

## Abstract

This bachelor thesis addresses the issue of a landmark case from 2008 which dealt with the city's gun ban and in which for the first time in the history of the Second Amendment was decided in favor of an individual right to bear arms, specifically for the purpose of self-defense. The Second Amendment to the United States Constitution reads "A well regulated Militia, being necessary to the security of a free State, the right of the people to keep and bear Arms, shall not be infringed." There are two possible ways to interpret this amendment. One side of the argument maintains that the Second Amendment guarantees an individual right to bear arms. The other maintains that it guarantees a right to bear arms just in connection with militia. NRA, one of the most powerful lobby groups in the USA, promotes the individual right to bear arms. As a part of my thesis I analyze methods of NRA's lobbying. The thesis examines to what extent did the Supreme Court of the United States and its justices copy thoughts of the NRA in this case. The goal of this thesis is to show similarity between the NRA's and Court's arguments with the help of long-term views and opinions of this organization that can be seen in the Amicus Curiae Brief. According to my analysis, the NRA is not the reason the case was born. However, without its long-term campaign there would not be any such case and the Court would surely not have decided in favor of Heller. The argumentation of the Supreme Court was very similar to that of the NRA. The NRA had influence over the decision in the case *D.C. v. Heller*.