

STATE OF MINNESOTA
COUNTY OF RAMSEY

DISTRICT COURT
SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT
Case Type: Civil/Other

Minnesota Gun Owners Caucus;
Plaintiff,

Court File No. _____

v.

City of Saint Paul, Minnesota
Defendant.

**AFFIDAVIT OF BRYAN STRAWSER
IN SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFFS'
MOTION FOR EX PARTE
TEMPORARY RESTRAINING
ORDER AND TEMPORARY
INJUNCTION**

I, Bryan Strawser, declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Minnesota that the foregoing is true and correct:

1. I am over the age of 18 and am competent to testify to the matters herein.

The facts stated in this affidavit are based on my personal knowledge.

2. I am the founder and Chair of the Board of Directors of the Minnesota Gun Owners Caucus (the "Caucus" or "Plaintiff"). I have served in leadership roles with the Caucus since 2015. I make this affidavit based on my personal knowledge, my review of records kept in the ordinary course of the Caucus's activities, and information provided to me by Caucus staff and members.

3. The Minnesota Gun Owners Caucus is a Minnesota non-profit membership organization that advocates for the rights of law-abiding firearm owners in Minnesota. The Caucus has members throughout the state, including many who reside in the City

of Saint Paul and many others who regularly work, travel, or carry firearms in Saint Paul.

4. MNGOC has thousands of members across Minnesota, including many who reside, work, and travel within the City of Saint Paul, and many more reside in the Twin Cities metropolitan area and regularly travel into Saint Paul for work, commerce, recreation, and other lawful purposes.

5. Many Caucus members who live in or travel to Saint Paul lawfully own and carry firearms and ammunition magazines that are targeted by Saint Paul Ordinance 25-65 (the “Ordinance”). These include standard-capacity magazines that hold more than 20 rounds, semiautomatic firearms that the Ordinance labels as “assault weapons,” and privately manufactured firearms that the Ordinance labels as “ghost guns.”

6. I personally own a privately manufactured firearm, what the Ordinance labels a “ghost gun”. I frequently travel to Saint Paul for business and recreation, and will now refrain from engaging in the lawful conduct of carrying that firearm as a result of the advancement of the Ordinance.

7. The Caucus brings this action both on its own behalf and on behalf of its members who are subject to the Ordinance and who will suffer harm if the Ordinance is allowed to be enacted, implemented, or enforced.

8. In the ordinary course of our work, members regularly contact the Caucus

to ask how new laws and local ordinances affect their ability to possess, carry, transport, and use firearms and ammunition magazines lawfully. I personally receive and review a large volume of such communications.

The Saint Paul Ordinance and Its Passage

9. On November 12, 2025, the Saint Paul City Council voted to pass Ordinance 25-65.

10. The Ordinance creates new criminal offenses related to so-called “large capacity magazines,” “assault weapons,” and “ghost guns” within the City of Saint Paul and on city property. Violations are punishable by criminal penalties.

11. The Ordinance bans the possession of common firearms defined as “Assault weapon[s],” magazines defined as “Large-capacity magazine[s],” and other related components.

12. Section 3 of the Ordinance states that it “shall take effect thirty (30) days after its passage, approval, and publication.” At the same time, the Ordinance contains language stating that it “shall not take effect” unless and until Minnesota’s firearm preemption statute is repealed or a “substantially the same” law is enacted at the state level.

13. The Ordinance does not define what it means for a state law to be “substantially the same” to the Ordinance, or who decides whether a future state law

meets that standard. Nor does it explain how the 30-day effective date interacts with the preemption-repeal and “substantially the same” contingencies.

14. The Mayor approved the Ordinance on November 19, 2025. Under Section 3, the Ordinance is scheduled to take effect thirty (30) days after its passage, approval, and publication.

15. Before the Council’s vote, on October 22, 2025, the Caucus sent a detailed written letter to the Saint Paul City Council and the Saint Paul City Attorney. In that letter, we explained that the proposed ordinance exceeded the City’s lawful authority, conflicted with Minnesota’s firearm preemption statute, and would invite immediate legal action if enacted.

16. Despite that notice and warning, the City Council proceeded to pass the Ordinance on November 12, 2025.

17. On November 12, 2025, immediately after passage of the Ordinance, Plaintiffs caused the Summons and Complaint in this action to be served on the City of Saint Paul in accordance with the Minnesota Rules of Civil Procedure.

Confusion, Chill, and Harm to Caucus Members from the Ordinance

18. Since the Ordinance was introduced and passed, the Caucus has heard from numerous members who are confused and concerned about the Ordinance’s effective date and the scope of its prohibitions.

19. Many members own magazines that hold more than 20 rounds and semiautomatic firearms that fall within the Ordinance's broad "assault weapon" definitions. These include common semiautomatic pistols and rifles that are lawfully possessed under Minnesota and federal law.

20. Members and followers of the Caucus have asked whether they may lawfully continue to possess or carry their firearms and magazines in Saint Paul parks, libraries, city-owned buildings, and other locations referenced in the Ordinance or whether they are at risk of arrest and prosecution.

21. Several members have indicated that, because of the Ordinance's vague and confusing language about its effective date, the repeal of state preemption, and the unclear "substantially the same" state-law trigger, they do not know when—or whether—the Ordinance will be enforced, what conduct might be deemed unlawful, or who decides when such conduct is prohibited.

22. As a result, some members have told the Caucus that they now refrain from carrying their usual defensive firearms or standard magazines in Saint Paul, will avoid traveling into Saint Paul with those items, or will alter their ordinary activities to reduce the risk of contact with Saint Paul law enforcement.

23. Others have expressed concern that the City could take the position that the Ordinance is enforceable 30 days after approval, regardless of preemption, and that they might be arrested or prosecuted in the interim while the legality of the Ordinance

is litigated.

24. This uncertainty and fear are already affecting the lawful behavior of Caucus members today. Members are changing their conduct, including where they may continue to reside, how and where they travel, what firearms and magazines they carry, and whether they enter certain city properties.

25. This uncertainty and fear are already affecting the lawful behavior of Caucus members today. Members are changing their conduct, including how and where they travel, what firearms and magazines they carry, and whether they enter certain city properties.

26. As the City moves forward with publication and implementation, Caucus members are facing an immediate choice between:

- a. exercising their rights as they have lawfully done under state law, at the risk of arrest and criminal prosecution under the Ordinance, or
- b. surrendering or altering their lawful conduct to avoid that risk.

27. The threat of arrest, criminal prosecution, criminal records, potential incarceration, and loss or seizure of firearms and magazines cannot be adequately remedied by money damages. The chill on members' exercise of their statutory and constitutional rights is also not compensable in money.

28. The Caucus itself is harmed when the City enacts and threatens to enforce unlawful ordinances like Ordinance 25-65.

29. The Caucus must divert time, staff, and financial resources away from its ordinary educational and advocacy activities and toward increased inquiries regarding the Ordinance, emergency member counseling, public education, and litigation to protect its members' rights.

30. The City's decision to pass an ordinance that exceeds its delegated authority and is in tension with state preemption law also undermines the Caucus's mission by creating patchwork local regulations that state law was designed to prevent, exposing members to a confusing and shifting landscape of criminal risk.

Need for Immediate and Ex Parte Temporary Restraining Order

31. The Mayor has approved the Ordinance. Absent court intervention, the City can and will proceed with publication and implementation.

32. If the City is alerted to the precise timing of Plaintiffs' request for an ex parte Temporary Restraining Order before the Court has an opportunity to act, the City will have a window in which it may accelerate the final steps of approval, publication, and codification of the Ordinance.

33. Once those steps are taken, Caucus members will face heightened and imminent risk of enforcement, and the Ordinance will have a stronger claim to being in effect. That is the precise harm Plaintiffs seek emergency relief to prevent.

34. The Caucus has already given the City extensive notice of its legal

objections and of its intent to challenge the Ordinance. The City chose to proceed despite that notice. Under these circumstances, providing advance notice of the time and place of an emergency ex parte hearing risks enabling the very harm this motion seeks to avert.

35. Saint Paul is not acting in isolation. The City is part of a coalition of municipalities exploring or advancing similar measures, including Mounds View and Shoreview¹, which are within this District. Entry of an immediate ex parte Temporary Restraining Order will promote judicial economy by resolving threshold legal questions about Ordinance 25-65 before additional cities adopt materially similar ordinances and become parties to separate or follow-on litigation. An order from this Court will provide clear guidance to those municipalities and may dissuade them from enacting or enforcing comparable measures while this challenge is pending.

36. Immediate injunctive relief is necessary to preserve the status quo, to prevent the unlawful enactment and enforcement of Ordinance 25-65, and to protect the rights of the Caucus and its members while this Court adjudicates the legality of the Ordinance.

FURTHER YOUR AFFIANT SAYETH NAUGHT.

¹ Page 7, *Gun Violence Prevention Ordinance 25-65*, CITY OF SAINT PAUL, Staff Report to City Council – October 22, 2025
<https://stpaul.legistar.com/View.ashx?M=F&ID=14881485&GUID=7D85E9E0-4EF0-4326-AA9B-A858B9C61A33> (last accessed 11/19/2025)

I declare under penalty of perjury that everything I have stated in this document is true and correct.

Dated: 11/19/2025

Executed in Ramsey County, MN

Bryan Strawser

Bryan Strawser (Nov 19, 2025 17:00:17 CST)

Bryan Strawser

MINNESOTA
JUDICIAL
BRANCH