Gun violence restraining orders in California, 2016–2018: case details and respondent mortality
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ABSTRACT

Background Gun violence restraining orders (GVROs), implemented in California in 2016, temporarily prohibit individuals at high risk of violence from purchasing or possessing firearms and ammunition. We sought to describe the circumstances giving rise to GVROs issued 2016–2018, to provide details about the GVRO process and quantify mortality outcomes for individuals subject to these orders (‘respondents’).

Methods For this cross-sectional description of GVRO respondents, 2016–2018, we abstracted case details from court files and used LexisNexis to link respondents to mortality data through August 2020.

Results We abstracted information for 201 respondents with accessible court records. Respondents were mostly white (61.2%) and men (93.5%). Fifty-four per cent of cases involved potential harm to others alone, 15.3% involved potential harm to self alone and 25.2% involved both. Mass shooting threats occurred in 28.7% of cases. Ninety-six and one half per cent of petitioners were law enforcement officers and one-in-three cases resulted in arrest on order service. One-year orders after a hearing (following 21-day emergency/ temporary orders) were issued in 53.5% of cases. Most (84.2%) respondents owned at least one firearm, and firearms were removed in 55.9% of cases. Of the 379 respondents matched by LexisNexis, 7 (1.8%) died after the GVRO was issued: one from a self-inflicted firearm injury that was itself the reason for the GVRO and the others from causes unrelated to violence.

Conclusions GVROs were used most often by law enforcement officers to prevent firearm assault/homicide and post-GVRO firearm fatalities among respondents were rare. Future studies should investigate additional respondent outcomes and potential sources of heterogeneity.

WHAT IS ALREADY KNOWN ON THIS TOPIC

⇒ Prior research suggests that risk-based temporary firearm removal laws similar to gun violence restraining orders (GVROs) have been primarily used to prevent firearm suicide, for which they appear to be effective tools. Effectiveness for preventing interpersonal violence is unknown.

WHAT THIS STUDY ADDS

⇒ In California, GVROs have been mostly used in cases of threatened interpersonal violence. No respondent deaths were caused by violence occurring after the GVRO was issued, suggesting that the law may be effective in preventing fatal firearm violence.

HOW THIS STUDY MIGHT AFFECT RESEARCH, PRACTICE OR POLICY

⇒ Findings can inform policymakers and practitioners about how to best design and implement GVROs and may also help researchers generate hypotheses regarding GVROs potential for multimodal violence prevention.

INTRODUCTION

Firearms are the most common means of homicide and suicide in the USA.1 Many acts of firearm violence are preceded by implicit or explicit threats, including two-thirds of public mass violence.2 Despite these warning signs, law enforcement officers in most states cannot remove firearms from individuals at risk of violence who are not already prohibited from possessing firearms. Extreme risk protection order (ERPO) laws were created to fill this legal gap.

Called gun violence restraining orders (GVROs) in California, these laws provide a civil mechanism to temporarily prohibit individuals from possessing and purchasing firearms and ammunition during periods of heightened risk of self- or other-directed harm.3 As of May 2022, 19 states and the District of Columbia have passed an ERPO-type law, the vast majority of which were enacted in the past 5 years. These orders show promise for preventing suicide4 5 and possibly mass shootings,6 7 but implementation has been slow and variable across jurisdictions in California.8 In addition, there are legitimate concerns about whether ERPOs, which can provide a life-saving, non-criminal solution to threats of firearm violence, are being used in ways that exacerbate racial and class-based inequities.8-10 We previously presented demographic information on individuals subject to GVROs—hereafter, ‘respondents’—in California over the first 4 years of implementation using the California Department of Justice’s (CA DOJ) restraining order data.7 Investigating case circumstances, respondent risk factors and violent outcomes provides a richer understanding of GVRO implementation and use as well as a foundation for identifying emerging inequities. This is particularly important now that
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President Biden has called on Congress to incentivise state adoption of ERPO laws and to pass a national law. The aim of the current study is to characterise GVRO cases in California in the first 3 years of implementation, 2016–2018. Using court case files and mortality data, we describe the circumstances that gave rise to these GVROs, provide details about the GVRO process and assess respondent mortality outcomes. We also compare demographic characteristics of respondents with those of the general population and the population of legal firearm owners (to whom GVRO respondents may be more similar) in order to identify whether any groups are conspicuously over-represented or under-represented. Findings will be of interest to policymakers, practitioners involved with GVRO implementation and firearm violence researchers.

METHODS

GVRO process

During the study period, law enforcement, family and household members were permitted to petition for a GVRO. There are three types of GVROs: emergency orders, lasting 21 days and available only to law enforcement; temporary orders, also lasting 21 days but available to all petitioners; and orders issued after a hearing, which lasted for 1 year during the study period (and up to 5 years beginning September 2020). Respondents are required to relinquish their firearms and ammunition to law enforcement or a licensed firearm dealer within 24 hours of being served an emergency or temporary order. When a short-term order is issued, a hearing is scheduled 21 days later, wherein a judge determines whether the respondent still poses a danger to themselves or others and rules on whether the order should be extended, terminated or let to expire.

Data collection

We identified all respondents to GVROs filed 2016–2018 with data from the California Restraining and Protective Order System provided by CA DOJ. We used this information to request case records from individual county courts across the state. We completed these requests in November 2019 and received the last court file in March 2020.

We determined whether respondents were alive in the study period by querying LexisNexis Risk Solutions in August 2020. Cause of death was determined from death certificates from the California Department of Public Health (received in June 2021). Mortality data were linked to GVRO data using respondent name and date of birth.

Measures and analysis

From the court documents, we abstracted information on respondent demographics, circumstances resulting in the GVRO, respondent risk factors, the GVRO process, and firearm access and removal. We used Microsoft Forms to abstract basic case details from the GVRO forms and Dedoose qualitative software to abstract information from narratives found in the court documents. Although they vary in length and detail, case narratives are always provided by the petitioner, occasionally by other parties (eg, in supporting documents such as police reports) and rarely by the respondent (in a formal response to the order). Our codebook is included as online supplemental emethods.

A small team of analysts trained and oversaw two student assistants, who carried out the abstraction. Abstractors double coded all cases for the GVRO forms abstraction and a random 20% sample for the case narrative abstraction, crosschecking their coding for consistency. After double coding these cases, the abstractors had reached consensus, allowing for single coding of the remaining narratives. Abstractors met with team members weekly to discuss questions, resolve discrepancies and refine the codebook.

We compared the demographics of respondents with two groups. While respondents need not have firearm access to qualify for a GVRO, we found that, in practice, they are very likely to be firearm owners (see the Results section). We, therefore, compared them to firearm owners in California using state-representative data from the 2018 California Safety and Wellbeing Survey. To provide broader context, we compared them with the general state population using data from the American Community Survey.

We used descriptive statistics to summarise respondent and case details. Information provided in case narratives varied and was especially sparse in emergency GVROs. As a result, we could often only determine whether a given code was present in the narrative, and we cannot infer from its absence that it was absent in fact. Accordingly, we included all cases in the denominator when calculating percentages, including those with missing information. Thus, estimates represent the statistical floor (ie, the lowest estimate consistent with the data). Information on missingness is presented in online supplemental etable 1.

Analyses were done in R (V4.0.2), Stata (V.15.1) and Dedoose (V8.3). This study was approved by the University of California, Davis Institutional Review Board. Neither patients nor the public were involved in the conduct of this study.

RESULTS

We requested court records for all 413 GVRO respondents and received 218 (online supplemental etable 2). The vast majority (94.4%) of files not received were for cases in which an emergency order was the most recent GVRO issued, which courts usually could not locate. Emergency orders are used by officers in the field and issued by a judge remotely. They are single-page petitions with extremely limited case details and are commonly filed with the petitioning law enforcement agency rather than the court, making them particularly difficult to obtain. Seventeen respondents without GVRO forms in their court records were dropped from analysis. We coded a total of 202 cases for 201 respondents. Respondents with abstracted records tended to have more recent GVROs than those without, but they were otherwise similar (online supplemental etable 3).

Respondent demographics

GVRO respondents were younger (median age: 39 years) and more likely to be men (93.5%) than other firearm owners in the state and the state population (table 1). The racial/ethnic distribution of GVRO respondents was mostly similar to that of the statewide firearm owning population, though differences in reporting did not allow for comparison of Asian Americans. Black individuals constituted a larger proportion of respondents (10.0%) than firearm owners overall (4.4%). At least 9.5% of respondents were veterans, which is about two times the statewide average (5.4%) but only one-third of the estimate for firearm owners (29.2%).

Case circumstances

Most (54.0%) cases involved a documented threat of harm to others alone, 15.3% involved a threat of harm to self alone and 25.2% included threats of both other-directed and self-directed harm (table 2). Among the nearly 80% of cases involving any other-directed threat, 29.4% included threats to intimate
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Pear VA, 2022; resulting in arrest. Information on prior violent behaviour was appeared in about 20% of cases, as did prior police contact diagnosis in the case file)—a risk factor primarily for suicide—quarter of cases. The next most common risk factor was a loss which directly related to the GVRO inciting event in about a substance use, including drugs and/or alcohol (34.2% of cases), violence in case narratives (table and 24.3% took place at a public venue (including workplaces and schools).

Nearly 60% of inciting events took place at a private residence of people or at least three people other than oneself), including all six cases involving minors (who, in all cases, targeted schools). Nearly 60% of inciting events took place at a private residence and 24.3% took place at a public venue (including workplaces and schools).

We identified many known or hypothesised risk factors for violence in case narratives (table 3). The most common was substance use, including drugs and/or alcohol (34.2% of cases), which directly related to the GVRO inciting event in about a quarter of cases. The next most common risk factor was a loss or relationship problem relating to an intimate partner, which appeared in 22.8% of cases. Mental illness (indicated by a named diagnosis in the case file)—a risk factor primarily for suicide—appeared in about 20% of cases, as did prior police contact resulting in arrest. Information on prior violent behaviour was less common, ranging from 5.4% with a history of self-harm to 10.4% with a history of intimate partner violence perpetration.

Process details
Over 95% of petitioners were law enforcement officers (table 4). Petitioners often cited evidence obtained from interacting with the respondent (50.0%) or information provided by the respondent’s family members (32.7%), significant other (27.7%) or bystanders (22.3%) in the petition. At the time of police contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age, med (25th–75th pctl)</td>
<td>39 (28–52)</td>
<td>57 (45–67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors, n (%)</td>
<td>6 (3.0)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>188 (93.5)</td>
<td>301 (72.9; 66.8–78.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13 (6.5)</td>
<td>128 (27.1; 21.7–33.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>123 (61.2)</td>
<td>318 (64.1; 56.3–71.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>35 (17.4)</td>
<td>71 (20.4; 14.6–27.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>20 (10.0)</td>
<td>16 (4.4; 2.0–9.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>10 (5.0)</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/unknown</td>
<td>12 (6.0)</td>
<td>24 (11.1; 6.8–17.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanicity, n (%)§</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro, large</td>
<td>151 (75.1)</td>
<td>297 (67.5; 60.2–74.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro, medium</td>
<td>40 (19.9)</td>
<td>87 (24.9; 18.8–32.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro, small</td>
<td>3 (1.5)</td>
<td>16 (2.7; 1.5–4.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-metro</td>
<td>7 (3.5)</td>
<td>28 (4.9; 3.0–8.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military service, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active duty</td>
<td>5 (2.5)</td>
<td>2 (0.5; 0.1–1.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veteran</td>
<td>19 (9.5)</td>
<td>143 (29.2; 23.4–35.8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| *One respondent was missing age and one was missing race/ethnicity. 177 records (88.1%) did not mention military service, which could indicate lack of service or a lack of reporting. §Urbanicity was measured at the county level with the 2013 Rural–Urban Continuum Codes. All non-metropolitan codes were collapsed into a single non-metro category.

GVRO, gun violence restraining order.

Table 2 Circumstances of the inciting events leading to a GVRO

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases (n=202)* n (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target of harm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self alone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self and others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other-directed targets (n=160)†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone at work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone at school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other specific person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat details†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any threat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threatening behaviour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…with a firearm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…without a weapon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…with another weapon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal threat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail/email/text threat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat posted on social media</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential mass shooting‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociopolitical or religious motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workplace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*201 unique respondents; one person had two distinct GVROs. Percentages are calculated with unknown (missing) values in the denominator.
†Categories are not mutually exclusive. Threat details were coded as (1) if present and otherwise left blank (0), so we cannot distinguish between ‘no’ and ‘unknown’. ‡A potential mass shooting was defined as a threat to shoot an unspecified number of people or at least three people other than oneself. GVRO, gun violence restraining order.
or GVRO service, nearly one-third of respondents were arrested on criminal charges and just under one-fourth were placed on an involuntary psychiatric hold. Police use of force (including compliance holds, pointing a firearm at the respondent and the use of ‘less lethal weapons’ like bean bag rounds and tasers) was noted in 5.0% of cases. The 1-year order after a hearing was issued in 53.5% of cases, sought but not issued in 9.9% of cases and not sought in 33.2% of cases. Petitioners were far more likely to have legal representation than respondents at the hearing for the 1-year order (67.3% vs 18.3%, respectively). Additional process details are presented in online supplemental etable 4.

Firearm access and recovery

Based on information in the court documents, the majority (84.2%) of respondents owned a firearm at the time of the inciting event, and a small number had access to another’s firearm (4.5%) or were in the 10-day waiting period after purchasing a firearm (2.5%; table 5). Firearm removal was documented in 55.9% of cases, with a total of 653 firearms removed. Of these cases, firearms were primarily recovered by law enforcement (85.8%).
Expected text from the image provided.
are civil mechanisms, are leading to arrests. If they are used puni-
atively without complementary social service resources, family
and friends may be discouraged from alerting law enforcement
to potentially dangerous situations out of fear of enmeshing
the person at risk in the criminal legal system.

We also found that the 1-year order after a hearing was not
sought in one-third of cases. When it was sought, the 1-year
order was issued 84% of the time. In all, just over 50% of cases
resulted in an order after a hearing (this would be lower if we
had received court records for the emergency orders that courts
were unable to locate). In contrast, about 80% of cases in Wash-
ington State and Colorado and 87% in Broward County, Florida
resulted in long-term orders following a hearing.15–17 Reasons
for this difference should be further explored but suggest varia-
tion in use or case circumstances, with California cases perhaps
reflecting shorter-term, acute crises.

Our findings regarding orders after a hearing raised another
potential concern: of respondents with a hearing, only 18.3%
had legal representation. Key informants previously noted that
this could perpetuate class-based disparities in the legal system,
with wealthier respondents more often avoiding the order after a
hearing than others. We do not have data on respondent income,
but a slightly higher proportion of cases in which the respon-
dent had a lawyer resulted in the order after a hearing being
denied when it was sought (18.5% vs 14.9%). Given the small
number of respondents with a lawyer, this can only be taken as
suggestive.

An additional indication that implementation can be improved
is that firearms known to law enforcement were not recovered
in 12% of cases—two times the 5% reported in King County,
Washington.14 Firearms may go unrecovered for many reasons,
including being sold, stolen, lost or hidden and due to lack of
officer follow-up when they are stored outside of the respon-
dent’s home. This undermines the purpose of the order and pres-
ents a clear safety concern; we suggest law enforcement agencies
create and/or review strategies to locate and recover outstanding
firearms.

Our findings also highlight ways in which GVROs may have
prevented suicide among respondents, 40.6% of whom were
issued a GVRO for reasons including a threat of self-harm. One
responded died by suicide using a firearm, but the injury was
inflicted during the inciting event that resulted in the GVRO,
before the order had been issued. No other respondents in the
first 3 years of implementation died by suicide post-GVRO,
using firearms or other means. Around 3% of respondents died
by suicide after being issued a risk warrant (another risk-based
temporary firearm removal law) in Connecticut and Marion
County, Indiana, yet the laws in those states were found to be
effective at preventing firearm suicide.13–15 These studies are
not directly comparable to ours, though, as they had longer
follow-up periods. We had a small number of respondents and
a short period of follow-up and cannot infer causation between
the order and subsequent lack of suicide, but these findings are
promising nevertheless.

Additionally, we were limited by the information included
in the case files. Much of the contextual information, such as
respondent risk factors and the circumstances precipitating the
order, came from narratives included in the petition. Petitioners
used their judgement about what details were pertinent and
drew on different sources of information depending on who
they contacted.

Finally, we were limited to evaluating mortality only among
respondents, who threatened self-harm in about 40% of cases.
The case files did not include the necessary individual-level
information needed to link mortality data to other individuals
threatened by respondents, so these mortality outcomes remain
uncertain. In the future, GVRO researchers will need to consider
how best to evaluate outcomes among those who primarily make
threats against others.

**CONCLUSIONS**

GVROs in California, 2016–2018, were used primarily to
prevent other-directed harm, including mass shootings. While
our findings raised some concerns, we also found evidence
suggestive of success: in particular, no suicides occurred post-
GVRO. Future research should examine cases in 2 more recent
years, as uptake increased dramatically in 2019.16 It should also
examine differences by race/ethnicity to identify potential indica-
tors of inequitable use.6 Finally, given that GVROs are primarily
being used to prevent assaultive violence in California, there is
a pressing need for additional effectiveness evaluations examing
this type of firearm violence.25
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**eTable 1. Missingness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cases with unknown values (n=202)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target of harm</td>
<td>11 (5.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential mass shooting</td>
<td>8 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorism investigation</td>
<td>7 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political/social/religious motivation</td>
<td>9 (4.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>21 (10.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child present</td>
<td>7 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order after a hearing</td>
<td>7 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal representation at hearing (n=104)</td>
<td>2 (1.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firearm ownership</td>
<td>4 (2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undocumented firearms recovered (n=113)</td>
<td>8 (7.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of firearm recovered (n=113)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handgun</td>
<td>4 (3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long gun</td>
<td>6 (5.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assault-type weapon</td>
<td>7 (6.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanism of recovery (n=113)</td>
<td>12 (10.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. 201 unique respondents; one person had 2 distinct gun violence restraining orders.
Table 2. Gun violence restraining order (GVRO) respondent court records requested and received, 2016-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent records (n)</th>
<th>Respondent records by most recent GVRO type (n, %)(^a)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EGV</td>
<td>TGV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total requested</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>227 (55.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total received</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>43 (19.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total coded</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>27 (13.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No GVRO forms</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16 (94.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total not received</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>184 (94.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason: Unable to locate</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>81 (95.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason: None given</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>103 (93.6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) EGV = Emergency GVRO; TGV = Temporary GVRO; OGV = Order after a hearing
eTable 3. Characteristics of respondents with and without abstracted records

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Respondents with abstracted records (n=201)</th>
<th>Respondents without abstracted records (n=212)</th>
<th>p-value&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at most recent GVRO, med (25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-75&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; pctl)&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>39 (28-52)</td>
<td>41.5 (30-53)</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minors, n (%)</td>
<td>6 (3.0)</td>
<td>4 (1.9)</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>188 (93.5)</td>
<td>188 (88.7)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13 (6.5)</td>
<td>24 (11.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>123 (61.2)</td>
<td>129 (60.9)</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>35 (17.4)</td>
<td>46 (21.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>20 (10.0)</td>
<td>9 (4.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>10 (5.0)</td>
<td>15 (7.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other/Unknown</td>
<td>12 (6.0)</td>
<td>13 (6.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of most recent GVRO (2016-2018)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>22 (11.0)</td>
<td>49 (23.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>23 (11.4)</td>
<td>59 (27.8)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>156 (77.6)</td>
<td>104 (49.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdiction with a plurality of orders</td>
<td>San Diego</td>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> One respondent with an abstracted record is missing age and one is missing race/ethnicity.

<sup>b</sup> Wilcoxon rank sum test was used to test for differences in median age; chi-squared tests were used to test for differences in all other variables.
### eTable 4. Additional process details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Cases&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; &lt;br&gt; (n=202)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Days between emergency/temporary order and final hearing,</td>
<td>27 (21, 61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median (25&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-75&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt; pct)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuance of court date, n (%)&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sought</td>
<td>118 (58.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granted</td>
<td>80 (39.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sought but not granted</td>
<td>3 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sought but outcome unknown</td>
<td>1 (0.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent response to the order, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response submitted</td>
<td>172 (85.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>30 (14.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order expired, order after a hearing not sought</td>
<td>5 (2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order terminated</td>
<td>5 (2.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome of response unknown</td>
<td>6 (3.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not successful in contesting, order after a hearing issued</td>
<td>14 (6.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent request to terminate order, n (%)</td>
<td>0 (0.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petitioner request to renew order, n (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sought</td>
<td>200 (99.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granted</td>
<td>2 (1.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> 201 unique respondents; one person had 2 distinct GVROs.

<sup>b</sup> Among 128 cases with an order after a hearing issued or sought and with hearing and issue dates.

<sup>c</sup> A continuance seeks to change the hearing to a later date.
eMethods: GVRO narrative coding training manual

**Abbreviations:**
GVRO = Gun violence restraining order  
LE = Law enforcement  
R = Respondent  
Y = Yes  
N = No  
DK = Don’t know  
OGV = Order after a hearing  
AFS = Automated Firearm System

**DESCRIPTORS:** descriptors are used to more easily classify cases’ basic characteristics. Descriptors are mutually exclusive. The **first coder** should complete the descriptors. The **second coder** should review the descriptors and note any discrepancies with a memo.

- We expect that we cannot fill out all descriptors so if you do not know one, leave it blank.
- If it seems like you have the information to fill it out but the response options do not include an appropriate option, write a memo and send an email to the group.

**Target of Harm 1-3:** Others, LE; Others, other specific target; Self; Others, workplace; Others, medical; Others, family violence (not IPV); Others, school/children; Others, intimate partner; Others, random targets

  - **Who is the target of harm in the case?** (Fill in “Target of Harm 2” and “Target of Harm 3” as needed)

**Location of inciting event:** Residence, Place of Business, School, Public Place, Place of worship, Internet

  - **Where did the event that got the ball rolling on the GVRO happen?**

**Potential mass shooting?** Y/N

  - **Was a GVRO sought in efforts to prevent a mass shooting?** A potential mass shooting is a threat to shoot some unspecified number of people OR a threat to shoot at 3 or more people other than oneself.

**Terrorism Investigation:** Y/N

  - **Does the file indicate that this case is/was being investigated as terrorism or terrorism-related?**

**Political/social/religious motivation:** Y/N

  - **Use this to indicate that the events leading to the GVRO were motivated by the respondent’s political, social, or religious views.**

**Firearm access:** Access, personally owned; Access, not personally owned; Purchased; Intends to purchase; No known access

  - **Characterize the firearm access the respondent had according to the case narrative (not mutually exclusive). These four types of firearm access describe varying degrees of**
proximity. The most proximal type of access is “access, personally owned” and the least proximal is “no known access”. “Purchased” indicates that the respondent purchased a firearm but is still in the 10-day waiting period, i.e., the GVRO would prevent the actual acquisition of an already purchased firearm. “Intends to purchase” indicates that the respondent has expressed intent to purchase a firearm, but has not yet done so. Ownership can be legal or not.

Firearm access 2: Access, personally owned; Access, not personally owned; Purchased; Intends to purchase; No known access
- Characterize the second type of firearm access the respondent had according to the case narrative.

Petitioner relationship to respondent: Household member, intimate partner; Law enforcement (no relationship); Family member, other; Family member, parent; Household member, roommate; Family member, spouse; Law enforcement (some relationship)
- Who is the petitioner in relation to the respondent?

# Guns Recovered Owned by Respondent: Number
- Total number of guns recovered as reported in the record. Only fill this out if it is clear. If there is no information on recovery, leave it blank. Only count guns, not gun parts. But if gun parts are recovered, flag it with a memo.

# of known firearms NOT recovered owned by respondent: Number
- List the number of guns not recovered that were owned by the respondent (e.g., firearms that law enforcement thought the respondent had as indicated by AFS but that were not recovered). Only fill this out if it is clear. If there is no information on recovery, leave it blank.

# Guns Recovered Not Owned by Respondent: Number
- List the number of guns recovered that were not owned by the respondent (e.g., any guns recovered that belonged to a parent, spouse, or roommate). Only fill this out if it is clear. If there is no information on recovery, leave it blank. Only count guns, not gun parts. But if gun parts are recovered, flag it with a memo.

# Guns Not Recovered Not Owned by Respondent: Number
- List the number of guns not recovered that were not owned by the respondent but were relevant to the case (e.g., any guns not recovered that belonged to a parent, spouse, or roommate that were relevant because the respondent had access to them). Only fill this out if it is clear. If there is no information on recovery, leave it blank.

# Guns Recovered, ownership not specified: Number
- List the number of guns for whom the owner was unspecified. If there is no information on recovery, leave it blank. Only count guns, not gun parts. But if gun parts are recovered, flag it with a memo.
Any guns not recovered, ownership unknown (Y/N)
- Use this code to indicate that NOT all guns that the respondent has access to have been
recovered, but there are no details on exactly how many gun(s) there are or who the
gun(s) belong to. If there is no information on recovery, leave it blank.

Firearms recovered that were not in AFS?: Y/N
- Does the record indicate that agents recovered firearms that were not known about
because they were not recorded in AFS? If there is no information on recovery, leave it
blank. Only count guns, not gun parts. But if gun parts are recovered, flag it with a
memo.

Handgun(s) Recovered?: Y/N
- Were any handguns recovered? If there is no information on recovery, leave it blank.

Shotgun(s) Recovered?: Y/N
- Were any shotguns recovered? If there is no information on recovery, leave it blank.

Rifle(s) Recovered?: Y/N
- Were any (non-assault) rifles recovered? If there is no information on recovery, leave it
blank.

Assault-type weapon(s) Recovered?: Y/N
- Were any assault-type weapons recovered? This includes “assault rifles,” “modern
sporting rifles,” or “modern tactical rifles?” Examples include AR rifles, AK rifles, and
SKS rifles. See the addendum on assault weapons for more information. If there is no
information on recovery, leave it blank.

OGV: Issued, Sought but not issued, Not sought
- Characterize the Order After Hearing in this case. If the Order After Hearing
documents have a hearing date, “filed” stamp, expiration date, and/or signatures, it can
be considered as issued. If these are all missing, it can be considered NOT issued.

Request for continuance: Granted, Sought but not granted, Not sought
- Did the case involve a request for continuance?

Respondent military affiliation: Active duty, veteran
- Does the record indicate whether the respondent has a military affiliation, and if so,
what is it? If unknown, leave it blank.

Respondent work-related access to firearms: Private Investigator, Police Officer, Security Guard,
Other
- Does the respondent have a job that gives them access to firearms?

Child present?: Y/N
- Does the record indicate that a child (or children) was present at the GVRO events (e.g.,
a witness to the events) or somehow involved (e.g., threatened directly)?
CODING: codes are used to capture details of the cases’ contexts and characteristics. Codes are NOT mutually exclusive.

**Respondent risk factors:** These codes will be used to identify known risk factors for committing violence among respondents, or triggering events that led to the GVRO.

**Sub-codes “GVRO-related” and “background risk”:**
Use these, when available, to indicate whether the risk factor was related to the events leading to the GVRO (“GVRO-related”) or not (“background risk”). GVRO-related risk factors should be part of the cluster of events leading to the GVRO. Background risks give context about the person but are not directly related to the current GVRO.

**Social isolation/alienation:**
Use this code if it is stated that the respondent was/felt socially isolated from others.

**Loss/relationship problem:**
Use this to indicate that the respondent recently had a falling out with a friend, family member, or significant other, or if there was a death/near death event of a friend, family member, or significant other. Use sub-codes to indicate both whether the relationship problem was related to the GVRO and what the nature of the relationship was between the respondent and the problem individual.

**Harming animals:**
Use this to indicate that the respondent intentionally killed or injured animals. This does not include hunting unless it is noted that unnecessary pain was intentionally inflicted upon the animal.

**Off your meds—current:**
Use this to indicate that the respondent stopped using their prescribed medication shortly before the GVRO.

**Health problems:**
Use this to indicate that the respondent has physical health problems (e.g. disability, chronic or acute illness, etc.). Do not include mental illnesses.

**Mental illness (named):**
Use this to indicate that the respondent has a mental illness if the diagnosis is stated explicitly (e.g. “R has history of mental illness” or “R has depression” or “R has PTSD”). We cannot diagnose people’s mental illnesses. Do not code for mental illness if it is not explicitly stated. If there is sworn testimony by a mental health (MH) professional that R has a mental illness (even if the MH professional did not do an in-person evaluation), count it as mental illness (named).

**Age-related dementia/cognitive impairment:**
Use this to indicate that the respondent has age-related dementia or similar disorders resulting in cognitive impairment. We cannot diagnose people’s dementia or cognitive impairment. Do not code for dementia/cognitive impairment if it is not explicitly stated.

**Other cognitive impairment:**
Use this to indicate that the respondent has some other (not age-related) form of cognitive impairment. We cannot diagnose people’s cognitive impairment. Do not code for cognitive impairment if it is not explicitly stated.
**Substance use:**
Use this to indicate that the respondent uses or abuses drugs or alcohol, or that substance/drug access precipitated events leading to the GVRO.

**Seeing things, hearing things, people chasing them:**
Use this to indicate that the respondent is displaying signs of psychosis (hallucinations, delusions).

**Prior self-directed violence:**
Use this to indicate that the respondent has a history of intentionally harming themselves. Current self-directed harm (related to the GVRO) should be indicated with a descriptor.

**Prior threat/ideation of self-directed violence:**
Use this to indicate that the respondent has a history of threatening or thinking about intentionally harming themselves. Actual self-harm should be coded as “prior self-directed violence.” Current self-directed harm (related to the GVRO) should be indicated with a descriptor.

**Restraining/protective order:**
Use this to indicate that the respondent has been the subject of a restraining or protective order (not including the GVRO). If the order is no longer in effect, use the sub-code “past”; if it is still in effect (e.g., box is checked on “Other court cases,” section b of GV-110: “Are there now any protective or restraining orders in effect relating to Respondent?”), use the sub-code “current.” If status is unknown, just use the parent code. Note: GV-110 section 4a relates to criminal OR civil court cases, so, unless there is additional information elsewhere, don’t assume a checked box in 4a is civil or criminal.

**Police involvement:**
Any mention of respondent’s involvement with police, whether prior contacts with police/calls for service only or formal action by police (e.g., arrests, charges, or convictions).

**Prior other-directed violence or threatening behavior:**
Use this to indicate that the respondent has a history of intentionally harming others or using threatening tactics (e.g., stalking, property damage, vandalism). Use sub-codes to indicate the target of harm’s relationship to the respondent. Current other-directed harm (related to the GVRO) should be indicated with a descriptor.

**Prior threat/ideation of other-directed violence or threatening behavior:**
Use this to indicate that the respondent has a history of threatening or thinking about intentionally harming others, or using threatening tactics (e.g., stalking, property damage, vandalism). Actual other-directed harm should be coded as “prior other-directed violence” Use sub-codes to indicate the target of harm’s relationship to the respondent. Current other-directed harm (related to the GVRO) should be indicated with a descriptor.

**Hate groups/propaganda:**
Use this to indicate that the respondent is affiliated with a hate group or has expressed interest or engaged with hate propaganda.

**Employment issues/unemployment:**
Use this to indicate that the respondent has current or former problems maintaining stable employment, recent job loss, or if there are other problems at work, like a contentious or hostile environment.
Housing instability:
Use this to indicate that the respondent has been homeless or nearly homeless (e.g., sleeping in a car or camper, temporary housing in a hotel/motel), or that the respondent’s housing instability precipitated events leading to the GVRO.

Other:
Use this to indicate the respondent had other risk factors for committing violence not named above.

Terminal/serious health problem, new diagnosis or failed treatment:
Use this to indicate that the respondent has a terminal or serious health problem, or experienced a new diagnosis or failed treatment. If such an event precipitated the events leading to the GVRO, mark as "GVRO-related."

Threats: These codes will be used to identify if the respondent used any of these means to threaten during the events leading up to the GVRO.

Verbal threat:
Use this to indicate the respondent is threatening verbally.

Dangerous/threatening behavior: With firearm; With other weapon; Without weapon
Use this to indicate the respondent is displaying dangerous or threatening behavior that could harm or actually did harm oneself or another. Use sub codes above to indicate weapon involvement.

Threat posted on social media:
Use this to indicate the respondent posted threats on a social media platform, i.e., Instagram, Facebook, Twitter.

Mail/email/text message threat:
Use this to indicate the respondent mailed letters, packages, etc. containing threats, or emailing/texting threats to other individual(s), organization(s), or institution(s).

Other:
Use this to indicate the respondent used other means to threaten not mentioned above.

Access to other weapons: These codes will be used to identify if the respondent had access to any other types of weapons besides firearms.

Bomb(s):
Use this to indicate the respondent had access to bomb(s) of any sort.

Sword(s):
Use this to indicate the respondent had access to sword(s) of any sort, i.e., Longsword, Broadsword, Backsword, Katana, Sabre, etc.

Knives (knife):
Use this to indicate the respondent had access to knives or a knife of any sort, i.e., Hunting, Machete, Pocket, Bayonets, etc.

Other:
Use this to indicate the respondent had access to any other types of weapons not mentioned above.

Source of info to petitioner: These codes will be used to identify whom the sources providing information to the petitioner about the respondent or event(s) leading up to the GVRO are in relationship to the respondent.
Respondent: 
Use this code to indicate the respondent provided information to the petitioner.

Significant other: 
Use this code to indicate the petitioner’s source of information was a significant other of the respondent, i.e., spouse, girlfriend/boyfriend, whether current or former.

Family member: 
Use this code to indicate the petitioner’s source of information was a family member to the respondent, i.e., parent, sibling, uncle, aunt, grandparent, stepparent, stepsibling, etc.

Household member: 
Use this code to indicate the petitioner’s source of information was a member living in the same household, but not related to the respondent, e.g., a roommate.

Co-worker: 
Use this code to indicate the petitioner’s source of information was a co-worker of the respondent.

Friend/Acquaintance: 
Use this code to indicate the petitioner’s source of information was a friend or acquaintance of the respondent.

School employee: 
Use this code to indicate the petitioner’s source of information was an employee at the school the respondent attended, i.e., teacher, principal, janitor, etc.

Medical personnel: 
Use this code to indicate the source providing information to the petitioner is medical personnel, i.e., paramedic, nurse, doctor, mental health professional, etc.

Other law enforcement: 
Use this code to indicate the source providing information to the petitioner is other law enforcement, i.e., uniformed officer, investigator, federal agent, etc.

Social media posts: 
Use this code to indicate the petitioner is receiving their source of information from social media posts.

Witnesses (bystanders): 
Use this code to indicate the source providing information to the petitioner is a witness or bystander to the event(s) leading up to the GVRO.

Other: 
Use this code to indicate another source providing information to the petitioner not mentioned above.

Police action at contact or service: These codes will be used to identify what police actions or services took place when in contact with the respondent at any time.

Transport to hospital: 
Use this code to indicate the respondent was transported to the hospital at police contact.

5150: 
Use this code to indicate the respondent was placed on a 5150 hold at police contact. (A 5150 is a California law code for the temporary and involuntary psychiatric commitment of individuals who present a danger to themselves or others due to signs of mental illness.)
**Arrest on criminal charges:**
Use this code to indicate the police arrested the respondent on criminal charges at contact.

**Psych evaluation:**
Use this code to indicate the respondent received a psychiatric evaluation at police contact.

**Use of Force:**
Use this code to indicate police use of force at contact with the respondent.

**Other protective order:**
Use this code to indicate the respondent has been subject to another restraining or protective order not mentioned above (not including the GVRO) at police contact for the GVRO.

**Mechanism of recovery:** Use these codes to identify how firearms were removed from the situation (the cluster of events that led to the GVRO). Firearm recovery can refer to firearms the respondent personally owns, or other firearms s/he doesn’t own but has access to. The following codes are not necessarily mutually exclusive (multiple codes may apply).

- **LE, no search warrant:**
  Use this code if firearms were recovered by law enforcement, but there is no mention of a search warrant.

- **LE, search warrant:**
  Use this code if law enforcement obtained a search warrant in order to recover firearms.

- **Taken to licensed retailer:**
  Use this code if the firearm(s) were taken to a licensed retailer.

**Respondent protested grounds of order:** Use this code if the respondent submitted form GV-120, *Response to Petition for Gun Violence Restraining Order* in opposition to the grounds of the order, OR if it is indicated that, during the court hearing, the respondent protested the grounds of the order. The following child codes identify the specific reasons that the respondent stated for his/her opposition. Multiple child codes may apply.

- **No access to firearms:**
  Use this code if the respondent claims s/he does not have access to firearms, therefore the order is not necessary.

- **Not a serious threat:**
  Use this code if the respondent claims s/he does not pose a serious threat, either because 1) the evidence cited by the petitioner does not, in the respondent’s view, rise to the necessary level of seriousness, or 2) because the respondent made an actual threat (verbal or not) but claims it was only a joke/pretend.

- **Remorseful:**
  Use this code if the respondent claims the order is not necessary because s/he regrets his/her behaviors/threats, and/or pledges not to engage in those behaviors/threats again.

- **Has gotten help since originating circumstances:**
  Use this code if the respondent claims s/he has taken steps to address and remove the causes of the circumstances leading to the GVRO.

**Contests information in petition:**
Use this code if the respondent contests the accuracy of the information in the petition.
**Outcome of respondent response:** Use these codes to describe the outcome of the respondent’s opposition to the order, i.e., the judge’s decision.

- **Not successful in contesting:**
  Use this code if the judge did not approve the respondent’s request to terminate/prevent the order.

- **Successful, order terminated:**
  Use this code if the judge sided with the respondent, thereby terminating an existing order.

- **Firearms returned:**
  Use this code if it’s stated that firearms were returned to the respondent due to the termination of an order.

- **Successful, order expired:**
  Use this code if 1) an OGV was not requested after the respondent response was submitted and 2) the temporary order was not terminated (but rather was allowed to expire).

**Persons at hearing:** Use these codes to describe who attended any court hearing for a GVRO. This information can be found, at the least, on form GV-130. If form GV-130 is not included, you may find this info elsewhere in the narrative. We do not need to know names or any other details – just IF the following people were there.

- **Legal rep for respondent:**
  Use this code if a legal representative for the respondent was present.

- **Legal rep for petitioner:**
  Use this code if a legal representative for the petitioner was present.

- **Petitioner (or stand-in):**
  Use this code if the petitioner/stand-in for the petitioner was present.

- **Respondent:**
  Use this code if the respondent was present.

**Continuance requested by:** If a request was made that the court hearing for the 1-year GVRO be postponed, use these codes to identify who made the request (forms GV-115, *Request to Continue Court Hearing for Firearms Restraining Order*; GV-116 *Order for Continuance and Notice of New Hearing*).

- **Petitioner/CA:**
  Use this code to identify that the petitioner or city attorney (acting on the petitioner’s behalf) made the request.

- **Respondent:**
  Use this code to identify that the respondent or lawyer for the respondent made the request.
Addendum: Identifying Assault Weapons

We are interested in capturing data on what type(s) of firearm(s) GVRO respondents own and/or have access to. You’ll be asked to record this information in Dedoose as part of the court record abstraction. It’s worth reviewing these resources on assault weapons before abstracting. When there is doubt, the group can review. DOJ consultation will be available if needed.

Assault weapons in California are divided into three categories:

- **Category 1.** The Roberti-Roos Assault Weapons Control Act of 1989 (effective December 31, 1991)
  - Under this act, any firearm on a list specified in Penal Code sections 30501, formerly 12276, is considered an assault weapon (see page 2 below).
- **Category 2.** All AK and AR-15 Series Weapons (effective August 16, 2000)
- **Category 3.** Generic Characteristics (see below) (effective January 1, 2000)

Additional information on assault weapons is available [here](#) (with pictures), [here](#) and [here](#).

**Category 1 assault weapons, pursuant to Penal Code, section 30510, are listed below.**

(a) All of the following specified rifles

(1) All AK series including, but not limited to, the models identified as follows:
   (A) Made in China AK, AKM, AKS, AK47, AK47S, 56, 56S, 84S, and 86S.
   (B) Norinco 56, 56S, 84S, and 86S.
   (C) Poly Technologies AKS and AK47.
   (D) MAADI AK47 and ARM.

(2) UZI and Galil.
(3) Beretta AR-70.
(4) CETME Sporter.
(6) Daewoo K-1, K-2, Max 1, Max 2, AR 100, and AR 110C.
(7) Fabrique Nationale FAL, LAR, FNC, 308 Match, and Sporter.
(8) MAS 223.
(9) HK-91, HK-93, HK-94, and HK-PSG-1.
(10) The following MAC types:
    (A) RPB Industries Inc. sM10 and sM11.
    (B) SWD Incorporated M11.

(11) SKS with detachable magazine.
(12) SIG AMT, PE-57, SG 550, and SG 551.
(14) Sterling MK-6.
(15) Steyr AUG.
(16) Valmet M62S, M71S, and M78S.
(17) Armalite AR-180.
(18) Bushmaster Assault Rifle.
(19) Calico M-900.
(20) J&R ENG M-68.
(21) Weaver Arms Nighthawk.

(b) All of the following specified pistols:
(1) UZI.
(2) Encom MP-9 and MP-45.
(3) The following MAC types:
   (A) RPB Industries Inc. sM10 and sM11.
   (B) SWD Incorporated M-11.
   (C) Advance Armament Inc. M-11.
   (D) Military Armament Corp. Ingram M-11.
(4) Intratec TEC-9.
(5) Sites Spectre.
(6) Sterling MK-7.
(7) Calico M-950.
(8) Bushmaster Pistol.

(c) All of the following specified shotguns:
(1) Franchi SPAS 12 and LAW 12.
(2) Striker 12.
(3) The Streetsweeper type S/S Inc. SS/12.

**Category 3 generic characteristics, pursuant to Penal Code, section 30515, are listed below:**

(a) Notwithstanding Section 30510, “assault weapon” also means any of the following:
   (1) A semiautomatic, centerfire rifle that does not have a fixed magazine but has any one of the following:
      (A) A pistol grip that protrudes conspicuously beneath the action of the weapon.
      (B) A thumbhole stock.
      (C) A folding or telescoping stock.
      (D) A grenade launcher or flare launcher.
      (E) A flash suppressor.
      (F) A forward pistol grip.
   (2) A semiautomatic, centerfire rifle that has a fixed magazine with the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds.
   (3) A semiautomatic, centerfire rifle that has an overall length of less than 30 inches.
   (4) A semiautomatic pistol that does not have a fixed magazine but has any one of the following:
      (A) A threaded barrel, capable of accepting a flash suppressor, forward handgrip, or silencer.
      (B) A second handgrip.
      (C) A shroud that is attached to, or partially or completely encircles, the barrel that allows the bearer to fire the weapon without burning the bearer’s hand, except a slide that encloses the barrel.
      (D) The capacity to accept a detachable magazine at some location outside of the pistol grip.
   (5) A semiautomatic pistol with a fixed magazine that has the capacity to accept more than 10 rounds.
   (6) A semiautomatic shotgun that has both of the following:
(A) A folding or telescoping stock.
(B) A pistol grip that protrudes conspicuously beneath the action of the weapon, thumbhole stock, or vertical handgrip.
(7) A semiautomatic shotgun that has the ability to accept a detachable magazine.
(8) Any shotgun with a revolving cylinder.