

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

<hr/>		)	
DICK ANTHONY HELLER, <i>et al.</i>	)	)	
	)	)	
Plaintiffs,	)	)	
	)	)	
v.	)	)	Civil Action No.08-01289 (RMU)
	)	)	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	)	
	)	)	
Defendants.	)	)	
<hr/>		)	

JOINT STATUS REPORT

Pursuant to the Minute Order of January 6, 2009, the parties hereby submit the following joint status report.

On or about March 10, 2009, the District of Columbia was served with a complaint in *Hanson v. District of Columbia*, No. 09-cv-00454 (RMU), challenging various provisions of District law regulating firearms as violating the Second Amendment and the holding in *District of Columbia v. Heller*, \_\_\_ U.S. \_\_\_, 128 S. Ct. 2783 (2008).

On March 25, 2009, the Court granted the instant plaintiffs’ motion for leave to file their Second Amended Complaint. On March 30, 2009, the District filed its Motion to Consolidate the *Hanson* case with the instant matter.

Neither the *Hanson* complaint nor the instant Second Amended Complaint appear to challenge any provision of the Inoperable Pistol Amendment Act of 2008, Act 17-690. The Firearms Control Amendment Act of 2008, Act 17-708 became effective on April 1, 2009. *See* <http://www.dccouncil.washington.dc.us/lims/searchbylegislation.aspx> (as of April 7, 2009).

The instant parties continue to agree that the matter is likely to be resolved through dispositive motions.

The District believes that consolidating the two cases “would increase efficiency . . . by achieving judicial economy in the adjudication of potentially dispositive motions involving similar material facts . . . and common questions of law.” *Chang v. United States*, 217 F.R.D. 262, 266–67 (D.D.C. 2003). Consequently, the District respectfully suggests that a consolidated dispositive briefing schedule would be in the best interests of the parties and the Court.

The Plaintiffs believe that this case concerns exclusively questions of law and suggest that the Court, upon resolution of the District’s Motion to Consolidate, issue a scheduling order for the filing of motions for summary judgment within 60 days of the issuance of the scheduling order. Plaintiffs take no position on the District’s Motion to Consolidate.

DATE: April 8, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Dick Anthony Heller  
Absalom F. Jordan, Jr.  
William Carter  
Mark Snyder  
By Counsel

/s/ Richard E. Gardiner

Richard E. Gardiner  
D.C. Bar No. 386915  
Suite 403  
3925 Chain Bridge Road  
Fairfax, VA 22030  
(703) 352-7276  
regardiner@cox.net

/s/ Stephen P. Halbrook

Stephen P. Halbrook  
D.C. Bar No. 379799  
Suite 404  
10560 Main Street  
Fairfax, VA 22030  
(703) 352-7276  
protell@aol.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

District of Columbia  
Adrian Fenty  
By Counsel

PETER J. NICKLES  
Attorney General, District of Columbia

GEORGE C. VALENTINE  
Deputy Attorney General, Civil Litigation Division

/s/ Ellen A. Efros  
ELLEN A. EFROS, D.C. Bar No. 250746  
Chief, Equity Section I  
441 Fourth Street, N.W., 6th Floor South  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Telephone: (202) 442-9886

/s/ Andrew J. Saindon  
ANDREW J. SAINDON, D.C. Bar No. 456987  
Assistant Attorney General  
Equity I Section  
441 Fourth Street, N.W., 6th Floor South  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
Telephone: (202) 724-6643  
Facsimile: (202) 727-0431  
andy.saindon@dc.gov

*Attorneys for Defendants*