

NOV 07 2016

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>RIMA RAULINAITIS, SIGITAS RAULINAITIS,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Plaintiffs-Appellants,</p> <p>v.</p> <p>LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFFS DEPARTMENT,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Defendant-Appellee.</p>

No. 12-56508

D.C. No.
2:11-cv-08026-MWF-JCG

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Michael W. Fitzgerald, District Judge, Presiding

Submitted October 25, 2016**

Before: LEAVY, SILVERMAN, and GRABER, Circuit Judges.

Rima and Sigitas Raulinaitis appeal from the district court's summary judgment in their 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action alleging violations of their Second Amendment rights. We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291. We review de

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3.

** The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

novo, *Peruta v. County of San Diego*, 824 F.3d 919, 925 (9th Cir. 2016) (*en banc*), and we affirm.

In *Peruta v. San Diego*, this court, sitting en banc, held that a member of the general public does not have a right under the Second Amendment to carry a concealed firearm in public, and that a state may impose restrictions, including a showing of good cause, on concealed carry. *Id.* at 939. The San Diego and Yolo County Sheriff's Department policies interpreting the California statutory good cause requirement at issue in *Peruta* therefore survived a Second Amendment challenge. *Id.* For the same reasons, the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department's policies interpreting the California statutory good cause requirement do not violate the Second Amendment.

AFFIRMED.