

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

BRIAN WRENN, et al.,)	Case No. 15-CV-162-FJS
)	
Plaintiffs,)	
)	
v.)	
)	
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, et al.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

[PROPOSED] ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiffs’ motion to hold Defendants in contempt.

On May 18, 2015, this Court entered a preliminary injunction commanding the Defendants to cease enforcing the “good” or “proper” reason requirement for issuance of a handgun carry license. See Dkt. 13. This Court specifically found that enforcing this provision causes irreparable harm by depriving individuals of their Second Amendment rights. This Court further

ORDER[ED] that Defendants, their officers, agents, servants, employees, and all persons in active concert or participation with them who receive actual notice of the injunction, are enjoined from denying handgun carry licenses to applicants who meet the requirements of D.C. Code 22- 4506(a) and all other current requirements for the possession and carrying of handguns under District of Columbia law;

Dkt. 13, at 23.

This order was clear and unambiguous.

The evidence before the Court shows that Defendants are nonetheless refusing to issue handgun carry licenses for a period of 90 days to otherwise qualified applicants because they are allegedly reviewing the Court’s order.

The Court’s May 18 order is in effect today and requires no further clarification. Defendants are also sophisticated and frequent litigants who understand well the process for noticing an appeal

and seeking a stay of this Court's orders should they wish to obtain relief from such orders.

Defendants have failed to notice an appeal and they have failed to seek a stay pending appeal.

Defendants are hereby ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE, by _____, 2015, why they should not be held in contempt for violating this Court's injunction entered May 18, 2015.

SO ORDERED.

This the ____ day of May, 2015.

The Hon. Frederick J. Scullin, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge