

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

STATE OF MINNESOTA
IN COURT OF APPEALS

FILED

September 18, 2025

**OFFICE OF
APPELLATE COURTS**

CASE TITLE:

Minnesota Gun Owners Caucus

Cross-Appellant,

**STATEMENT OF THE CASE OF
CROSS-APPELLANT**

vs.

DISTRICT COURT CASE NUMBER:

62-CV-25-1083

APPELLATE COURT CASE NUMBER:

A25-1507

Tim Walz, Governor of Minnesota,
in his official capacity;

Keith Ellison, Attorney General of
Minnesota, in his official capacity;

Drew Evans, Superintendent of the
Minnesota Bureau of Criminal
Apprehension, in his official
capacity,

Appellants;

Mary Moriarty, Hennepin County
Attorney, in her official capacity,

Cross-Respondent.

1. Court or agency of case origination and name of presiding judge or hearing

Ramsey County District Court, the Honorable Leonardo Castro presiding.

2. Jurisdictional Statement

(A) Appeal from district court.

Yes.

Statute, rule or other authority authorizing appeal:

Minn. R. Civ. App. P. 103.03(a). See also Minn. R. App. P. 103.02, subd. 2.

Date of entry of judgment or date of service of notice of filing of order from which appeal is taken:

Both the Order and Judgment were issued and entered on August 18, 2025.

Authority fixing time limit for filing notice of appeal (specify applicable rule or statute):

Minn. R. Civ. App. P. 104.01, subd. 4.

Date of filing any motion that tolls appeal time:

N/A

Date of filing of order deciding tolling motion and date of service of notice of filing:

N/A

(B) Certiorari appeal.

N/A

(C) Other appellate proceedings.

N/A

(D) Finality of order or judgment.

Does the judgment or order to be reviewed dispose of all claims by and against all parties, including attorney fees? Yes (X) No ()

3. State type of litigation and designate any statutes at issue.

Minnesota Gun Owners Caucus sues under the Single Subject Clause of the Minnesota Constitution, claiming that the omnibus bill passed by the Minnesota Legislature on May 19, 2024 (HF 5247, 93d Leg., Reg. Sess. (Minn. 2024)) is invalid in its entirety because it lacks a single subject as required by the Constitution.

4. Brief description of claims, defenses, issues litigated, and result below. For criminal cases, specify whether conviction was for a misdemeanor, gross misdemeanor, or felony offense.

Plaintiff Minnesota Gun Owners' Caucus sought invalidation of the entire omnibus bill pursuant to the Single Subject Clause. In the alternative, the Gun Owners' Caucus sought severance and invalidation of Article 36 of the omnibus bill (pertaining to firearms) pursuant to the Single Subject Clause. In the further alternative, the Gun Owners' Caucus sought severance and invalidation of section two of Article 36 of the omnibus bill (which prohibited the possession of "binary triggers") pursuant to the Single Subject Clause.

Defendants moved to dismiss and Plaintiff cross-moved for summary judgment. Defendants initially challenged the Gun Owners Caucus's standing to sue on behalf of its members. After receiving supplemental evidence, the District Court held that the Gun Owners Caucus has standing.

Defendants argued that the Single Subject Clause presents a "political question" that the courts may not enforce. The District Court rejected that position as contrary to Minnesota Supreme Court precedent.

Defendants also asked the District Court to hold that this lawsuit was untimely under a novel "codification rule," pursuant to which procedural defects in the enactment of statutes cannot be challenged in court after the Revisor of Statutes publishes them in the state code books. The District Court rejected that position as lacking any grounding in Minnesota law.

On the merits, Defendants conceded that the binary trigger ban violates the Single Subject Clause, but argued that it should be severed and that the rest of the omnibus bill should stand. The District Court expressed grave doubt as to whether the omnibus bill as a whole is valid, but granted Defendants' requested relief and severed and struck only the binary trigger ban.

The District Court therefore granted summary judgment in favor of the Gun Owners' Caucus, but only on the narrowest form of relief requested by the Caucus: severance and invalidation of only the binary trigger ban. The District Court denied the Gun Owners' requests for broader relief.

5. List specific issues proposed to be raised on appeal.

Minnesota's Constitution requires that all laws must include only a single subject. In 2024, the Legislature enacted a 1400-page omnibus bill that covered every subject imaginable—from road construction to abortion in health-insurance plans to building codes to pay for rideshare drivers to food samples in grocery stores. Should this statute be struck down in full based on its utter lack of a single subject?

6. Related appeals.

List all prior or pending appeals arising from the same action as this appeal. If none, so state.

None.

List any known pending appeals in separate actions raising similar issues to this appeal. If none are known, so state.

UnitedHealth Group Incorporated, et al. v. State of Minnesota, et al., Appellate Court No. A25-1398, Ramsey County District Court Case No. 62-CV-24-4764.

7. Contents of record.

Is a transcript necessary to review the issues on appeal? Yes (X) No ()

If yes, full (X) or partial () transcript?

Has the transcript already been delivered to the parties and filed with the district court administrator? Yes () No (X)

If not, has it been ordered from the court reporter? Yes (X) No ()

If a transcript is unavailable, is a statement of the proceedings under Rule 110.03 necessary? Yes () No ()

In lieu of the record as defined in Rule 110.01, have the parties agreed to prepare a statement of the record pursuant to Rule 110.04? Yes () No (X)

8. Is oral argument requested? Yes (X) No ()

If so, is argument requested at a location other than that provided in Rule 134.09, subd. 2? Yes () No (X)

9. Identify the type of brief to be filed.

Formal brief under Rule 128.02. (X)

Informal brief under Rule 128.01, subd. 1 (must be accompanied by motion to accept unless submitted by claimant for reemployment benefits). ()

Trial memoranda, supplemented by a short letter argument, under Rule 128.01, subd. 2. ()

10. Names, addresses, and telephone numbers of attorney for appellant and respondent.

Attorneys for Cross-Appellant:

UPPER MIDWEST LAW CENTER

Douglas P. Seaton (#127759)
Nicholas J. Nelson (#391984)
Alexandra K. Howell (#504850)
Austin M. Lysy (#505052)
12600 Whitewater Dr., Suite 140
Minnetonka, Minnesota 55343
Doug.Seaton@umlc.org
Nicholas.Nelson@umlc.org
Allie.Howell@umlc.org
Austin.Lysy@umlc.org
(612) 428-7000

Attorneys for State Appellants:

Liz Kramer (#0325089)
Solicitor General

Peter J. Farrell (#0393071)
Deputy Solicitor General

Anna Veit-Carter (#0392518)
Emily B. Anderson (#0399272)
Matt Mason (#0397573)
Assistant Attorneys General

445 Minnesota Street, Suite 600
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101
(651) 300-7547

liz.kramer@ag.state.mn.us
peter.farrell@ag.state.mn.us
anna.veit-carter@ag.state.mn.us
emily.anderson@ag.state.mn.us
matt.mason@ag.state.mn.us

Attorneys for Cross-Respondent Mary F. Moriarty:

Matthew L.R. Messerli (#0403677)
Kelly K. Pierce (#0340716)
Assistant County Attorneys

13A Government Center, MC137
300 South Sixth Street
Minneapolis, MN 55487
(612) 348-0727

matthew.messerli@hennepin.us
kelly.pierce@hennepin.us

SIGNATURE

/s/ Nicholas J. Nelson

DATED: September 18, 2025