is a corporation, you must provide the corporate disclosure information required by Fed. R. App. P. 26.1 by completing the item #3):

Village of Oak Park

- (2) The names of all law firms whose partners or associates have appeared for the party in the case (including proceedings in the district court or before an administrative agency) or are expected to appear for the party in this court:

Mayer Brown LLP

Klein, Thorpe & Jenkins, Ltd.

U.S.C.A. - 7th Circuit  
**RECEIVED**

- (3) If the party or amicus is a corporation:

i) Identify all its parent corporations, if any; and


APR X 6 2009 JIR  
GINO J. AGNELLO  
CLERK

U.S.C.A. - 7th Circuit  
**RECEIVED**

APR X 6 2009 JIR

GINO J. AGNELLO  
CLERK

ii) list any publicly held company that owns 10% or more of the party's or amicus' stock:

Attorney's Signature: 

Date: 4/6/09

Attorney's Printed Name: Ranjit J. Hakim

Please indicate if you are *Counsel of Record* for the above listed parties pursuant to Cir. Rule 3(d). Yes \_\_\_ No X

Address: 71 S. Wacker Dr., Chicago IL 60611

Phone Number 312-701-8758

Fax Number: 312-706-9124

E-Mail Address: rhakim@mayerbrown.com

CIRCUIT RULE 26.1 DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Appellate Court No: 08-4244, 08-4241, 08-4243

Short Caption: NRA, et al. v. Chicago; NRA, et al. v. Village of Oak Park; McDonald, et al. v. Chicago

To enable the judges to determine whether recusal is necessary or appropriate, an attorney for a non-governmental party or amicus curiae, or a private attorney representing a government party, must furnish a disclosure statement providing the following information in compliance with Circuit Rule 26.1 and Fed. R. App. P. 26.1.

The Court prefers that the disclosure statement be filed immediately following docketing; but, the disclosure statement must be filed within 21 days of docketing or upon the filing of a motion, response, petition, or answer in this court, whichever occurs first. Attorneys are required to file an amended statement to reflect any material changes in the required information. The text of the statement must also be included in front of the table of contents of the party's main brief. **Counsel is required to complete the entire statement and to use N/A for any information that is not applicable if this form is used.**

**PLEASE CHECK HERE IF ANY INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS NEW OR REVISED AND INDICATE WHICH INFORMATION IS NEW OR REVISED.**

- (1) The full name of every party that the attorney represents in the case (if the party is a corporation, you must provide the corporate disclosure information required by Fed. R. App. P. 26.1 by completing the item #3):

Village of Oak Park

- (2) The names of all law firms whose partners or associates have appeared for the party in the case (including proceedings in the district court or before an administrative agency) or are expected to appear for the party in this court:

Mayer Brown LLP

Klein, Thorpe & Jenkins, Ltd.

- (3) If the party or amicus is a corporation:

i) Identify all its parent corporations, if any; and

ii) list any publicly held company that owns 10% or more of the party's or amicus' stock:

U.S.C.A. - 7th Circuit  
RECEIVED  
APR X 6 2009 JIR

GINO J. AGNELLO  
CLERK

Attorney's Signature: Alexandra E. Shea Date: 4/6/09

Attorney's Printed Name: Alexandra E. Shea

Please indicate if you are *Counsel of Record* for the above listed parties pursuant to Cir. Rule 3(d). Yes  No

Address: 71 S. Wacker Dr., Chicago IL 60611

Phone Number 312-701-8398

Fax Number: 312-706-9318

E-Mail Address: ashea@mayerbrown.com

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

	Page
<b>TABLE OF AUTHORITIES</b> .....	iii
<b>JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT</b> .....	1
<b>ISSUES PRESENTED</b> .....	2
<b>STATEMENT OF THE CASE</b> .....	3
<b>STATEMENT OF FACTS</b> .....	9
<b>SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT</b> .....	9
<b>ARGUMENT</b> .....	12
<b>I. BINDING SUPREME COURT PRECEDENT HOLDS THAT THE SECOND AMENDMENT DOES NOT RESTRAIN THE STATES.</b> ...	14
<b>II. UNDER THE SUPREME COURT’S SELECTIVE INCORPORATION DOCTRINE, THE SECOND AMENDMENT SHOULD NOT BE INCORPORATED.</b> .....	20
<b>A. Incorporation, Like Other Due Process Issues, Requires Evaluation Of Many Factors And Considerations, And Is Not Automatic.</b> .....	22
<b>B. <u>Heller</u> Limited Its Analysis To The Text Of The Second Amendment And Did Not Consider Factors That Govern A Selective Incorporation Analysis.</b> .....	26
<b>C. There Is No Fundamental Categorical Right To Arms In Common Use, To Handguns In Particular, Or To Any Particular Arms For Self Defense.</b> .....	30
<b>1. The Second Amendment’s origins do not show a fundamental right to arms in common use, including handguns.</b> .....	30
<b>2. The state constitutions do not show a deeply rooted right to arms in common use.</b> .....	37

3.	<b>The purpose of self-defense in the home does not require access to any particular weapon, including those in common use, especially where adequate alternative arms are allowed. ....</b>	<b>44</b>
4.	<b>Under the concept of ordered liberty, local governments should be afforded great latitude in regulating firearms, including weapons in common use. ....</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>III.</b>	<b>CONGRESSIONAL INTENT UNDERLYING THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT IS NO BASIS TO INCORPORATE THE SECOND AMENDMENT. ....</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>IV.</b>	<b>JUDGMENT ON THE PLEADINGS WAS PROPER ON ALL COUNTS. ....</b>	<b>59</b>
	<b>CONCLUSION .....</b>	<b>64</b>

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	Page
<b>CASES</b>	
<u>Adamson v. State of California</u> , 332 U.S. 46 (1947), overruled on other grounds by <u>Malloy v. Hogan</u> , 378 U.S. 1 (1964) .....	53
<u>Agostini v. Felton</u> , 521 U.S. 203 (1997) .....	16
<u>Anderson v. Celebrese</u> , 460 U.S. 780 (1983) .....	61
<u>Andrews v. State</u> , 1871 WL 3579, 50 Tenn. 165 (1871) .....	40
<u>Apodaca v. Oregon</u> , 406 U.S. 404 (1972) .....	45
<u>Arnold v. City of Cleveland</u> , 616 N.E.2d 163 (Ohio 1993) .....	43
<u>Aymette v. State</u> , 1840 WL 1554, 2 Hum. 154 (Tenn. 1840) .....	40
<u>Bach v. Pataki</u> , 408 F.3d 75 (2d Cir. 2005) .....	18
<u>Barron v. Mayor &amp; City Council of Baltimore</u> , 32 U.S. (7 Pet.) 243 (1833) .....	20, 33
<u>Benjamin v. Bailey</u> , 662 A.2d 1226 (Conn. 1995) .....	42, 43
<u>Benton v. Maryland</u> , 395 U.S. 784 (1969) .....	25
<u>Bliss v. Commonwealth</u> , 1822 WL 1085, 2 Litt. 90 (Ky. 1822) .....	40
<u>Campbell v. Louisiana</u> , 523 U.S. 392 (1998) .....	24

<u>Carson v. State,</u> 247 S.E.2d 68 (Ga. 1978) .....	42
<u>Cases v. United States,</u> 131 F.2d 916 (1st Cir. 1942) .....	18
<u>Chandler v. Florida,</u> 449 U.S. 560 (1981) .....	51
<u>Chaplinsky v. New Hampshire,</u> 315 U.S. 568 (1942) .....	49
<u>City of Cincinnati v. Langan,</u> 640 N.E.2d 200 (Ohio Ct. App. 1994) .....	43
<u>City of Cleveland v. Turner,</u> No. 36126, 1977 WL 201393 (Ohio Ct. App. Aug. 4, 1977) .....	42
<u>City of Junction City v. Mevis,</u> 601 P.2d 1145 (Kan. 1979) .....	41
<u>City of Lakewood v. Pillow,</u> 501 P.2d 744 (Col. 1972) .....	41
<u>City of Salina v. Blaksley,</u> 83 P. 619 (Kan. 1905) .....	38
<u>Commonwealth v. Davis,</u> 343 N.E.2d 847 (Mass. 1976) .....	38
<u>County of Sacramento v. Lewis,</u> 523 U.S. 833 (1998) .....	23
<u>Danforth v. Minnesota,</u> 128 S. Ct. 1029 (2008) .....	25
<u>District of Columbia v. Heller,</u> 128 S. Ct. 2783 (2008) .....	passim
<u>Duncan v. Louisiana,</u> 391 U.S. 145 (1968) .....	passim
<u>Edwards v. City of Goldsboro,</u> 178 F.3d 231 (4th Cir. 1999) .....	18

<u>Edwards v. Elliott,</u> 88 U.S. (21 Wall.) 532 (1874) .....	59
<u>Ex parte Thomas,</u> 97 P. 260 (Okla. 1908) .....	40
<u>Farmer v. Brennan,</u> 81 F.3d 1444 (7th Cir. 1995) .....	60
<u>Fresno Rifle &amp; Pistol Club, Inc. v. Van de Kamp,</u> 965 F.2d 723 (9th Cir. 1992) .....	18
<u>Hunt v. Daley,</u> 677 N.E.2d 456 (Ill. App. Ct. 1997) .....	62
<u>Hurtado v. California,</u> 110 U.S. 516 (1884) .....	24, 25, 40, 44
<u>Jehovah’s Witnesses in the State of Washington v. King County Hospital Unit No. 1,</u> 390 U.S. 598, 598 (1968) (per curiam) .....	49
<u>Justice v. Elrod,</u> 832 F.2d 1048 (7th Cir. 1987) .....	18
<u>Kalodimos v. Village of Morton Grove,</u> 470 N.E.2d 266 (Ill. 1984) .....	12, 42
<u>Lawrence v. Texas,</u> 539 U.S. 558 (2003) .....	40
<u>Love v. Pepersack,</u> 47 F.3d 120 (4th Cir. 1995) .....	18
<u>Malloy v. Hogan,</u> 378 U.S. 1 (1964) .....	15, 53
<u>Maloney v. Cuomo,</u> 554 F.3d 56 (2d Cir. 2009) .....	17
<u>Mapp v. Ohio,</u> 367 U.S. 643 (1961) .....	17

<u>Miller v. Texas</u> , 153 U.S. 535 (1894) .....	passim
<u>Minneapolis &amp; St. Louis R. v. Bombolis</u> , 241 U.S. 211 (1916) .....	24
<u>Montana v. Egelhoff</u> , 518 U.S. 37 (1996) .....	23, 37
<u>Morrison v. State</u> , 339 S.W.2d 529 (Tex. Crim. App. 1960) .....	42
<u>Mosby v. Devine</u> , 851 A.2d 1031 (R.I. 2004) .....	41
<u>Mr. S. v. Webb</u> , 2009 WL 650542 (D. Conn. Mar. 13, 2009) .....	17
<u>Osborn v. Haley</u> , 549 U.S. 225 (2007) .....	24
<u>Palko v. Connecticut</u> , 302 U.S. 319 (1937), overruled on other grounds by <u>Benton v. Maryland</u> , 395 U.S. 784 (1969) .....	24
<u>People v. Abdullah</u> , 870 N.Y.S.2d 886 (N.Y. Crim. Ct. Dec. 30, 2008) .....	17
<u>People v. Smelter</u> , 437 N.W.2d 341 (Mich. Ct. App. 1989) .....	43
<u>People v. Williams</u> , 377 N.E.2d 285 (Ill. App. Ct. 1978) .....	41
<u>Peoples Rights Organization, Inc. v. City of Columbus</u> , 152 F.3d 522 (6th Cir. 1998) .....	18, 62
<u>Planned Parenthood v. Casey</u> , 505 U.S. 833 (1992) .....	61
<u>Presser v. Illinois</u> , 116 U.S. 252 (1886) .....	passim

<u>Prince v. Massachusetts,</u> 321 U.S. 158 (1944) .....	49
<u>Quilici v. Village of Morton Grove,</u> 695 F.2d 261 (7th Cir. 1982) .....	passim
<u>Riggins v. Nevada,</u> 504 U.S. 127 (1992) .....	50
<u>Rinzler v. Carson,</u> 262 So. 2d 661 (Fla. 1972) .....	42
<u>Rodriguez de Quijas v. Shearson/American Express, Inc.,</u> 490 U.S. 477 (1989) .....	16
<u>Saban v. United States Department of Labor,</u> 509 F.3d 376 (7th Cir. 2007) .....	17
<u>Santos v. United States,</u> 461 F.3d 886 (7th Cir. 2006) .....	19
<u>Schenk v. United States,</u> 249 U.S. 47 (1919) .....	49
<u>Sell v. United States,</u> 539 U.S. 166 (2003) .....	50
<u>Silveira v. Lockyer,</u> 312 F.3d 1052 (9th Cir. 2002) .....	18
<u>Sklar v. Byrne,</u> 727 F.2d 633 (7th Cir. 1984) .....	12, 18, 42, 62
<u>The Slaughter-House Cases,</u> 83 U.S. (16 Wall.) 36 (1872) .....	52, 59
<u>State v. Dawson,</u> 159 S.E.2d 1 (N.C. 1968) .....	41
<u>State v. Fennell,</u> 382 S.E.2d 231 (N.C. App. 1989) .....	42
<u>State v. Hamdan,</u> 665 N.W.2d 785 (Wis. 2003) .....	42

