



COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA  
OFFICE OF ATTORNEY GENERAL  
HARRISBURG, PA 17120

TOM CORBETT  
ATTORNEY GENERAL

16TH FLOOR  
STRAWBERRY SQUARE  
HARRISBURG, PA 17120  
(717) 787-3391

August 24, 2009

The Honorable Shawn C. Wagner  
Adams County Office of the District Attorney  
Adams County Courthouse  
111-117 Baltimore Street  
Gettysburg, PA 17325

*Re Local Ordinances Concerning Firearms*

Dear District Attorney Wagner:

Recently, my office has received a number of inquiries about the enactment of local ordinances pertaining to the use, possession or acquisition of firearms. These inquiries have chiefly concerned the authority of a political subdivision to legislate in this regard, and the related question of whether an adopted ordinance is legally enforceable. I am writing to share the position that my office has taken because your office, too, may be confronted with these issues and may find this information helpful.

Any review of this issue must, of course, begin with an examination of the Commonwealth's statutory law to determine what, if anything, it provides with respect to a political subdivision's ability to legislate on this subject. Our General Assembly has addressed this matter by enacting, as part of the Crimes Code, the provisions found in 18 Pa.C.S. § 6120 (Limitation on the regulation of firearms and ammunition), which contain this express prohibition: "No county, municipality or township may in any manner regulate the lawful ownership, possession, transfer or transportation of firearms, ammunition or ammunition components when carried or transported for purposes not prohibited by the laws of this Commonwealth." § 6120(a). As used in this statute, "firearms" has, with one exception, the same meaning as in 18 Pa.C.S. § 5515 (Prohibiting of paramilitary training): "Any weapon which is designed to or may readily be converted to expel any projectile by the action of an explosive; or the frame or receiver of any such weapon."<sup>1</sup>

In the more than thirty-five years since the enactment of § 6120(a), Pennsylvania's courts, including its Supreme Court, have uniformly interpreted its provisions to preempt local governments from legislating with respect to the ownership, use, possession or transportation of firearms. *See, e.g., Schneck v. City of Philadelphia*, 383 A.2d 227 (Pa. Cmwlth. 1978)(striking down a Philadelphia ordinance that regulated the acquisition and transfer of firearms). In

<sup>1</sup>Air rifles are not "firearms" for purposes of § 6120(a). *See* § 6120(b)(incorporating definition found in 18 Pa.C.S. § 6304). An "air rifle" is: "Any air gun, air pistol, spring gun, spring pistol, B-B gun or any implement that is not a firearm which impels a pellet of any kind with a force that can reasonably be expected to cause bodily harm." It does not include paintball guns or markers. § 6304(g).

*Schneck*, the Commonwealth Court, sitting *en banc*, held that §6120(a) “clearly preempts local governments from regulating the lawful ownership, possession and transportation of firearms . . . .” It declared the ordinance to be invalid and unenforceable.

Nearly two decades later, in *Ortiz v. Commonwealth*, 681 A.2d 152 (Pa. 1996), our Supreme Court provided further guidance when it considered ordinances banning certain types of assault weapons passed by the cities of Philadelphia and Pittsburgh. Although both cities are home rule municipalities, and as such, each “may exercise any power or perform any function not denied by [the Pennsylvania] Constitution, by its home rule charter or by the General Assembly at any time,” PA. CONST. art. IX, § 2, the court explained that, in the area of firearms, the General Assembly has, by enacting §6120(a), acted affirmatively to prohibit local regulation of the ownership, possession, use or transfer of firearms, thus denying all municipalities, including those which operate under a home rule charter, the authority to legislate in this regard. 681 A.2d at 155. The court in *Ortiz* also stressed that “[b]ecause the ownership of firearms is constitutionally protected, its regulation is a matter of statewide concern . . . . Thus, regulation of firearms is a matter of concern in all of Pennsylvania . . . and the General Assembly, not city councils, is the proper forum for the imposition of such regulation.” *Id.* at 156.

Given this straightforward explication of Pennsylvania law by its highest court, it is, and continues to be, my understanding that any effort by a municipality to legislate in a way that affects the ownership, use, possession, transfer or transportation of a firearm is not legitimate. On those occasions when my office’s input has been sought, we have communicated this. Rulings to date in ongoing cases involving this issue support that conclusion.

The issue of firearms-related preemption is currently being litigated in three cases pending in the state appellate courts. All of the cases arise from the enactment of ordinances in Philadelphia. In *Clarke, et al. v. House of Representatives, et al.*, 957 A.2d 361 (Pa. Cmwlth. 2008) (“*Clarke P*”), two members of Philadelphia City Council filed suit in the Commonwealth Court against both houses of the General Assembly seeking a declaratory judgment that seven ordinances, dealing with firearms passed by Philadelphia City Council and signed by the Mayor in May of 2007, were legal and enforceable.<sup>2</sup> In an *en banc* ruling, Commonwealth Court

---

<sup>2</sup> The seven ordinances provided as follows:

**Bill 040117-A** limits handgun purchases to one per month and prohibits straw purchases and sales. **Bill 060700** mandates the reporting of lost or stolen firearms. **Bill 040136-A** requires a license in order to acquire a firearm within Philadelphia or bring a firearm into Philadelphia. **Bill 040137** requires the annual renewal of a gun license. **Bill 040312** states that a firearm can be confiscated from someone posing a risk of harm. **Bill 040315** prohibits the possession or transfer of assault weapons. **Bill 040118-A** requires that any person selling ammunition report the purchase and the purchaser to the Police Department.

sustained preliminary objections to the petition for review and dismissed the action on the basis it did not state a claim as to which relief could be granted. The court concluded that the ordinances were “not materially different from those presented in *Schneck* and *Ortiz*,” and were therefore likewise preempted by §6120(a). The Council members have appealed to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court. Disposition of that appeal, which is docketed at No. 74 MAP 2008, is pending.

Commonwealth Court has addressed the preemption question even more recently in *National Rifle Association, et al. v. City of Philadelphia, et al.* (“*NRA*”), \_\_\_ A.2d \_\_\_ 2009 WL 1692390 (Pa. Cmwlth. 06-18-09). That case involved a challenge to five ordinances passed by Philadelphia City Council in April of 2008.<sup>3</sup> The court of common pleas determined, as a threshold matter, that the plaintiffs did not have standing to challenge three of the ordinances, specifically, the “imminent danger,” “protection from abuse” and “lost or stolen gun” ordinances.<sup>4</sup> The remaining two, the “straw purchaser” and “assault weapons” ordinances, it concluded, were preempted by §6120(a) and permanently enjoined city officials from enforcing them. The city appealed that ruling to Commonwealth Court which, in an *en banc* decision issued June 18, 2009, affirmed the lower court’s ruling in all respects. A petition for allowance of appeal seeking review of Commonwealth Court’s ruling was filed in the Pennsylvania Supreme Court on July 17, 2009. The case is docketed in that court at No. 399 EAL 2009.

The petitioners in *Clarke I* filed another suit in Commonwealth Court against the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania also challenging the 2008 ordinances. In that action, *Clarke, et al. v. Commonwealth of Pennsylvania*, No. 284 M.D. 2008 (Pa. Cmwlth.) (“*Clarke II*”), my

---

<sup>3</sup> These five ordinances, the court said,

can be summarized as follows: **Bill No. 080017, “Imminent Danger Ordinance,”** authorizes the temporary removal of firearms from persons found by the court, upon affidavit of two police officers or a district attorney, to pose a risk of imminent harm to themselves or others; **Bill No. 080018-A, “Protection From Abuse Ordinance,”** prohibits persons subject to an active protection from abuse order from acquiring or possessing firearms when such order provides for confiscation of the firearms; **Bill No. 080032-A, “Lost or Stolen Gun Ordinance,”** requires gun owners to report their lost or stolen firearms to law enforcement officials within twenty-four hours after discovery of the loss or theft; **Bill No. 080033, “Assault Weapons Ordinance,”** prohibits the possession, sale and transfer of certain offensive weapons, including assault weapons, as well as certain contraband accessories or ammunition; and finally, **Bill No. 080035-A, “Straw Purchaser Ordinance,”** prohibits any person when purchasing a handgun from acting as a straw purchaser and prohibits the purchase of more than one handgun within any thirty-day period, except for any person who is not a straw purchaser.

2009 WL 1692390, \*1 (emphasis added).

<sup>4</sup> In its decision, the court of common pleas noted that although these three ordinances were not technically at issue in the case because of the lack of standing, it nevertheless felt the same reasoning would apply. In some media accounts of this decision and Commonwealth Court’s affirmance, it was reported that these three ordinances had been “approved” by the courts. That is incorrect. Because of the lack of standing, the courts have never had jurisdiction to rule on these issues. If anything, the court of common pleas’ remarks suggest a contrary outcome.

The Honorable Shawn C. Wagner  
August 24, 2009  
Page 4 of 4

office, which represents the Commonwealth, filed preliminary objections seeking to dismiss the case on several grounds, including preemption. On December 3, 2008, Commonwealth Court sustained those objections and dismissed the case, based on its ruling in *Clarke I*. An appeal to the Pennsylvania Supreme Court, where it is docketed at No. 92 MAP 2008, is pending.

Obviously, the Supreme Court's forthcoming decisions in *Clarke I and II*, and any decision it might issue in *NRA*, if it chooses to hear the case, will furnish further guidance on this subject. In our view, the existing body of law, and its consistent application of the principles of preemption, at very minimum, counsels great caution in dealing with locally-enacted ordinances which affect firearm use, ownership, possession and transportation. Given what the courts have said, we believe it would be appropriate to treat such enactments as invalid.

I hope that this discussion of this issue will be helpful to you. Please contact Amy Zapp, Deputy Attorney General, Special Litigation Section, at (717) 705-4487, if my office can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tom Corbett". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large initial "T" and a long, sweeping underline.

TOM CORBETT  
Attorney General