National Feder tiz of the Blind e t al v T \mathbf{c} 41.

ration (f the Blind et al v. Target Corporati	ion			Doc		
С	ase 3:06-cv-01802-MHP D	ocument 28-2	Filed 06/12/2006	Page 1 of 2			
1	LAURENCE W. PARADIS (C	alifornia Bar No.	. 122336)				
2	MAZEN M. BASRAWI (Calif DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVC	OCATES	5475)				
3	2001 Center Street, Third Floor Berkeley, California 94704	r					
4	Telephone:(510) 665-8644Facsimile:(510) 665-8511TTY:(510) 665-8716						
5	TTY: (510) 665-8716 TODD M. SCHNEIDER (Calit	fornia Dar No. 15	(9252)				
6	JOSHUA KONECKY (Califor SCHNEIDER & WALLACE						
7	180 Montgomery Street, Suite San Francisco, CA 94104	2000					
8	Telephone:(415) 421-7100Fax:(415) 421-7105						
9	TTY: (415) 421-1655						
10	DANIEL F. GOLDSTEIN (pro BROWN, GOLDSTEIN & LE	VY, LLP					
11	120 E. Baltimore St., Suite 170 Baltimore, MD 21202	0					
12 13	Telephone: (410) 962-1030 Fax: (410) 385-0869						
13							
15							
16	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT						
17	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION						
18	NATIONAL FEDERATION C	Case No.: C 06-01802 MHP					
19	BLIND, the NATIONAL FED THE BLIND OF CALIFORNI	ERATION OF	CLASS ACTION	<i>52</i> WITH			
20	their members and all others sin and BRUCE F. SEXTON, on b	milarly situated,	[proposed] ORDER	DENYING			
21	and all others similarly situated		DEFENDANT TAR CORPORATION'S	RGET			
22	Plaintiffs,		DISMISS				
23	v.		Judge: The Honorab	le Marilyn Hall I	Patel		
24 25	TARGET CORPORATION						
25 26	Defendant.						
27							
28							
	National Federation of the Blind, et	al. v. Target Corpor	ation				
	Case No.: C 06-01802 MHP [proposed] Order Denying Defenda						
				Doc	ckets.J		

DISABILITY RIGHTS ADVOCATES 2001 Center Street, Third Floor Berkeley, CA 94704-1204 510.665.8644

1	Having considered Defendant Target Corporation's ("Target") Motion to Dismiss				
2	Plaintiffs' Amended Complaint and Plaintiffs' Opposition; and good cause appearing, the Court				
3	hereby DENIES Target's Motion for the following reasons:				
4	1.	plaintiffs have properly pled a claim under the Americans With Disabilities Act			
5		("ADA"), 42 U.S.C. §§12101, et seq., because Target stores are places of public			
6		accommodation and target.com is a service, privilege and advantage of Target store			
7		that is denied to the blind;			
8	2.	plaintiffs have properly pled a claim under the Unruh Act, Cal. Civ. Code §§51, et			
9		seq., because:			
10		(a) Target is a business establishment within the meaning of the Unruh Act and			
11		target.com is a service, privilege and advantage that Target denies to the blind;			
12		and			
13		(b) plaintiffs have properly pled a claim under Title III of the ADA;			
14	3.	plaintiffs have properly pled a claim under California's Disabled Persons Act			
15		("DPA"), Cal. Civ. Code §§54, et seq., because:			
16		(a) Target stores are public accommodations within the meaning of the DPA and			
17		target.com is a privilege, service and advantage of Target stores that is denied			
18		to the blind;			
19		(b) target.com is a public place within the meaning of the DPA that is denied to the			
20		blind; and			
21		(c) plaintiffs have properly pled a claim under Title III of the ADA;			
22	4.	The Commerce Clause of the Constitution of the United States, U.S. Const. art. I,			
23		§8, cl. 3, does not bar the application of the Unruh Act and DPA to target.com.			
24					
25	IT IS SO C	ORDERED.			
26					
27	Dated:	, 2006			
28		United States District Court Judge			
	National For	donation of the Plind at al. v. Tanget Comparation			
	Case No.: C	deration of the Blind, et al. v. Target Corporation 2 06-01802 MHP Order Denying Defendant Target Corporation's Motion to Dismiss			
	[[hi ohosed] (state 2 on jung 2 of one of portation of motion to promises			