NYSRPA, in co-operation with the NRA, has filed a lawsuit in federal court challenging the SAFE Act on constitutional grounds. Involved with the suit are some of the nations most experienced 2nd Amendment attorneys. We ask that no other 3rd party legal action be taken without prior consultation. We realize that this law impacts a very large number of people, but this is an extremely important case and must be handled properly with the best lawyers.

Here is a copy of the legal filing (pdf).

- **March 21, 2013:** Initial filing.
- **April 15, 2013 Update:** Motion for Preliminary Injunction and Motion for Expedited Hearing filed. Memorandum in support of a preliminary injunction
.
- **April 22, 2013 Update:** NRA files a *Amicus Curiae* in support of our lawsuit.
- **May 14, 2013 Update:** New York State Sheriff's Association files a *Amicus Curiae* in support of our lawsuit.
- **May 15, 2013 Update:** We have filed both a Complaint and an Amended Complaint in the USDC for the Western District of New York. Our Amended Complaint claims that the SAFE Act is unconstitutional in that it violates the Second Amendment, the Equal Protection Clause, and is unconstitutionally vague. Subsequent to the filing of our Amended Complaint, we filed a Motion for Preliminary Injunction asking the Court to Order all defendants to cease the enforcement and prosecution of the SAFE Act. The Court has not yet decided our request. After a hearing to establish a briefing schedule, Judge William Skretny issued a Scheduling Order. Under the Order, the following deadlines were set: the time for all defendants to file an Answer to the Amended Complaint was stayed until June 7. All defendants have until June 7 to respond to our motion for preliminary injunction or cross-move for dispositive relief; The plaintiffs have until July 8 to oppose any cross-motion by the defense and/or reply to any opposition to the motion for PI; and the defendants' time to reply to any opposition filed by the plaintiffs was not decided, but will be addressed by the Court at a later date. The Court set August 23 as the next date for the parties to return to court, characterizing this date as a "status conference/hearing date, with emphasis for now on status conference." To date we have spent $164,000 on the suit and have received an additional $80,000 from the NRA Civil Rights Defense Fund.
- **June 13, 2013 Update:** The State has until June 22 to respond to our amended complaint. Afterwards we have 30 days to respond to them. Both parties are due in court August 23. To date we have spent $225,000 on the lawsuit.
- **July 1, 2013 Update:** Response from Attorney General Eric Schneiderman with cross-motion to dismiss and/or summary judgement.

Nassau County District Attorney Kathleen Rice
and
State Police legal counsel Kevin Bruen

have also filed briefs in support of SAFE.

- **July 26, 2013 Update:** The August date has been moved back. Both parties are due in court on September 12.
- **August 23, 2013 Update:** Senator Kathy Marchione filed a *Amicus Curiae* in support of our lawsuit.
- **August 28, 2013 Update:** We have filed the following documents: Memo of Law , Notice of Cross-Motion
,
Counter Statement of Undisputed Facts
and
Response to the State Defendants' Statement of Undisputed Facts
.
- **September 13, 2013 Update:** Yesterday's court meeting was postponed. No new date has been set yet.
- **September 30, 2013 Update:** The NSSF filed a *Amicus Curiae* in support of our lawsuit.
- **October 31, 2013 Update:** The State has requested a *motion for summary judgement* in an attempt to have our lawsuit thrown out.
- **November 19, 2013 Update:** Our lawyers have asked the Judge to schedule a public hearing to outline our case against the law .
- **November 25, 2013 Update:** Our lawyers have responded to the State's request for a *motion for summary judgement*
and have requested our own
motion for summary judgement
. Since briefing is complete, we believe the Court will schedule an oral argument on the motions. Normally, for cases involving controversial of issues, courts will hold an oral argument although they are not required to as the issues involved in the motions are purely legal. No testimony is required and the Court may just rule on the papers that have been filed. At this time we do not know if the Court will have a hearing. Procedural rules do not require the Court either to set a hearing or to decide the motion within a specified amount of time.

Please do not call or e-mail the office or directors asking for more information. Any announcements will be published here on our website.

We will not win without support from gun owners. You can help either by *joining/renewing your membership* or *making a online donation*

. Thank you all for your support.