



July 23, 2026

VIA ACMS

Clerk of Court
United States Court of Appeals
for the Fifth Circuit

Re: Knife Rights, Inc. v. Blanche, No. 25-10754

To the Clerk:

Pursuant to Fed.R.App.P. 28(j), Plaintiffs-Appellants respectfully submit the Third Circuit's recent decision, *Association of New Jersey Rifle and Pistol Clubs, Inc. v. Attorney General New Jersey*, Nos. 24-2415, 24-2450 and 24-2506 (3d Cir. July 17, 2026) (*en banc*). The decision bears directly on issues in this appeal.

Applying *Bruen*, *Rahimi*, *Hemani*, and *Wolford*, the Third Circuit held unconstitutional New Jersey's ban on commonly possessed semiautomatic rifles and magazines capable of holding more than ten rounds.

The Third Circuit held that *Bruen* step one asks whether a law restricts "Arms," defined by *Wolford* as "any weapon customarily used for

Clerk of Court
Page 2

offensive or defensive purposes.” Slip op. 32–34. “Common use has no bearing on” that definition; “customarily” describes how an object is normally used—as a weapon—rather than how numerically common it is. *Id.* at 32–33 and n.22. This supports Plaintiffs-Appellants’ argument that switchblades—indisputably weapons designed and customarily used for offensive or defensive purposes—are “Arms” within the Second Amendment’s plain text. Reply Br. 2–3, 10.

The court also expressly placed “common use” at *Bruen*’s second, historical, step because whether a law restricts a commonly used arm is necessarily part of “how” it burdens the right and determines whether proposed historical analogues are relevantly similar. Slip op. 32–34. It further held that arms “in common use for lawful purposes” cannot be “dangerous and unusual,” and common use encompasses lawful purposes beyond self-defense and is measured in today’s terms. *Id.* at 27–29. Plaintiffs-Appellants introduced un rebutted evidence that switchblades are lawfully possessed in the millions. Reply Br. 5, 18–19.

The Third Circuit also rejected the same Bowie-knife analogues relied upon here. Most of these laws merely restricted concealed carry;

Clerk of Court
Page 3

only one state prohibited possession, and its Supreme Court held that prohibition unconstitutional except as to concealed carry. Slip op. 49–52. Those laws could not justify “a ban on an entire class of arms in common use for lawful purposes.” *Id.* at 48–52. Likewise, concealed-carry regulations cannot justify Sections 1242 and 1243’s prohibitions on acquisition, manufacture, sale, and possession. Reply Br. 23–30.

Sincerely,

/s/ John W. Dillon

John W. Dillon

of

Dillon Law Group APC

Counsel for Plaintiffs-Appellants

cc: All counsel of record via ACMS

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Knife Rights, Inc.; Cameron
Sjodin; David Draeger; and
Kevin Crystal,

Plaintiffs,

v.

Keith Ellison, in his official
capacity as Attorney General of
the State of Minnesota; Brad
Wise, in his official capacity as
Sheriff of the Anoka County
Sheriff's Office; Mike Meheen,
in his official capacity as Chief
of the South Lake Minnetonka
Police Department; Brad
Johnson, in his official capacity
as County Attorney of the
Anoka County Attorney's
Office; and Mary Moriarty, in
her official capacity as County
Attorney of the Hennepin
County Attorney's Office,

Defendants.

CIVIL FILE NO. 0:24-cv-3749

**NOTICE OF
SUPPLEMENTAL
AUTHORITY**

Plaintiffs respectfully submit this notice of supplemental authority regarding the Third Circuit Court of Appeals' recent decision in *New Jersey Rifle and Pistol Clubs, Inc. v. Attorney General New Jersey*, Nos. 24-2415, 24-2450, and 24-2506 (3d Cir. July 17, 2026) (*en banc*). A copy of the Third Circuit's decision is attached hereto as **Exhibit A**.

Applying the Supreme Court's decisions in *Bruen*, *Rahimi*, *Hemani*, and *Wolford*, the Third Circuit held unconstitutional New Jersey's ban on commonly possessed semiautomatic rifles and magazines capable of holding more than ten rounds. *See Ass'n of New Jersey Rifle & Pistol Clubs, Inc. v. Att'y Gen. New Jersey*, No. 24-2415, 2026 WL 2075513 (3d Cir. July 17, 2026); *See also United States v. Rahimi*, 602 U.S. 680 (2024); *United States v. Hemani*, 146 S.Ct. 1677 (2026); and *Wolford v. Lopez*, No. 24-1046, ___ S. Ct. ___, 2026 WL 1825723 (U.S. June 25, 2026).

Plaintiffs respectfully submit that this most recent decision bears directly on the legal framework governing the Court's analysis under *New York State Rifle & Pistol Ass'n v. Bruen*, including the proper plain-text inquiry at the first step of the *Bruen* analysis and the historical-analog inquiry at the second step.

Respectfully submitted,

July 24, 2026

/s/ John W. Dillon
 John W. Dillon
 Plaintiff's Counsel
 License # 296788, *Pro Hac Vice*
 2647 Gateway Road Suite 105, No. 255
 Carlsbad, CA 92009
 Phone # 760-642-7150