

1 FRANCISCO J. SILVA (SBN 214773)  
 e-mail: fsilva@cmanet.org  
 2 LONG X. DO (SBN 211439)  
 e-mail: ldo@cmanet.org  
 3 LISA MATSUBARA (SBN 264062)  
 e-mail: lmatsubara@cmanet.org  
 4 CALIFORNIA MEDICAL ASSOCIATION  
 1201 J Street, Suite 200  
 5 Sacramento, California 95814-2906  
 Telephone: (916) 444-5532  
 6 Facsimile: (916) 551-2027

7 Attorneys for CALIFORNIA MEDICAL  
 ASSOCIATION  
 8

9 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
 10 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
 11 OAKLAND DIVISION

13 SAFEWAY INC.,

14 Plaintiff,

15 v.

17 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN  
 FRANCISCO, *et al.*,

18 Defendants.  
 19  
 20

Case No. CV-11-0761 (CW)

**APPLICATION OF THE CALIFORNIA  
 MEDICAL ASSOCIATION FOR  
 LEAVE TO FILE *AMICUS CURIAE*  
 BRIEF; *AMICUS CURIAE* BRIEF IN  
 SUPPORT OF DEFENDANTS'  
 MOTION TO DISMISS**

Date: June 2, 2011  
 Time: 2:00 p.m.  
 Judge: Hon. Claudia Wilken  
 Court: Courtroom 2 – 4th Floor

**APPLICATION FOR LEAVE TO FILE AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF**

1  
2 The California Medical Association (“CMA”) hereby requests permission to file the  
3 attached *amicus curiae* brief in support of the City and County of San Francisco’s (“San  
4 Francisco”) motion to dismiss the complaint in this action, filed by Safeway Inc. (“Safeway”).  
5 Counsel for CMA has reviewed Safeway’s complaint in this action to challenge the  
6 constitutionality and legality of San Francisco’s ordinance prohibiting the sale of tobacco in retail  
7 stores with pharmacies, S.F. Ordinance Nos. 194-08 and 245-10 (the “Ordinance”). CMA  
8 believes it can assist the Court in resolving a key issue raised by Safeway’s complaint: whether  
9 San Francisco treats similarly situated entities differently under the Ordinance and whether any  
10 such distinction is rationally related to a legitimate public health interest.

11 CMA is a not-for-profit professional association for physicians with approximately 35,000  
12 members throughout California. For more than 150 years, CMA has promoted the science and art  
13 of medicine, the care and well-being of patients, the protection of the public health and the  
14 betterment of the medical profession. CMA’s physician members practice medicine in all  
15 specialties and settings. CMA carries out this mission through advocacy on behalf of organized  
16 medicine in the courts and before legislatures and regulators.

17 CMA strongly supports the San Francisco Ordinance because it is squarely in line with  
18 decades of official CMA policy, including recent policy specifically supporting a prohibition on  
19 the sale of tobacco products in stores that provide pharmacy services. Such policy mirrors that of  
20 the American Medical Association and is based upon sound medical and public health research.  
21 In short, the Ordinance is consistent with the conclusions of the medical and public health  
22 community that an integral component of the overall campaign against smoking and tobacco  
23 addiction must include efforts to address the social norms and messages associated with smoking  
24 and to limit the availability, visibility and accessibility of tobacco.

25 Unlike other retail outlets that sell cigarettes, stores that provide pharmacy services pose a  
26 unique problem if they also sell tobacco products. Stores such as Safeway that contain a  
27 pharmacy are an integral part of the health care delivery system. Selling tobacco products in such  
28 institutions creates a conflict of interest and sends a mixed message that can undermine the





1 care delivery outlets where patients go to receive health care services and prescription drugs. The  
2 sale of cigarettes in such health care delivery outlets creates a conflict of interest and sends a  
3 mixed message about the harmful effects of smoking. It also could frustrate the ability of  
4 physicians to treat patients who may have access to cigarettes in the same location that fills their  
5 drug prescriptions and offers medical advice.

6 By focusing on stores that contain a pharmacy, San Francisco does not treat similarly  
7 situated stores differently and, in any event, has made a sound policy decision that is based on  
8 medical and public health research. The Ordinance is consistent with the official policy of  
9 organized medicine at the state and federal levels. Accordingly, CMA urges the Court to grant  
10 San Francisco's motion to dismiss Safeway's complaint.

## 11 **BACKGROUND**

12  
13 The public health community has waged a long campaign against smoking and tobacco  
14 products. Smoking is the leading preventable cause of death. An average of 36,687 Californians  
15 died each year between 2000 and 2004 due to smoking.<sup>2</sup> Between 2004 and 2006 the rate of  
16 smoking among California high school students increased by 17 percent.<sup>3</sup>

17 In 1988 California voters passed Proposition 99, a health protection act that created the  
18 nation's first statewide tobacco control program.<sup>4</sup> Proposition 99 promotes the health of  
19 Californians by employing comprehensive public health strategies that work "1) to protect  
20 nonsmokers by reducing exposure to environmental tobacco smoke...; and 2) to reduce smoking  
21 prevalence by discouraging adolescents from taking up smoking and encouraging smokers to  
22

---

23 <sup>2</sup>*State Specific Smoking Attributable Mortality and Years of Potential Life Lost – United*  
24 *States 2000-2004*, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, CDC Pub. No. 58(02), at 29-33  
(January 2009) [online at <<http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm5802a2.htm>>].

25 <sup>3</sup>*Youth Smoking*, California Dep't of Public Health, California Tobacco Control Program  
26 (July 2008).

27 <sup>4</sup>*See Toward a Tobacco-Free California 2006-2008: Confronting A Relentless Adversary:*  
28 *A Plan for Success (Executive Summary)*, Tobacco Education and Research Oversight Committee  
for California (March 2006) [online at [http://www.cdph.ca.gov/services/boards/teroc/](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/services/boards/teroc/Documents/TEROCMasterPlan06-08ExecSum.pdf)  
[Documents/TEROCMasterPlan06-08ExecSum.pdf](http://www.cdph.ca.gov/services/boards/teroc/Documents/TEROCMasterPlan06-08ExecSum.pdf)].

1 quit.”<sup>5</sup>

2 Part of California’s response to Proposition 99 is the promulgation of regulations and  
3 restrictions on the use and sale of tobacco products. These sorts of governmental interventions  
4 are central because they serve the twin purposes of decreasing harmful exposure to secondhand  
5 smoke<sup>6</sup> and potentially reducing future addiction rates of current non-smokers.<sup>7</sup>

6 In 1976, the Legislature enacted the Indoor Clean Air Act, Health & Safety Code  
7 §§118885 *et seq.*, which requires that publicly-owned buildings, health facilities and retail food  
8 establishments dedicate significant portions of indoor space open to the general public as non-  
9 smoking areas. In 1995, California’s comprehensive smoke-free workplace law took effect to  
10 prohibit smoking in virtually all enclosed workplaces, including offices, restaurants and shops.  
11 *See* Labor Code §6404.5. In 1998, bars in California became smoke-free. *See id.* at §6404.5(f).  
12 In 2003, California prohibited smoking within 20 feet of a main entrance, exit or operable  
13 window of a public building owned or leased by the state, a county, city, city and county, or a  
14 California community college district. *See* Gov. Code §§7596-98. The sale of tobacco products  
15 to minors is prohibited. *See* Penal Code §308; Bus. & Prof. Code §22952. Over twenty  
16 campuses of the University of California, California State University and California Community  
17 College system have prohibited the sale of tobacco products.<sup>8</sup>

18 Evidence-based studies by medical and public health researchers have shown that these  
19 sorts of governmental tobacco control policies work. As noted in *R.J. Reynolds Tobacco Co. v.*  
20 *Shewry*, 423 F.3d 906, 913 (9th Cir. 2005), “[t]here is substantial evidence, including published  
21

---

22 <sup>5</sup>Novotny & Siegel, *California’s Tobacco Control Saga*, 15 HEALTH AFFAIRS 59, 59  
23 (1996).

24 <sup>6</sup>*Toward A Tobacco-Free California 2006-2008*, *supra* n.4, at 4.

25 <sup>7</sup>*See* Siegel, Michael, *et al.*, *Local Restaurant Smoking Regulations and the Adolescent*  
26 *Smoking Initiation Process*, 162 ARCH. PEDIATR. ADOLESC. MED. 477, 477 (2008); Alamar,  
27 Benjamin and Glantz, Stanton, *Effect of Increased Social Unacceptability of Cigarette Smoking*  
28 *on Reduction in Cigarette Consumption*, 96 AMER. J. PUB. HEALTH: HEALTH POLICY & ETHICS  
1359 (2006).

<sup>8</sup>These prohibitions in California’s universities and colleges are documented online at  
<http://www.cyanonline.org/College/CollegePolicies/CaliforniaPolicies>.

1 medical studies indicating that the [state’s tobacco control] programs, and the media campaign in  
2 particular have been successful in achieving their goals of ‘preventing tobacco use by children  
3 and young adults.’” (quoting *R.J Reynolds v. Bonta*, 272 F. Supp. 2d 1085, 1088 n.5 (E.D. Cal.  
4 2003)). *See also* Hamilton, W., *et al.*, *Do Local Tobacco Regulations Influence Perceived*  
5 *Smoking Norms? Evidence from Adult and Youth Surveys in Massachusetts*, 23 HEALTH EDUC.  
6 RES. 709 (2008) (“There is good evidence that tobacco control policies are associated with  
7 reductions in smoking prevalence among both youth and adults”).

8         Given the successes of these anti-tobacco campaigns, public health officials and health  
9 professionals have begun to focus on new arenas and institutions where the harms of smoking and  
10 tobacco addiction can be implicated. Their trajectory has landed on health promoting businesses,  
11 such as pharmacies. Indeed, organized medicine has recently adopted formal positions to extend  
12 tobacco control efforts to these types of businesses. Pharmacy associations have long been  
13 opposed to the sale of tobacco products in pharmacies. In 1970, the American Pharmaceutical  
14 Association (“APhA”) stated, “[m]ass display of cigarettes is in direct contradiction to the role of  
15 the pharmacy as a public health facility.”<sup>9</sup> The next year, the APhA House of Delegates  
16 recommended that tobacco products not be sold in pharmacies.<sup>10</sup> In 1973 and 1977, the  
17 California Pharmacists Association recommended that pharmacists discourage the sale of tobacco  
18 products in the pharmacies in which they practice “in the interest of raising the standards for  
19 public health and social welfare in the community.”<sup>11</sup> A study published in 2006 found that 81.7  
20 percent of licensed pharmacists are opposed to the sale of tobacco products in pharmacies and  
21 only 1.6% of licensed pharmacists favored such sales.<sup>12</sup>

---

24         <sup>9</sup>*See* Hudmon, Karen S., *et al.*, *Pharmacy Students’ Perceptions of Tobacco Sales in*  
25 *Pharmacies and Suggested Strategies for Promoting Tobacco-Free Experiential Sites*, 70 AM. J.  
PHARM. EDUC. 75 (2006).

26         <sup>10</sup>*See id.*

27         <sup>11</sup>*Id.*

28         <sup>12</sup>*Id.*

**DISCUSSION****A. San Francisco's Ordinance Is Squarely in Line with Official Policies of the California Medical Association and the American Medical Association.**

Organized medicine has long advanced policies and efforts to reduce the prevalence of smoking and tobacco. Each year CMA delegates — representing the approximately 35,000 CMA members and county and specialty medical societies — convene to debate and pass resolutions dictating official positions and policies of California's House of Medicine. There are more than fifty CMA resolutions since 1984 that broadly support prohibitions or strict restrictions on tobacco advertising, sales and use in public places. A sample of these policies includes:

- Res. 717a-06 (2006), to advance prohibitions on the sale of tobacco use and sale in state hospitals;
- Res. 105-98 (1998), to develop and implement an anti-tobacco program for young women;
- Res. 113-96 (1996), to study and implement better protection of children from tobacco products;
- Res. 121-95 (1995), to advocate for strong restrictions on tobacco advertising to teenagers;
- Res. 108a-93 (1993), to encourage education of the harmful effects of smoking in automobiles;
- Res. 102-92 (1992), to support broad licensing of businesses that wish to sell tobacco products;
- Res. 101a-92 (1992), to advocate for a ban on smoking on airlines;
- Res. 103-87 (1987), to advocate for the prohibition of smoking in the workplace; and
- Res. 101a-85 (1985), to encourage public and private school authorities to incorporate health maintenance with a heavy emphasis on non-smoking in junior high and high school curricula.

These resolutions have had a real impact on public health campaigns and legislation. Carrying out the 1987 resolution to prohibit smoking in the workplace, in 1994 CMA led a

1 coalition of health, labor and business interests to sponsor A.B. 13, known as the California  
2 Smoke-Free Workplace Law and signed by the Governor on July 21, 1994. The law is the first in  
3 the nation to establish a statewide prohibition of smoking in places of employment, including  
4 virtually all bars and restaurants. Similar laws have been passed throughout the nation. It is  
5 notable that the effort was started at the local level in San Francisco. The San Francisco Medical  
6 Society (a CMA affiliate) was prominent among anti-tobacco advocates who successfully  
7 instituted a ban on smoking in restaurants in San Francisco in the early 1990s, years ahead the  
8 rest of the state.

9 CMA's House of Delegates recently passed a resolution that has direct bearing on this  
10 case. In 2008 CMA delegates passed Resolution No. 719-08 to resolve "[t]hat CMA support  
11 prohibitions on the sale of tobacco products in pharmacies." The resolution also called for CMA  
12 to bring a similar measure before the American Medical Association ("AMA"), which has a  
13 similar policymaking process. Consequently, AMA Resolution 419 was passed at the 2009  
14 annual meeting of AMA delegates, which commands the AMA to "[s]pecifically and publicly  
15 oppose the sale and marketing of tobacco products, including cigarettes, in a pharmacy" and  
16 "[c]ommunicate with appropriate federal agencies, including the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco,  
17 and Firearms, public health groups, various pharmacy trade groups, and media outlets to seek  
18 their help in removing tobacco products from pharmacy shelves."

19 These resolutions apply not only to stand-alone pharmacies but also to any business that  
20 provides pharmacy services to the public. This is because stand-alone pharmacies are rare and  
21 most, if not all, pharmacies are located within stores or businesses that offer other merchandise or  
22 services. Given this, a ban of tobacco sales just from the pharmacy units within stores would be  
23 too narrow and ineffective. As explained in the next section, the sale of tobacco products in  
24 stores with pharmacies could undermine efforts to control social norms and perceptions about  
25 smoking and a healthy lifestyle as well as interfere with the treatment protocols of physicians  
26 whose patients may go to stores with pharmacies to fill drug prescriptions.

1 **B. The Experience and Research of Physicians and Public Health Officials Support San**  
 2 **Francisco's Ordinance.**

3 Organized medicine's call for a ban of the sale of tobacco products in stores with  
 4 pharmacies reflects decades of research finding that altering social norms about smoking and  
 5 lessening the ubiquity of smoking and tobacco products are vital in the public health campaign  
 6 against smoking. San Francisco's Ordinance does just that.

7 **1. The Research Behind the Campaign to Eliminate Smoking.**

8 Empirical research has repeatedly confirmed the public health community's view that  
 9 negative social perceptions about smoking, as well as reduced access to and visibility of smoking  
 10 and cigarettes, can lower the rate at which current non-smokers experiment with and ultimately  
 11 become addicted to smoking. Public health professionals identify "the key to a successful  
 12 tobacco control effort is the contiguous delivery of anti-tobacco messages by many different  
 13 sources, consistently and over an extended period of time."<sup>13</sup>

14 Studies have found that strong governmental regulation of smoking corresponds and may  
 15 contribute to anti-smoking community norms.<sup>14</sup> Social norms about smoking influences smoking  
 16 rates, particularly among those not yet addicted.<sup>15</sup> Surveys of adolescent smoking behavior

---

17  
 18 <sup>13</sup>Novotny & Siegel, *California's Tobacco Control Saga*, *supra* n.5, at 68.

19 <sup>14</sup>See Hamilton, W., *et al.*, *Do Local Tobacco Regulations Influence Perceived Smoking*  
 20 *Norms? Evidence from Adult and Youth Surveys in Massachusetts*, 23 HEALTH EDUC. RES. 709  
 21 (2008) at 709 ("[L]ocal communities can influence adults and youths' perceptions of community  
 22 smoking norms by adopting a broad array of strong tobacco control regulations"); Macy,  
 23 Jonathan T., *et al.*, *Smoke-Free Air Laws and Perceived Norms About Smoking in Four Texas*  
 24 *Cities*, 136th American Public Health Association Annual Meeting and Exposition (Oct. 27,  
 25 2008); Albers, A.B., *et al.*, *Relation Between Restaurant Smoking Regulations and Attitudes*  
 26 *Towards the Prevalence and Social Acceptability of Smoking*, 13 TOBACCO CONTROL 347 (2004).

27 <sup>15</sup>See, *e.g.*, Christakis, Nicholas and Fowler, James, *The Collective Dynamics of Smoking*  
 28 *in a Large Social Network*, 358 NEW ENGL. J. MED. 2249 (2008); Katz, Mitchell, *Banning*  
*Tobacco Sales in Pharmacies: The Right Prescription*, 300 J. AM. MED. ASS'N 1451 (2008);  
 Alesci, Nina, *et al.*, *Smoking Visibility, Perceived Acceptability, and Frequency in Various*  
*Locations Among Youth and Adults*, 36 PREV. MED. 272 (2003); Alamar & Glantz, *Effect of*  
*Increased Social Unacceptability of Cigarette Smoking*, *supra* n.7, at 1359 ("Social  
 unacceptability has been repeatedly shown to be an important influence on both initiation and  
 quitting.") (citing *Preventing Tobacco Use Among Young People: A Report of the Surgeon*

1 “suggest that smoke-free workplaces and homes are associated with significantly lower rates of  
2 adolescent smoking.”<sup>16</sup> This demonstrates that the “adoption of a smoke-free home policy sends  
3 a message to family members that smoking is not condoned, while the lack of such a policy may  
4 send the opposite message.”<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, empirical research connects lower densities of retail  
5 outlets with lower consumption, particularly among youth.<sup>18</sup>

6 A recent study analyzing Chinese and Korean immigrants in California (large ethnic  
7 populations in San Francisco) found that “immigrant smokers in California have stopped smoking  
8 at a dramatically higher rate than their counterparts in their native countries not because their  
9 personal propensity for success at quitting suddenly changes after moving to a new country, but  
10 because the social norm in California makes them more likely to try.”<sup>19</sup> Thus, immigrants reacted  
11 to living in an environment promoting the social norm that smoking is unacceptable by trying to  
12 quit more than those who stay in their native countries where smoking is more acceptable. The  
13 more they try to quit the more they succeed.<sup>20</sup>

---

14  
15  
16  
17 *General*, U.S. Dept. of Health & Hum. Servs. (1994); *Reducing Tobacco Use: A Report of the*  
18 *Surgeon General*, U.S. Dept. of Health & Hum. Servs. (2000)).

19 <sup>16</sup>Farkas *et al.*, *Association Between Household and Workplace Smoking Restrictions and*  
20 *Adolescent Smoking*, 284 J. AMER. MED. ASS’N 717, 720 (2000).

21 <sup>17</sup>*Id.* at 721.

22 <sup>18</sup>*See, e.g.,* Pearce, J., *et al.*, *The Neighbourhood Effects of Geographical Access to*  
23 *Tobacco Retailers on Individual Smoking Behavior*, 63 J. EPIDEMIOL. CMTY. HEALTH 69 (2009)  
24 (finding individuals living in neighborhoods with best access to supermarkets and convenience  
25 stores where tobacco sold higher odds of smoking); Leatherdale, S.T. and Strath, J.M., *Tobacco*  
26 *Retailer Density Surrounding Schools and Cigarette Access Behaviors Among Underage Smoking*  
27 *Students*, 33 ANN. BEHAV. MED. 105 (2007) (finding tobacco retailer density surrounding school  
28 is related to student access behaviors); Novak, Scott, *et al.*, *Retailer Tobacco Outlet Density and*  
*Youth Cigarette Smoking: A Propensity-Modeling Approach*, 96 AM. J. PUB. HEALTH 670 (2006)  
(reductions in retail tobacco outlet density may reduce rates of youth smoking).

<sup>19</sup>Zhu *et al.*, *High Quit Ratio Among Asian Immigrants in California: Implications for*  
*Population Tobacco Cessation*, 9 NICOTINE & TOBACCO RESEARCH, S505, S513 (2007).

<sup>20</sup>*Id.* at S512.

1           **2. Applying the Lessons of the Public Health Campaign Against Smoking and**  
2           **Tobacco Products to Stores with Pharmacies.**

3           Since studies have found that “increasing the social unacceptability of smoking is a highly  
4 effective policy tool in reducing consumption,” restricting tobacco access by prohibiting its sale  
5 in stores with pharmacies would increase the perception of social unacceptability in the  
6 community, especially in places that also provide health care services. The experience of the  
7 anti-tobacco campaign is that such efforts are likely to result in reduced consumption of  
8 tobacco.<sup>21</sup>

9           By offering pharmacy services, a store becomes an access point within the health care  
10 delivery system. The store is perceived by the public to be, and in fact is, an institution where  
11 customers can receive trustworthy healthcare advice and receive prescription drugs as part of  
12 medical treatment for all sorts of diseases and ailments. Indeed, the public perceives community  
13 pharmacists as among the most trusted health care professionals, according to the drugstore  
14 industry’s trade organization.<sup>22</sup> It is thus antithetical to the health promoting functions and  
15 perceptions associated with stores that offer pharmacy services to also offer tobacco products.  
16 Public health officials and researchers have concluded that “[s]elling tobacco products sends  
17 misleading messages that conflict with a pharmacy’s purpose of promoting health.”<sup>23</sup>  
18 Accordingly, organized medicine believes that providing access to tobacco in places that provide  
19 pharmacy services could undermine anti-tobacco efforts.

20           Physicians have an additional, more practical reason to strongly oppose the sale of  
21 tobacco products in stores where pharmacists operate. Smoking and tobacco addiction are known  
22 to cause or be associated with innumerable medical ailments and maladies. Avoiding tobacco  
23 products is important, and often critical, in the treatment of these various medical issues. When

24 \_\_\_\_\_  
25           <sup>21</sup>Alamar & Glantz, *Effect of Increased Social Unacceptability of Cigarette Smoking*,  
*supra* n.7, at 1362.

26           <sup>22</sup>See National Association of Chain Drug Stores, Chain Pharmacy Industry Profile at 61  
(2008-09).

27           <sup>23</sup>*Toward A Tobacco-Free California 2009-2011*, Tobacco Education and Research  
28 Oversight Committee for California, at 21.

1 physicians prescribe drugs as part of their treatment protocol, they do not want their patients to  
2 have access to tobacco products in the same place where they go to get their prescription  
3 medications. In other words, selling tobacco in Safeway stores where patients go to fill drug  
4 prescriptions could undermine physicians' efforts to treat their patients.

5 San Francisco's Ordinance applies the research and experience of the public health  
6 community. It is in line with the trajectory of tobacco control efforts and is expected to yield  
7 benefits in the continuing public health campaign against smoking and tobacco products.

8 **C. The San Francisco Ordinance Does Not Violate Equal Protection.**

9 In spite of the public health benefits to be achieved by San Francisco's Ordinance,  
10 Safeway apparently wishes to see the whole Ordinance stricken because it distinguishes between  
11 retail stores that do or do not contain pharmacies. Safeway alleges that the Ordinance  
12 "differentiates arbitrarily and capriciously between similarly situated retailers solely on the  
13 ground that some have, and some do not have, somewhere on their premises, a lawful pharmacy."  
14 Complaint ¶66. Organized medicine disagrees.

15 *First*, as evident from the foregoing discussion, stores that contain pharmacies and also  
16 sell cigarettes, such as Safeway stores, are not similarly situated to stores that sell cigarettes but  
17 do not contain pharmacies. Unlike with the latter type of stores, the problems with a conflict of  
18 interest, mixed message about the harmful effects of smoking and frustration of physicians'  
19 efforts at treating their patients arise when a store that offers pharmacy services also sells  
20 cigarettes. These problems may not arise in general retail outlets that sell cigarettes but do not  
21 serve as an access point in the health care delivery system, like stores with pharmacies.  
22 Organized medicine's call for a prohibition on cigarette sales in stores with pharmacies is  
23 consistent with calls for such anti-tobacco controls in all other health care delivery institutions,  
24 such as hospitals.

25 *Second*, regardless whether San Francisco has made a distinction between similarly  
26 situated stores, there is a rational basis for banning the sale of tobacco products in stores with  
27 pharmacies. As explained, the official policy of CMA (as well as the AMA) calling for such a  
28 ban relies on the research and experience of physicians and public health officials. The



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

I, Long X. Do, certify that on this 15th day of April, 2011, a copy of the foregoing **Application of the California Medical Association for Leave to File *Amicus Curiae* Brief; *Amicus Curiae* Brief in Support of Defendants’ Motion Dismiss** was served on all counsel of record by electronically filing it with the Clerk of the Court for the United States District Court, Northern District of California, Oakland Division, by using the official Electronic Case File (ECF) Internet Site of the Northern District of California system, which automatically provides electronic notification to the following persons:

**Vince Chhabria** (vince.chhabria@sfgov.org)  
San Francisco City Attorney's Office  
City Hall, Room 324  
1 Dr. Carlton B. Goodlett Pl.  
San Francisco, CA 94102  
(415) 554-4674  
(415) 554-4699 (fax)

**Barbara Lynne Harris Chiang** (bhc@dillinghammurphy.com)  
**John Norman Dahlberg** (jnd@dillinghammurphy.com)  
**Thomas John Klitgaard** (tjk@dillinghammurphy.com)  
**William Francis Murphy** (wfm@dillinghammurphy.com)  
Dillingham & Murphy, LLP  
225 Bush Street, 6th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94104-4207  
(415) 397-2700  
(415) 397-3300 (fax)

\_\_\_\_\_  
/s/ Long X. Do  
Long X. Do  
Attorney for *Amicus Curiae* California Medical Association