ELECTRONICALLY FILE	D
Superior Court of California,	
County of San Diego	

#### . ... :44 AM

Court sy Clerk

		Superior Court of Califor County of San Dieg			
		02/28/2019 at 10:39:			
1	BRIGGS LAW CORPORATION [FILE: 1593.65]	Clerk of the Superior C By Regina Chanez,Deputy			
2	Cory J. Briggs (State Bar no. 176284) Anthony N. Kim (State Bar no. 283353)				
3	99 East "C" Street, Suite 111 Upland, CA 91786				
4	Telephone: 909-949-7115 Fax: 909-949-7121				
5	Attorneys for Plaintiff and Petitioner San Diegans for	pr			
6	Open Government				
7					
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE	STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
9	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO	- CENTRAL DIVISION			
10		37-2019-00011410-CU-MC-CTL			
11	SAN DIEGANS FOR OPEN GOVERNMENT,	CASE NO			
12	Plaintiff and Petitioner,	VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE			
13	vs.	RELIEF AND PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE UNDER THE CALIFORNIA			
14	CITY OF SAN DIEGO; and DOES 1 through 100,	PUBLIC RECORDS ACT AND OTHER LAWS			
15	Defendants and Respondents.				
16					
17					
18	Plaintiff and Petitioner SAN DIEGANS FO	R OPEN GOVERNMENT ("SDOG") alleges as			
19	follows:				
20	Introductory	Statement			
21	1. SDOG brings this lawsuit under the C	California Public Records Act ("CPRA"), as well			
22	as the California Constitution, the common law, and	l other applicable legal authorities. SDOG made			
23	a lawful CPRA request to Defendants/Respondent	s, but they have illegally failed to disclose the			
24	responsive public records.				
25	Parti	es			
26	2. SDOG is a non-profit organization fo	rmed and operating under the laws of the State of			
27	California. One of its primary roles as a governme	ent "watchdog" is ensuring that public agencies			
28	comply with all applicable laws aimed at promoting transparency and accountability in government.				

Defendant and Respondent CITY OF SAN DIEGO ("CITY") is a "local agency" within 3. 1 2 the meaning of Government Code Section 6252.

3

4. The true names and capacities of the Defendants/Respondents identified as DOES 1 through 100 are unknown to SDOG, who will seek the Court's permission to amend this pleading in 4 5 order to allege the true names and capacities as soon as they are ascertained. SDOG is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that each of the fictitiously named Defendants/Respondents 1 through 6 7 100 has jurisdiction by law over one or more aspects of the public records that are the subject of this 8 lawsuit or has some other cognizable interest in the public records.

9 5. SDOG is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that, at all times stated in this pleading, each Defendant/Respondent was the agent, servant, or employee of every other 10 Defendant/Respondent and was, in doing the things alleged in this pleading, acting within the scope 11 of said agency, servitude, or employment and with the full knowledge or subsequent ratification of his 12 13 principals, masters, and employers. Alternatively, in doing the things alleged in this pleading, each 14 Defendant/Respondent was acting alone and solely to further his own interests.

15

21

22

#### Jurisdiction and Venue

6. The Court has jurisdiction over this lawsuit pursuant to Government Code Sections 6258 16 17 and 6259; Code of Civil Procedure Sections 526a, 1060 et seq., and 1084 et seq.; the California 18 Constitution, and the common law, among other provisions of law.

19 7. Venue in this Court is proper because the obligations, liabilities, and violations of law alleged in this pleading occurred in the County of San Diego in the State of California. 20

#### FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: Violation of Open-Government Laws (Against All Defendants/Respondents)

8. 23 The preceding allegations in this pleading are fully incorporated into this paragraph. 9. 24 On or about January 17, 2019, SDOG caused to be submitted to CITY a request for 25 certain public records pertaining to the amount of housing built with "in lieu" fees since June 3, 2003.

A true and correct copy of the request is attached to this pleading as Exhibit "A." 26

10. 27 CITY acknowledged receipt of the request, invoked their right to a 14-day extension, 28 and promised to respond by February 8, 2019. They did not respond by their own deadline.

1 11. On or about February 21, 2019, SDOG reminded CITY in writing that it had missed its
 2 own promised deadline for a response. SDOG asked: "How much longer for responsive records?" As
 3 of the filing of this pleading, SDOG is unaware of any response and has not received the responsive
 4 public records.

5

12. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and on that basis alleges as follows:

A. CITY did not do a thorough search for all public records responsive to
PLAINTIFF's request, including but not limited to failing to search for responsive public records
maintained on the personal accounts and/or devices of public officials. By way of example and not
limitation, CITY has never provided SDOG with any affidavit or other evidence like that described in *Smith v. City of San Jose*, 2 Cal.5th 608 (2017), to satisfactorily establish that each CITY-affiliated
agent using a personal account and/or device has thoroughly searched for and produced all responsive
public records in and/or on the agent's personal account and/or device.

13

B.

CITY has not produced any public records responsive to SDOG's request.

C. To the extent any of the responsive public records is exempt from disclosure,
CITY did nothing to assist SDOG in submitting a focused and effective request that would enable her
to obtain those responsive records that are not exempt from disclosure.

17 13. SDOG and other members of the public have been harmed as a result of 18 Defendants'/Respondents' failure to produce the public record responsive to SDOG's request. By way 19 of example and not limitation, the legal rights of SDOG and its members to access information 20 concerning the conduct of the people's business is being violated and continues to be violated.

#### SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: Declaratory Relief under Code of Civil Procedure Section 1060 et seq. (Against All Defendants/Respondents)

22 23

21

14. The preceding allegations in this pleading are fully incorporated into this paragraph.

SDOG is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that an actual controversy exists between SDOG, on the one hand, and Defendants/Respondents, on the other hand, concerning their respective rights and duties under the CPRA, the California Constitution, the common law, and other applicable legal authorities. As alleged in this pleading, SDOG contends that at least public record responsive to SDOG's request exists and that Defendants/Respondents are required by law to produce each and every responsive record; whereas Defendants/Respondents dispute SDOG's
 contention.

3 16. SDOG desires a judicial determination and declaration as to whether disclosable public
4 records were unlawfully withheld by Defendants/Respondents and whether they were required by law
5 to produce such records in a timely manner.

#### Prayer

FOR ALL THESE REASONS, SDOG respectfully prays for the following relief against all
Defendants/Respondents (and any and all other parties who may oppose SDOG in this lawsuit) jointly
and severally:

10

6

A. On the First Cause of Action:

A judgment determining or declaring that Defendants/Respondents have not
 promptly and fully complied with the CPRA, the California Constitution, the common law, and/or other
 applicable laws with regard to SDOG's request;

2. A writ of mandate ordering Defendants/Respondents to promptly and fully
comply with the CPRA, the California Constitution, the common law, and all other applicable laws with
regard to SDOG's request; and

Preliminary and permanent injunctive relief directing Defendants/Respondents
 to fully respond to SDOG's request and to permit SDOG to inspect and obtain copies of all responsive
 public records.

20

B.

On the Second Cause of Action:

An order determining and declaring that the failure of Defendants/Respondents
 to disclose all public records responsive to SDOG's request and to permit SDOG to inspect and obtain
 copies of the responsive public records does not comply with the CPRA, the California Constitution,
 the common law, and/or other applicable laws; and

25 2. Preliminary and permanent injunctive relief directing Defendants/Respondents
 26 to respond to and disclose all public records responsive to SDOG's request and to permit SDOG to
 27 inspect and obtain copies of the responsive public records.

28

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF ETC.

1	C. On All Causes of Action:						
2	1. An order providing for the Court's continuing jurisdiction over this lawsuit in						
3	order to ensure that Defendants/Respondents fully comply with the CPRA, the California Constitution,						
4	the common law, and/or other applicable laws;						
5	2. All attorney fees and other legal expenses incurred by SDOG in connection with						
6	this lawsuit; and						
7	3. Any further relief that this Court may deem appropriate.						
8	Date	Date: February 28, 2019. Respectfully submitted,					
9				BRIGGS LAW CORPORATION			
10			By:	/ hai			
11				Cory J. Briggs			
12				Attorneys for Plaintiff and Petitioner San Diegans for Open Government			
13				*			
14							
15							
16							
17							
18							
19 20							
20							
21 22							
22							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

### COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE UNDER THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RECORDS ACT AND OTHER LAWS

Exhibit "A"

# Request #19-263

DPEN

16 of 20 filtered by: Open

8

# As of February 27, 2019, 7:25am Request Visibility: Embargoed -- Will be auto-published 72 hours after closure

# Details

For each unit of housing built, subsidized, or otherwise in any way or to any degree financed by "in lieu" fees received pursuant to Division 13 of Article 2 of Chapter 14 of the San Diego Municipal Code since June 3, 2003, each and every public record that specifies one or more of the following:

(1) The address of the unit.

(2) The number of bedrooms of the unit.

(3) The square footage of the unit.

(4) The date on which a final certificate of occupancy was issued for the unit.

(5) The level of affordability (e.g., low income, very low income, or extremely low income) at which the unit is offered.

(6) The nature of any affordability-related conditions, covenants, or restrictions recorded against the unit.

*Received* January 17, 2019 via web

Departments Development Services

Requester

Cory Briggs

► A cory@briggslawcorp.com

19-497-0021

🚔 Briggs Law Corporation

# Documents

Public (pending)

(none)

Requester (none)

# Staff

Point of Contact Ginger Rodriguez

# Timeline

### External Message

Requester + Staff

How much longer for responsive records? You promised a response by February 8, but you did not respond. Thanks.

February 21, 2019, 12:10pm by the requester

### External Message

Requester + Staff

Mr. Briggs,

We have received your Public Records Act request.

The Development Services Department has to conduct a search for records, examine records, consult with another agency, or compile data in order to determine whether it has disclosable records. Pursuant to Cal. Government Code section 6253(c), City staff need to search for, collect, and appropriately examine a voluminous amount of separate and distinct records that are demanded in a single request. Therefore, the City is taking a 14-day extension in which to conduct this search and examination. We will notify you on or before 02/08/2019 whether the City has disclosable records.

Kind regards.

January 25, 2019, 3:19pm by Ginger Rodriguez, Public Records Administration Coordinator (Staff)

### Department Assignment

Public

Added: Development Services.

January 17, 2019, 4:56pm by Angela Laurita, Public Records Administration Manager

### External Message

Requester + Staff

Please be advised that City staff have received your CPRA request. Within the next 10 days, we will determine whether your request seeks copies of disclosable records in the City's possession or whether the City will require an extension.

January 17, 2019, 3:40pm

# **Request Opened**

Request received via web January 17, 2019, 3:40pm

.

Public

	VERIFICATION	
	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF San Diego	
	I have read the foregoing COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY, INJUNCTIVE, AND OTHE	
	RELIEF AND PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE etc.	and know its contents.
	<b>X</b> CHECK APPLICABLE PARAGRAPH	
	I am a party to this action. The matters stated in the foregoing document are true of my own I	
×	those matters which are stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe the Lam $\mathbb{F}^{2}$ or $\mathbb{O}^{2}$	
<u> </u>	I am 😰 an Officer 🗆 a partner 🗆 a of San D Government	legans for Open
	a party to this action, and am authorized to make this verification for and on its behalf, and I make t reason. I am informed and believe and on that ground allege that the matters stated in the f true. The matters stated in the foregoing document are true of my own knowledge except as are stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true. I am one of the attorneys for a party to this action. Such party is absent from the county of aforesaid where such attorneys have t this verification for and on behalf of that party for that reason. I am informed and believe and on that	to those matters which heir offices, and I make
	matters stated in the foregoing document are true.	
	Executed on February 28, 20, 19, at San Diego I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and	, California.
	Pedro Quiroz, Jr. Type or Print Name PROOF OF SERVICE	S
	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF	
	I am employed in the county of I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is,	, State of California.
	I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is,	
	On, 20, I served the foregoing document described as	
		in this action
	by placing the true copies thereof enclosed in scaled envelopes addressed as stated on the attached matches by placing $\Box$ the original $\Box$ a true copy thereof enclosed in scaled envelopes addressed as follows:	
	BY MAIL	
	* I deposited such envelope in the mail at	, California.
	The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid.	
	As follows I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correctly dependent with US mostly approach that some day with masters that	
	Under that practice it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day with postage th	• - •
	California in the ordinary course of business. I am awar party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more the deposit for mailing in affidavit.	
,	Executed on, 20, at	, California.
$\Box$	Executed on ,20 , at **(BY PERSONAL SERVICE) I delivered such envelope by hand to the offices of the addressed	
_	Executed on , 20 , at , 20 , at (State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above	, California.
	<ul> <li>(State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose dimade.</li> </ul>	
	Type or Print Name Signa	ature

\* (By MAIL SIGNATURE MUST BE OF PERSON DEPOSITING ENVELOPE IN MAIL SLOT. BOX. OR BAG) \*\*(FOR PERSONAL SERVICE SIGNATURE MUST BE THAT OF MESSENGER)