1 2 3 4 5 6	BRIGGS LAW CORPORATION [FILE: 2060.05] Cory J. Briggs (SBN 176284) Janna M. Ferraro (SBN 328921) 99 East "C" Street, Suite 111 Upland, CA 91786 Telephone: 909-949-7115 Attorney for Plaintiff and Petitioner Project for Open Government	ELECTRONICALLY FILED Superior Court of California, County of San Diego 07/15/2022 at 11:25:26 AM Clerk of the Superior Court By Melinda McClure, Deputy Clerk	
0	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA		
8	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO – HALL OF JUSTICE		
9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	PROJECT FOR OPEN GOVERNMENT, Plaintiff and Petitioner, vs. CITY OF SAN DIEGO; and DOES 1 through 100, Defendants and Respondents.	CASE NO. 37-2022-00028202-CU-MC-CTL VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE UNDER THE CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RECORDS ACT AND OTHER LAWS	
17	Plaintiff and Petitioner PROJECT FOR OPE	N GOVERNMENT ("PLAINTIFF") alleges as	
18	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
19			
20	·		
21			
22			
23			
24	, , , , ,		
25			
26			
27	of California. It serves as a government "watchdog" for purposes of making sure that public agencies		
28	and officials are transparent in their conduct, accountable for their conduct, and conform their conduct		

to all applicable legal requirements. At least one of PLAINTIFF's members resides in and pays taxes in the City of San Diego.

- 3. Defendant and Respondent CITY OF SAN DIEGO ("CITY") is a "local agency" within the meaning of Government Code Section 6252.
- 4. The true names and capacities of the Defendants/Respondents identified as DOES 1 through 100 are unknown to PLAINTIFF, who will seek the Court's permission to amend this pleading in order to allege the true names and capacities as soon as they are ascertained. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that each of the fictitiously named Defendants/Respondents 1 through 100 has jurisdiction by law over one or more aspects of the public records that are the subject of this lawsuit or has some other cognizable interest in the public records.
- 5. PLAINTIFF 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 Defendant/Respondent and was, in doing the things alleged in this pleading, acting within the scope of said agency, servitude, or employment and with the full knowledge or subsequent ratification of his/her/its principals, masters, and employers. Alternatively, in doing the things alleged in this pleading, each Defendant/Respondent was acting alone and solely to further his/her/its own interests.

Jurisdiction and Venue

- 6. The Court has jurisdiction over this lawsuit pursuant to Government Code Sections 6258 and 6259; Code of Civil Procedure Sections 526a, 1060 *et seq.*, and 1084 *et seq.*; the California Constitution, and the San Diego City Charter, among other provisions of law.
- 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.

Legal Background

- 8. At all times relevant to this lawsuit, Government Code Section 6253 has provided as follows:
 - (a) Public records are open to inspection at all times during the office hours of the state or local agency and every person has a right to inspect any public record, except as hereafter provided. Any reasonably segregable portion of a record shall be available for inspection by any person requesting the record after deletion of the portions that are exempted by law.

2

3

4

- (b) Except with respect to public records exempt from disclosure by express provisions of law, each state or local agency, upon a request for a copy of records that reasonably describes an identifiable record or records, shall make the records promptly available to any person upon payment of fees covering direct costs of duplication, or a statutory fee if applicable. Upon request, an exact copy shall be provided unless impracticable to do so.
- (c) Each agency, upon a request for a copy of records, shall, within 10 days from receipt of the request, determine whether the request, in whole or in part, seeks copies of disclosable public records in the possession of the agency and shall promptly notify the person making the request of the determination and the reasons therefor. In unusual circumstances, the time limit prescribed in this section may be extended by written notice by the head of the agency or their designee to the person making the request, setting forth the reasons for the extension and the date on which a determination is expected to be dispatched. No notice shall specify a date that would result in an extension for more than 14 days. When the agency dispatches the determination, and if the agency determines that the request seeks disclosable public records, the agency shall state the estimated date and time when the records will be made available. As used in this section, "unusual circumstances" means the following, but only to the extent reasonably necessary to the proper processing of the particular request:
- (1) The need to search for and collect the requested records from field facilities or other establishments that are separate from the office processing the request.
- (2) The need to search for, collect, and appropriately examine a voluminous amount of separate and distinct records that are demanded in a single request.
- (3) The need for consultation, which shall be conducted with all practicable speed, with another agency having substantial interest in the determination of the request or among two or more components of the agency having substantial subject matter interest therein.
- (4) The need to compile data, to write programming language or a computer program, or to construct a computer report to extract data.
- (d) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed to permit an agency to delay or obstruct the inspection or copying of public records.
- (1) A requester who inspects a disclosable record on the premises of the agency has the right to use the requester's equipment on those premises, without being charged any fees or costs, to photograph or otherwise copy or reproduce the record in a manner that does not require the equipment to make physical contact with the record, unless the means of copy or reproduction would result in either of the following:
 - (A) Damage to the record.
- (B) Unauthorized access to the agency's computer systems or secured networks by using software, equipment, or any other

technology capable of accessing, altering, or compromising the agency's electronic records.

- (2) The agency may impose any reasonable limits on the use of the requester's equipment that are necessary to protect the safety of the records or to prevent the copying of records from being an unreasonable burden to the orderly function of the agency and its employees. In addition, the agency may impose any limit that is necessary to maintain the integrity of, or ensure the long-term preservation of, historic or high-value records.
- (3) The notification of denial of any request for records required by Section 6255 shall set forth the names and titles or positions of each person responsible for the denial.
- (e) Except as otherwise prohibited by law, a state or local agency may adopt requirements for itself that allow for faster, more efficient, or greater access to records than prescribed by the minimum standards set forth in this chapter.
- (f) In addition to maintaining public records for public inspection during the office hours of the public agency, a public agency may comply with subdivision (a) by posting any public record on its internet website and, in response to a request for a public record posted on the internet website, directing a member of the public to the location on the internet website where the public record is posted. However, if after the public agency directs a member of the public to the internet website, the member of the public requesting the public record requests a copy of the public record due to an inability to access or reproduce the public record from the internet website, the public agency shall promptly provide a copy of the public record pursuant to subdivision (b).
- 9. At all times relevant to this lawsuit, San Diego City Charter Section 215 has provided as follows: "All books, records and accounts of every office and Department of the City shall be open to inspection by any citizen at all reasonable times and under reasonable regulations established by the Council, except such records and documents the disclosure of which would tend to defeat the lawful purpose which they are intended to accomplish."
- 10. At all times relevant to this lawsuit, San Diego City Charter Section 216 has provided as follows: "Copies or extracts, duly certified, from said books and records open for inspection, shall be given by the officer having the same in custody to any person demanding the same who shall be charged for such copies or extracts, and for certification, the charge to be fixed by the Council."
- 11. At all times relevant to this lawsuit, Section 5.2.3 of San Diego Administrative Regulation 95.21 has provided as follows: "*Departments* may not delay a response to a *Request* due to staffing levels or staff absences. If the *PRA Liaison* is out of the office during the time in which the City

must respond to a *Request*, the Department must have a backup for the PRA *Liaison* to work on the *Request* to ensure that all deadlines are met."

12. At all times relevant to this lawsuit, Section 5.4 (labeled "Ten-Day Response to Requestor for *Mayoral Departments*") of San Diego Administrative Regulation 95.21 has provided as follows:

Within 10 calendar days of the City's receipt of the *Request*, *PRA Program* staff must respond to the requester on behalf of the City. If the tenth calendar day after receipt falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the ten-day initial response must be sent on the previous Friday. If the tenth calendar day after receipt falls on a City holiday, the ten-day response must be sent no later than the day after the holiday. *PRA Program* staff serve as the point of contact for the requester throughout the timeline of the *Request*.

- 5.4.1. The ten-day response must contain the estimated date and time upon which the disclosable *Public Records* will be made available.
- 5.4.2. If all responsive *Public Records* are located and provided by the tenth day, or if the ten-day response states that no responsive *Public Records* exist, the *Request* can be closed.
- 5.4.3. The ten-day response does not require the actual disclosure of *Public Records*. Rather, responsive non-*Exempt* records must be promptly disclosed following a reasonable search and review of the records for exemptions.
- 5.4.4. In unusual circumstances, as specified below, *PRA Program* staff may extend the ten-day requirement by written notice to the requester setting forth the reasons for the extension and the date on which a determination as to whether the request in whole or in part seeks copies of disclosable public records will be made. The notice must specify a date that is within 14 calendar days of the notice. If the determination is that responsive non-exempt records exist, then the estimated date of disclosure must be provided to the requestor. It is the responsibility of the PRA Liaisons for the assigned department(s) to provide this determination to the PRA Program prior to the conclusion of the 14-day extension period.

Unusual circumstances means one or more of the following:

- a. Location. The need to search for and collect the requested *Public Records* from multiple City facilities or other establishments that are separate from the office or *Department* processing the *Request*.
- b. Volume. The need to search for, collect, and appropriately examine a voluminous amount of separate and distinct *Public Records* that are requested in a single *Request*.
- c. Multiple Agencies. The need for consultation, which shall be conducted with all practicable speed, with another agency having a substantial interest in the determination of the *Request*.

13. At all times relevant to this lawsuit, Section 5.9 (labeled "Procedure for *Independent Departments*") of San Diego Administrative Regulation 95.21 has provided as follows:

5.9.1. Ten-Day Response

Within 10 calendar days of the City's receipt of the *Request*, the *PRA Liaison* must respond to the requester on behalf of the City. If the tenth calendar day after receipt falls on a Saturday or Sunday, the ten-day initial response must be sent on the previous Friday. If the tenth calendar day after receipt falls on a City holiday, the ten-day response must be sent no later than the day after the holiday. The *PRA Liaison* serves as the *Department* point of contact for the requester throughout the timeline of the *Request*. [¶] See sections 5.4.1, 5.4.4 for Ten-Day Response requirements.

Factual Background

- 14. Defendants/Respondents encourage anyone interested in inspecting and/or obtaining copies of public records to submit his/her/its request through an online "NextRequest" platform located (as of the time of this lawsuit's commencement) at "http://sandiego.nextrequest.com." That platform's home page states in part: "Use of the NextRequest platform is intended to facilitate public access to public records. Official records are held by City departments and the Clerk pursuant to governing document retention schedules."
- 15. When a request is submitted through the NextRequest platform, a unique online file is opened for the request, a unique number is automatically assigned to the request, and receipt of the request is acknowledged in a "Timeline" included as part of the online file.
- 16. While the online file for a request is open, Defendants'/Respondents' communications with the person making the request and any responses thereto through the portal are posted in the "Timeline." Nobody other than the person making the request can see these communications until Defendants/Respondents close the file for the request and it is formally "published" for public view (minus the contact information for the person making the request) a few days after being closed.
- 17. Defendants/Respondents have a pattern and practice of not working diligently to locate and disclose all public records responsive to requests. Instead, Defendants/Respondents issue periodic progress updates approximately every two weeks similar in substance to this one: "The City is in the process of reviewing other potentially responsive records. We expect to provide an update by end of business on July 1. We reserve the right to withhold and/or redact any records or information that

20

25

26

27

28

may be exempt from disclosure under the Public Records Act, and/or other applicable legal privileges including, but not limited to, attorney work product and attorney client privileges." Sometimes the updates will promise the disclosure of responsive records on a rolling basis: "To update you on the status of your request, City staff continue to review potentially responsive records. We expect to provide you with an update by the end of business on July 27, and will continue providing disclosable records on a rolling basis as soon as they become available." For the most part, these updates are false, are known to be false when made, and amount to nothing more than a stall tactic.

- 18. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and on that basis alleges as follows:
- A. It is not uncommon for Defendants/Respondents to issue such false periodic updates for months at a time, and sometimes for more than a year, without a single record being produced, without any significant effort to determine whether responsive records exist, and/or without any significant effort to review responsive records for applicable exemptions and disclose non-exempt responsive records.
- B. At any given time over the last 18 months, there have been dozens and possibly hundreds of open requests for which Defendants/Respondents issue false periodic updates for extended periods of time without a single record being produced, without any significant effort to determine whether responsive records exist, and/or without any significant effort to review responsive records for applicable exemptions and disclose non-exempt responsive records.
 - C. Such lethargy in responding to requests for public records is intentional.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: Violation of Public-Records Laws (Against All Defendants/Respondents)

- 19. The preceding allegations in this pleading are fully incorporated into this paragraph.
- 20. Defendants/Respondents have a pattern and practice of delaying the disclosure of public records responsive to requests. It is possible for Defendants/Respondents to make full or substantially full disclosure of all requested public records within a reasonable period of time.
- 21. Defendants'/Respondents' lethargy in responding to requests for public records violates various laws. By way of example and not limitation:

- A. Such lethargy violates the CPRA's mandate that responsive public records be identified not more than 10 to 24 days after the request is received and an estimated date for disclosure be given, that responsive records be made available for inspection at all times during Defendants'/Respondents' normal business hours, and that copies of responsive records be made promptly available. It further violates the CPRA's prohibition against delay and obstruction in the disclosure of responsive records.
- B. Such lethargy violates the San Diego City Charter's requirement that all public records be open to inspection at all reasonable times and that copies of records responsive to a request be given to any person demanding them.
- C. Such lethargy violates San Diego Administrative Regulation 95.21's mandate that responsive public records be disclosed promptly after a reasonable search and review of the records for any applicable exemptions.
- 22. PLAINTIFF, its members, and other members of the public are injured as a result of Defendants'/Respondents' failure to promptly locate and disclose all responsive public records. Among other things, they are unable to adequately monitor Defendants'/Respondents' conduct of public business and are thus impaired in their ability to identify and correct improper governmental action.

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

- 23. The preceding allegations in this pleading are fully incorporated into this paragraph.
- 24. PLAINTIFF is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that an actual controversy exists between PLAINTIFF and similarly situated persons, on the one hand, and Defendants/Respondents, on the other hand, concerning their respective rights and duties under the CPRA, the California Constitution, the San Diego City Charter, and other applicable public-records laws. As alleged in this pleading, PLAINTIFF contends that Defendants/Respondents failed to comply promptly and in full with each of the applicable public-records laws as set forth in the preceding causes of action; whereas Defendants/Respondents dispute PLAINTIFF's contention.
- 25. PLAINTIFF desires a judicial determination and declaration as to whether Defendants/ Respondents are fully and promptly complying with all applicable public-records laws.

6 7

5

9

10

8

1112

1314

15

17

16

18

1920

21

23

22

2425

26

27

28

Prayer

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

- A. A judgment determining or declaring that Defendants/Respondents are not fully and promptly complying with all applicable-public records laws.
- B. A writ of mandate ordering Defendants/Respondents to fully and promptly comply with all applicable public-records laws.
- C. Preliminary and permanent injunctive relief directing Defendants/Respondents to fully and promptly respond to all public-records requests that they receive to the extent they did not do so prior to a determination on the merits of this lawsuit.
- D. An order providing for the Court's continuing jurisdiction over this lawsuit in order to ensure that Defendants/Respondents fully and promptly comply with all applicable public-records laws.
- E. All attorney fees and other legal expenses incurred by PLAINTIFF in connection with this lawsuit.
 - F. Any further relief that this Court may deem appropriate.

Dated: July 14, 2022.

Respectfully submitted,

BRIGGS LAW CORPORATION

By: Cory L Br

Cory J. Briggs

Attorney for Plaintiff and Petitioner Project for Open Government

VERIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF San Diego

	Thave read the foregoing COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND PR		
		w its contents.	
	X CHECK APPLICABLE PARAGRAPH		
	I am a party to this action. The matters stated in the foregoing document are true of my own knowledge except as to		
	those matters which are stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true.		
×	I am 🗷 an Officer 🗌 a partner 🗆 a of		
	PROJECT FOR OPEN GOVERNMENT	·	
	a party to this action, and am authorized to make this verification for and on its behalf, and I make this verification for and on its behalf, and I make this verification for and on its behalf, and I make this verification for and on its behalf, and I make this verification for and on its behalf, and I make this verification for and on its behalf, and I make this verification for and on its behalf, and I make this verification for and on its behalf, and I make this verification for an its behalf, and I make this verification for an its behalf, and I make this verification for an its behalf, and I make this verification for an its behalf, and I make this verification for an its behalf, and I make this verification for an its behalf, and I make this verification for an its behalf, and I make this verification for an its behalf, and I make this verification for an its behalf, and I make this verification for an its behalf.	cation for that	
	reason. I I am informed and believe and on that ground allege that the matters stated in the foregoing		
	true. The matters stated in the foregoing document are true of my own knowledge except as to those	maners winch	
\Box	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 their offic		
	this verification for and on behalf of that party for that reason. I am informed and believe and on that ground	allege that the	
	matters stated in the foregoing document are true.		
	Executed on July 14 . 20 22 , at San Diego	, California.	
	Executed on July 14 , 20 22 , at San Diego I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct	<u> </u>	
	and the state of control of perjury under the laws of the state of camornia that the foregoing is that and control		
	Mat Wahlstrom		
	Type or Print Name Signature		
	PROOF OF SERVICE		
	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF		
	I am employed in the county of , State	of California.	
	I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is,		
	and over the age of No and not a party to the William decision, my observed address is,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
	O 70 T 14 C 1 1 1 1		
	On, 20, I served the foregoing document described as		
	on	in this action	
	by placing the true copies thereof enclosed in scaled envelopes addressed as stated on the attached mailing list:		
П	by placing \square the original \square a true copy thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed as follows:		
ш	by placing in the original in a true copy thereof enclosed in sealed 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 corresponden	ce for mailing	
	Under that practice it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day with postage thereon fi		
	California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on		
	party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one date	ry after date of	
	deposit for mailing in affidavit.		
	Executed on , 20 , at	, California.	
	Executed on , 20 , at **(BY PERSONAL SERVICE) I delivered such envelope by hand to the offices of the addressee.	-	
		, California.	
	Executed on, 20, at	and correct I	
H			
	(Federal) declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the	ie service was	
	made.		
	The price of the second		
	Type or Print Name Signature	OCITINO ENVEYORE "	
	* (By MAIL SIGNATURE MUST BE OF PERSON DEP	OSTHING ENVELOPE IN	

MAIL SLOT. BOX. OR BAG)
***(FOR PERSONAL SERVICE SIGNATURE MUST BE THAT OF MESSENGER)
...
2001 © American LegalNet, Inc.