

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Hanson v. District of Columbia

Hanson · No. Civil Action No. 22-2256 (RC) · Decided March 30, 2026

SUMMARY

The United States District Court for the District of Columbia considers defendants’ partial motion to dismiss a pre-enforcement Second Amendment challenge to the District’s large-capacity magazine ban. The court holds that only plaintiff Tyler Yzaguirre has standing under binding D.C. Circuit precedent, but that his claim is not limited to the specific firearm registration application previously denied. The court also dismisses the Fifth Amendment claim and claims against the former and current Metropolitan Police Department chiefs in their individual and official capacities as described in the opinion.

CASE DETAILS

|                       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| COURT                 | United States District Court for the District of Columbia                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| WRITING FOR THE COURT | Rudolph Contreras                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| JURISDICTION          | United States District Court for the District of Columbia                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         |
| DECIDED               | March 30, 2026                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| DOCKET                | Civil Action No. 22-2256 (RC)                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| DISPOSITION           | other                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| PROCEDURAL POSTURE    | Plaintiffs brought a pre-enforcement constitutional challenge to the District of Columbia's large-capacity magazine ban. After the court denied a preliminary injunction and the D.C. Circuit affirmed, defendants moved under Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) to dismiss claims for lack of standing, failure to state a claim, and redundancy of official-capacity defendants.                                                                                                                                                                           |
| STANDARD OF REVIEW    | For a Rule 12(b)(1) motion, the court assumed the truth of material factual allegations, construed the complaint liberally, granted plaintiffs the benefit of reasonable inferences, and permitted consideration of materials outside the pleadings for jurisdictional issues. At the pleading stage, plaintiffs needed plausibly to allege each element of standing. For a Rule 12(b)(6) motion, the complaint had to contain sufficient factual matter to state a facially plausible claim, although conclusory allegations and legal conclusions need not be accepted as true. |

|                           |                                                                                                                            |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <b>PRECEDENTIAL VALUE</b> | Published memorandum opinion; the court applied binding D.C. Circuit precedent.                                            |
| <b>PARTIES</b>            | Andrew Hanson, Tyler Yzaguirre, Nathan Chaney, Eric Klun v. District of Columbia, Robert J. Contee III, Jeffrey W. Carroll |

## TOPICS

standing motions to dismiss subject matter jurisdiction second amendment civil procedure

## PRACTICE AREAS

constitutional law civil procedure civil rights municipal law firearms law

## QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether plaintiffs other than Yzaguirre plausibly alleged an injury in fact sufficient to establish standing for their pre-enforcement challenge to the District's large-capacity magazine ban.
2. Whether Yzaguirre's standing was limited to challenging the denial of registration for the particular firearm associated with a twelve-round magazine.
3. Whether the one-plaintiff rule allowed the court to proceed without determining the standing of each plaintiff seeking damages and individualized relief.
4. Whether claims against the MPD Chief in an official capacity were redundant when the District of Columbia was also named as a defendant.
5. Whether plaintiffs' Fifth Amendment due-process claim should be dismissed as duplicative of their Second Amendment claim.

## HOLDINGS

1. Under binding D.C. Circuit precedent, plaintiffs bringing a non-First Amendment pre-enforcement challenge to a criminal law must show that they have been singled out or uniquely targeted for prosecution, or otherwise allege the required concrete and imminent injury. Hanson, Chaney, and Klun did not satisfy that standard and lacked Article III standing.
2. The one-plaintiff rule did not eliminate the need to determine the standing of each plaintiff because the plaintiffs sought individualized damages and as-applied relief.
3. Yzaguirre's standing was not limited to the particular firearm-registration application for his firearm with a twelve-round magazine. He plausibly alleged a broader injury arising from the inability to possess and register standard-capacity large-capacity magazines he owns, including magazines in the twelve- to seventeen-round range.
4. Claims against the MPD Chief in his official capacity were redundant and were dismissed because the District of Columbia was already a named defendant.
5. Plaintiffs' Fifth Amendment claim was dismissed because plaintiffs conceded that it was duplicative of their Second Amendment claim.

## KEY QUOTATIONS

*“To establish standing, “a plaintiff must show (i) that he suffered an injury in fact that is concrete, particularized, and actual or imminent; (ii) that the injury was likely caused by the defendant; and (iii) that the injury would likely be redressed by judicial relief.”” (at 6)*

*“But surely standing doctrine does not require such a scheme.” (at 17)*

*“Accordingly, the Court will dismiss the MPD Chief in his official capacity to simplify the litigation without causing any prejudice to plaintiffs.” (at 18)*

## FACTUAL BACKGROUND

The District of Columbia prohibits possession of large-capacity ammunition-feeding devices holding more than ten rounds and requires firearm registration. Hanson, Yzaguirre, Chaney, and Klun alleged that they owned magazines capable of holding more than ten rounds outside the District and would possess and use them in the District but for the ban. Yzaguirre separately attempted to register a Sig Sauer P365 associated with a twelve-round magazine, but MPD denied the application because possession of a large-capacity magazine was illegal.

## PROCEDURAL HISTORY

Plaintiffs filed the complaint in August 2022 and later sought a preliminary injunction, which this court denied in April 2023. The D.C. Circuit affirmed the denial, and the Supreme Court denied certiorari. On remand, defendants filed a partial motion to dismiss. Plaintiffs conceded dismissal of their Fifth Amendment claim, claims against former Chief Contee, and individual-capacity claims against the current Chief. The court granted the motion in part and denied it in part, dismissing all plaintiffs except Yzaguirre for lack of standing, dismissing the Fifth Amendment claim, and dismissing official-capacity claims against the MPD Chief as redundant, while allowing Yzaguirre's challenge to proceed beyond the single firearm-registration application previously denied.

## DISPOSITION

other

## CASES CITED

- Hanson v. District of Columbia, 671 F. Supp. 3d 1 (D.D.C. 2023)
- Hanson v. District of Columbia, 120 F.4th 223 (D.C. Cir. 2024)
- New York State Rifle & Pistol Ass'n v. Bruen, 597 U.S. 1 (2022)
- Benson v. United States, No. 23-CF-0514, 2026 WL 628772 (D.C. Mar. 5, 2026)
- Abuzeid v. Mayorkas, 62 F.4th 578, 583 (D.C. Cir. 2023)
- American National Insurance Co. v. FDIC, 642 F.3d 1137, 1139 (D.C. Cir. 2011)
- Kareem v. Haspel, 986 F.3d 859, 866 n.7 (D.C. Cir. 2021)
- Bronner v. Duggan, 962 F.3d 596, 602 (D.C. Cir. 2020)
- Cutler v. U.S. Department of Health & Human Services, 797 F.3d 1173, 1179 (D.C. Cir. 2015)
- Ashcroft v. Iqbal, 556 U.S. 662, 678, 681 (2009)

- Bell Atlantic Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007)
- TransUnion LLC v. Ramirez, 594 U.S. 413, 423 (2021)
- Raines v. Byrd, 521 U.S. 811, 819 (1997)
- Lujan v. Defenders of Wildlife, 504 U.S. 555, 560-61 (1992)
- Jones v. U.S. Secret Service, 143 F.4th 489, 495 (D.C. Cir. 2025)
- Susan B. Anthony List v. Driehaus, 573 U.S. 149, 158-59 (2014)
- Navegar, Inc. v. United States, 103 F.3d 994, 996-1001 (D.C. Cir. 1997)
- Seegars v. Gonzales, 396 F.3d 1248, 1253-55 (D.C. Cir. 2005)
- Parker v. District of Columbia, 478 F.3d 370, 375-76 (D.C. Cir. 2007)
- District of Columbia v. Heller, 554 U.S. 570 (2008)
- MedImmune, Inc. v. Genentech, Inc., 549 U.S. 118, 128-29 (2007)
- Ord v. District of Columbia, 587 F.3d 1136, 1140-44, 1149 (D.C. Cir. 2009)
- LaShawn v. Barry, 87 F.3d 1389, 1393, 1395 (D.C. Cir. 1996) (en banc)
- Alpine Securities Corp. v. FINRA, 121 F.4th 1314, 1334 (D.C. Cir. 2024)
- Woodhull Freedom Foundation v. United States, 948 F.3d 363, 371 (D.C. Cir. 2020)
- New York Republican State Committee v. SEC, 799 F.3d 1126, 1135 (D.C. Cir. 2015)
- M.M.V. v. Garland, 1 F.4th 1100, 1110 (D.C. Cir. 2021)
- Town of Chester v. Laroe Estates, Inc., 581 U.S. 433, 439-40 (2017)
- Clinton v. City of New York, 524 U.S. 417, 431 n.19 (1998)
- Wehr-Darroca v. District of Columbia, No. 24-cv-3504, 2025 WL 2694790, at \*2-3 (D.D.C. Sept. 22, 2025)
- Gill v. Whitford, 585 U.S. 48, 66-68 (2018)
- American Federation of Government Employees v. United States, 330 F.3d 513, 518 (D.C. Cir. 2003)
- DaimlerChrysler Corp. v. Cuno, 547 U.S. 332, 353 (2006)
- Trump v. CASA, Inc., 606 U.S. 831, 837 (2025)
- United States v. Salerno, 481 U.S. 739, 745 (1987)
- Whole Woman's Health v. Jackson, Whole Woman's Health v. Jackson, 595 U.S. 30, 34-35, 47-50 (2021)
- McMillian v. Monroe County, 520 U.S. 781, 785 n.2 (1997)
- Kentucky v. Graham, 473 U.S. 159, 165 (1985)
- Monell v. Department of Social Services of City of New York, 436 U.S. 658, 690 n.55 (1978)
- Lopez v. District of Columbia, 268 F. Supp. 3d 256, 259 (D.D.C. 2017)
- Rubio v. District of Columbia, No. 23-cv-719, 2024 WL 3400227, at \*8 (D.D.C. July 12, 2024)
- Collette v. District of Columbia, No. 18-cv-1104, 2019 WL 3502927, at \*8 (D.D.C. Aug. 1, 2019)