1 2	THE SUTTON LAW FIRM, PC James R. Sutton (State Bar No. 135930) Bradley W. Hertz (State Bar No. 138564)	<b>ELECTRONICALLY FILED</b> Superior Court of California, County of San Diego	
3	Catherine E. Crane (State Bar No. 306495) 150 Post Street, Suite 405	04/07/2023 at 02:38:11 PM Clerk of the Superior Court	
4	San Francisco, CA 94108 Tel: (415) 732-7700	By Marfil Estrada, Deputy Clerk	
5	Fax: (415) 732-7701 jsutton@campaignlawyers.com		
6	<u>bhertz@campaignlawyers.com</u> ccrane@campaignlawyers.com		
7	Attorneys for Petitioners and Plaintiffs		
8 9	SAN DIEGO PUBLIC LIBRARY FOUNDA	ATION	
10		IE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
11			
12	FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO		
13	UNLIVITED J	JURISDICTION	
14	SAN DIEGO PUBLIC LIBRARY FOUNDATION and SAN DIEGO	Case No. 37-2023-00014954-CU-WM-CTL	
15	PARKS FOUNDATION,	VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE AND COMPLAINT	
16	Petitioners and Plaintiffs,	FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF	
17	V.		
18 19	DIANA FUENTES, in her capacity as	(California Code of Civil Procedure sections 1085, 526 and 1060, et seq.)	
20	SAN DIEGO INTERIM CITY CLERK; CYNTHIA PAES, in her capacity as		
20	SAN DIEGO COUNTY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS; and DOES 1 through 25,		
22	inclusive,		
23	Respondents and Defendants.		
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE AND CO	MPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF	

Petitioners and Plaintiffs SAN DIEGO PUBLIC LIBRARY FOUNDATION and
 SAN DIEGO PARKS FOUNDATION ("Petitioners") hereby seek from this Court a
 peremptory writ of mandate, injunctive relief, and declaratory relief directed to
 Respondents and Defendants DIANA FUENTES, in her capacity as SAN DIEGO
 INTERIM CITY CLERK (the "City Clerk"); CYNTHIA PAES, in her capacity as SAN
 DIEGO COUNTY REGISTRAR OF VOTERS (the "Registrar"); and DOES 1 through
 25, inclusive, and allege as follows:

#### **INTRODUCTION**

8

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

9 1. Petitioners bring this action as a result of Respondents' inaccurate and
10 legally unjustified determination that the citizens' initiative petition for the "Libraries
11 and Parks Improvement Act" (the "Initiative") does not contain enough valid signatures
12 of City of San Diego (the "City") voters to qualify for the ballot.

2. Petitioners, as the Initiative's official proponents, seek to present to the
voters of the City of San Diego a parcel tax in 2024 to provide much-needed ongoing
financial support to the City's libraries and parks.

3. In support of the Initiative effort, between July and December 2022,
Petitioners oversaw the gathering of, upon information and belief, more than 82,566
valid signatures of City voters. On or about December 15, 2022, Petitioners submitted
approximately 111,189 signatures to the City Clerk, and the Registrar was tasked with
reviewing the signatures to determine their sufficiency.

4. The Registrar selected a three percent random sample of signatures, as permitted by law, and reviewed 3,336 of the 111,189 signatures that had been submitted. On or about January 24, 2023, the Registrar concluded that only 2,201 of the 3,336 random sample signatures were valid, 1,135 were invalid, and that therefore the Initiative petition was projected to contain 72,285 valid signatures and thus failed to qualify for the ballot. The Registrar also concluded that because the Initiative petition failed to contain at least 78,438 valid signatures, it also failed to qualify for a "full count" of signatures to determine if it in fact contained the required number of valid signatures.

VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE AND COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF

2	Registrar's s	signatu	
			re determinations and concluded that the Registrar made numerous
3	legal and fac	legal and factual errors and that judicial relief is required to protect Petitioners, the	
4	voters, and the integrity of the initiative process.		egrity of the initiative process.
5	6.	The F	Registrar's legal and factual errors include, but are not limited to:
6		A)	Determining that 82,566 valid signatures (or ten percent of the 2020
7			General Election registered voters) are required, when in actuality,
8			upon information and belief, 80,020 valid signatures (or ten percent
9			of the 2022 General Election registered voters) are required.
10		B)	Invalidating approximately 125 signatures on the grounds that
11			voters' addresses as written on the Initiative petition were different
12			from the addresses as contained in the voters' registration records,
13			when in actuality the voters' street name was either slightly
14			misspelled or merely difficult to read (e.g., "Louisiania" Street
15			instead of "Louisiana" Street) or the voters used an imperfect U.S.
16			Postal Service abbreviation of their street names (e.g., for
17			"Mountain," using "Mt." instead of "Mtn.").
18		C)	Invalidating more than 150 signatures on the grounds that there were
19			discrepancies between the dates that petition circulators placed on
20			the petition and the dates that petition signers placed on the petition
21			(e.g., writing one's birthday instead of the day they signed the
22			petition).
23		D)	Determining that voters were required to affix a date next to their
24			signatures on the Initiative petition;
25		E)	Invalidating more than 20 signatures on the grounds that there were
26			discrepancies between the dates that petition signers placed on the
27			petition and the dates that they re-registered to vote at a different
28			address (e.g., moving to a new residence and re-registering to vote at
	VERIFIED	PETITION	N FOR WRIT OF MANDATE AND COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF

I

I

1		that new address, but then listing their old address on the petition the
2		very next day).
3	F)	Invalidating nearly 20 signatures on the grounds that there were
4		discrepancies between the signatures on the Initiative petition and
5		the signatures on the voters' registration records.
6	G)	Failing to take into account that electronic signatures, such as those
7		obtained from voters on electronic screens at the Department of
8		Motor Vehicles, can appear not to match signatures obtained from
9		voters on paper.
10	H)	Failing to validate certain signatures that had previously been
11		invalidated, even after admitting that such signatures should not been
12		invalidated.
13	I)	Applying overly strict and legally unsupported criteria to several
14		other categories of signatures, thus tainting the entire signature
15		review process.
16	J)	Depriving Petitioners, their supporters, voters, petition signers, and
17		others of their constitutional rights under the United States and
18		California Constitutions.
10	7. Acco	ordingly, Petitioners seek this Court's issuance of a writ of
20	mandate, an injune	ction, and a declaration, as prayed for herein, that would require the
20	Registrar to review	w the petition signatures again based on criteria established pursuant to
21	this litigation.	
		PARTIES
23	8. Petiti	ioner and Plaintiff SAN DIEGO PUBLIC LIBRARY FOUNDATION
24	(the "Library Four	ndation") is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization dedicated to supporting
25	library efforts to h	elp San Diegans learn new skills, pursue lifelong ambitions, and
26	achieve a better lit	fe with the help of dedicated staff, committed volunteers, and generous
27	donors and partner	rs. The Library Foundation strengthens communities by supporting
28	VERIFIED PETITIO	N FOR WRIT OF MANDATE AND COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF
	VERI IED I ETITIO	4

excellence in the San Diego Public Library system through philanthropy, advocacy and
 outreach. The Library Foundation is a catalyst for creating stronger communities
 through investment in the San Diego Public Library system - where access to resources
 supporting literacy, work readiness, and lifelong learning ensure equal opportunities for
 success.

6

7

8

9. The Library Foundation is based in the City of San Diego and County of San Diego, is one of the official proponents of the Initiative, is beneficially interested in this matter, and has standing to bring this action.

10. Petitioner and Plaintiff SAN DIEGO PARKS FOUNDATION (the "Parks 9 Foundation") is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization dedicated to improving the quality of 10 life of communities throughout the City of San Diego through equitable investments in 11 parks, greenspace, and recreational opportunities. The Parks Foundation was established 12 to provide critical support to the City of San Diego's Parks and Recreation Department. 13 The Parks Foundation secures funds from private and public supporters to address Parks 14 and Recreation's funding gaps in programming and maintenance of neighborhood parks 15 as well as implement projects directly. This support helps foster community health and 16 connection by providing opportunities for exercise, spending time in nature, social 17 interaction, and accessing resources. 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

11. The Parks Foundation is based in the City of San Diego and County of San Diego, is one of the official proponents of the Initiative, is beneficially interested in this matter, and has standing to bring this action.

12. Respondent and Defendant DIANA FUENTES is the Interim Clerk of the City of San Diego, and is charged by law with overseeing the initiative process in the City of San Diego, including reviewing, or contracting with the San Diego County Registrar of Voters to review, initiative petitions to determine whether they contain a sufficient number of valid signatures to qualify for the ballot.

1 13. Respondent and Defendant CYNTHIA PAES is the San Diego County
 2 Registrar of Voters, and is charged by law with overseeing the initiative process in the
 3 City of San Diego, including, when retained by a city within the county to review
 4 initiative petitions, to determine whether they contain a sufficient number of valid
 5 signatures to qualify for the ballot.

14. Doe Respondents and Defendants 1 through 25, inclusive, are, upon 6 information and belief, responsible for some of the legal violations alleged herein. The 7 true names and capacities of the Doe Respondents and Defendants are unknown to 8 Petitioners at the present time. The Doe Respondents and Defendants were, at all 9 relevant times, the agents or employees of some of the named Respondents and 10 Defendants and were acting in the course and scope of such agency or employment. 11 When Petitioners ascertain the names and capacities of the Doe Respondents and 12 Defendants, they will amend this Writ Petition/Complaint to insert such names in place 13 of the Doe names. 14

#### JURISDICTION AND VENUE

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

15. This Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to CCP sections 1085, 526 and 1060, et seq. Venue is proper in the San Diego County Superior Court because the parties are conducting business in, and the acts complained of which are the subject of this action occurred in, San Diego County, California.

# FACTUAL BACKGROUND

16. In November of 2021, Petitioners formed a political committee known as "Libraries and Parks for All, Sponsored by The San Diego Public Library Foundation and The San Diego Parks Foundation" for the purpose of placing a libraries and parks parcel tax initiative on the 2024 San Diego City ballot.

17. After fulfilling the numerous legal obligations that initiative proponents must undertake prior to collecting signatures on a petition, on or about July 9, 2022Petitioners began circulating the petition throughout the City so as to obtain the requisite number of signatures to qualify the Initiative for the ballot.

VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE AND COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF

1 18. The City Clerk informed Petitioners that they would have until December
 2 15, 2022 to collect at least 82,566 valid signatures in order to qualify the Initiative for the
 3 ballot. This number was derived by calculating ten percent of the 825,660 registered
 4 voters in the City as of the last general City election, which was November 3, 2020.

5

6

7

19. On December 15, 2022, Petitioners submitted the Initiative petition to the Registrar, with whom the City Clerk had contracted to review and verify petition signatures. The Registrar determined that the petition contained 111,189 signatures.

20. The Registrar selected a three percent random sample of signatures and
reviewed 3,336 of the 111,189 signatures that had been submitted.

21. On or about January 12, 2023, Petitioners transmitted a letter to the City 10 Clerk to seek clarification as to the amount of signatures required for the Initiative 11 petition to qualify for the ballot. Petitioners' letter noted that San Diego Municipal Code 12 section 27.1020(c)(2) refers to the "last general City election" as the election which the 13 City Clerk must use to tabulate the amount of signatures required in order for an 14 initiative to qualify for the ballot. The letter continued that since the petition signatures 15 had been submitted on December 15, 2022, the "last general City election," and thus the 16 election to be used to calculate the required number of signatures, must be the November 17 8, 2022 election, and not the 2020 general City election. 18

22. On or about January 13, 2023, the City Clerk responded to Petitioners' letter
and informed them that she had consulted with the San Diego City Attorney and that
based thereon she would be unable to change her decision about which election was the
proper one to use. The City Clerk therefore continued to base her signature requirement
calculations on the 2020 general City election and not the 2022 election.

23. On or about January 24, 2023, the Registrar determined that only 2,201 of the 3,336 random sample signatures were valid, 1,135 were invalid, and that therefore the Initiative petition was projected to contain 72,285 valid signatures and thus failed to qualify for the ballot. The Registrar also concluded that because the Initiative petition

28

24

25

26

27

failed to contain at least 78,438 valid signatures, it also failed to qualify for a "full count" of signatures to determine if it in fact contained the required number of valid signatures.

24. On or about January 27, 2023, Petitioners asked the Registrar and the City Clerk for more information about the 1,135 random sample signatures that the Registrar deemed invalid. That same day, the City Clerk provided Petitioners with a document entitled "Petition Statistics," which had been prepared by the Registrar and which set forth thirteen reasons why signatures were deemed insufficient. These included allegedly mismatched voter addresses, signature dates, circulation dates, voter registration dates. and signatures.

Also on January 27, 2023, Petitioners requested, pursuant to California
 Government Code section 7924.110, that the Registrar and City Clerk permit Petitioners
 to review the initiative petition signatures and to determine the grounds upon which the
 Registrar rejected the signatures.

Petitioners' signature review began on or about February 8, 2023 and
 continued through February 15, 2023. During the signature review process, Petitioners
 challenged more than 300 of the Registrar's determinations regarding invalid signatures,
 well over the 185 additional signatures needed for the Initiative to qualify for a "full
 count."

27. On or about February 13, 2023, the City Clerk's office notified Petitioners that the San Diego Municipal Code does not contain a challenge process regarding the signatures and that therefore the notice of insufficiency and any challenges will therefore need to be decided by the courts.

28. Between mid-February and early April 2023, Petitioners and the City (via both the City Clerk and City Attorney) met and conferred multiple times regarding how the various disputes as to invalid signatures might be resolved. Ultimately, there was no resolution, and thus Petitioners began preparing this writ petition/complaint.

1	FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION	
2	Writ of Mandate (CCP Section 1085, et seq.)	
3	(Against All Respondents and Defendants)	
4	29. Petitioners reallege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations of	
5	paragraphs 1 through 28, inclusive.	
6	30. Pursuant to CCP section 1085:	
7	"A writ of mandate may be issued by any court to any inferior person to	
8	compel the performance of an act which the law specially enjoins, as a duty	
9	resulting from an office, trust, or station "	
10	31. Pursuant to CCP section 1086:	
11	"The writ must be issued in all cases where there is not a plain, speedy, and	
12	adequate remedy, in the ordinary course of law. It must be issued upon the	
13	verified petition of the party beneficially interested."	
14	32. The issuance of a writ of mandate is necessary to enforce Petitioners' rights	
15	in that Petitioners, as beneficially interested parties, are entitled to such a writ and have	
16	no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law by which their rights	
17	can be upheld and Respondents can be compelled to comply with the law.	
18	33. Should the requested writ not issue, irreparable harm will occur in that	
19	Petitioners and others will be deprived of their rights to have the Initiative petition	
20	signatures reviewed in accordance with applicable law and the voters will be deprived of	
20	their rights to vote on a matter of substantial importance.	
21	34. Accordingly, the Court should issue a writ of mandate directing	
	Respondents to verify signatures on the Initiative in accordance with applicable law.	
23	SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION	
24	Injunctive Relief (CCP Section 526, et seq.)	
25	(Against All Respondents and Defendants)	
26	35. Petitioners reallege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations of	
27	paragraphs 1 through 28, inclusive.	
28	VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE AND COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF $\mathbf{Q}$	

1	36. Pursuant to CCP section 526:	
2	"(a) An injunction may be granted in the following cases:	
3	(1) When it appears by the complaint that the plaintiff is entitled to the	
4	relief demanded, and the relief, or any part thereof, consists in restraining the	
5	commission or continuance of the act complained of, either for a limited period or	
6	perpetually	
7	(4) When pecuniary compensation would not afford adequate relief."	
8	37. The issuance of an injunction is necessary to enforce Petitioners' rights	
9	in that Petitioners are entitled to the relief demanded – which consists of restraining the	
10	commission or continuance of the act complained of $-$ and pecuniary compensation will	
11	not afford adequate relief.	
12	38. Should the requested injunctive relief writ not issue, irreparable harm will	
13	occur in that Petitioners and others will be deprived of their rights to have the Initiative	
14	petition signatures reviewed in accordance with applicable law and the voters will be	
15	deprived of their rights to vote on a matter of substantial importance.	
16	39. Accordingly, the Court should issue injunctive relief directing	
17	Respondents to verify signatures on the Initiative in accordance with applicable law.	
18	THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION	
19	Declaratory Relief (CCP Section 1060, et seq.)	
20	(Against All Respondents and Defendants)	
21	40. Petitioners reallege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations of	
22	<ul><li>paragraphs 1 through 28, inclusive.</li><li>41. Pursuant to CCP section 1060, et seq.:</li></ul>	
23	"Any person who desires a declaration of his or her rights or duties with	
24	respect to another may, in cases of actual controversy relating to the legal	
25	rights and duties of the respective parties, bring an original action in the	
26	superior court The court may make a binding declaration of these rights or	
27	duties and the declaration shall have the force of a final judgment."	
28		
	VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE AND COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF $10$	

42. The issuance of declaratory relief is necessary to enforce Petitioners' rights in that Petitioners desire a declaration of their rights or duties with respect to Respondents in this case of actual controversy relating to the legal rights and duties of the respective parties.

43. Petitioners are of the view that Respondents have not fulfilled their legal duties with respect to the verification of signatures on the Initiative petition, and Respondents are of the view that they have fulfilled such duties.

8 44. Should the requested declaratory relief not issue, irreparable harm will
 9 occur in that Petitioners and others will be deprived of their rights to have the Initiative
 10 petition signatures reviewed in accordance with applicable law and the voters will be
 11 deprived of their rights to vote on a matter of substantial importance.

45. Accordingly, the Court should declare that Respondents have not fulfilled
 their legal duties with respect to the verification of signatures on the Initiative petition
 and that Respondents are required to verify signatures on the Initiative in accordance with
 applicable law.

# **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

# Violations of Federal and State Constitutional Rights (U.S. Constitution, First and Fourteenth Amendments; California Constitution, Article I, Sections 2, 3 and 7) (Against All Respondents and Defendants)

46. Petitioners reallege and incorporate herein by reference the allegations of paragraphs 1 through 28, inclusive.

47. Pursuant to the First and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States
Constitution and Article I, Sections 2, 3 and 7 of the California Constitution, Petitioners,
their supporters, voters, petition signers, and others have rights of free speech; the right
to petition their government for a redress of grievances; the right to due process; and the
right to equal protection under the laws.

27 28

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

16

17

18

19

20

48. As alleged hereinabove, Respondents have violated Petitioners' and others' constitutional rights in connection with the verification of signatures on the Initiative petition. The issuance of a judgment is necessary to enforce Petitioners' and others' constitutional rights.

49. Should such a judgment not be issued, irreparable harm will occur in that Petitioners and others will be deprived of their constitutional rights to have the Initiative petition signatures reviewed in accordance with applicable law and the voters will be deprived of their rights to vote on a matter of substantial importance.

50. Accordingly, the Court should issue a judgment that protects Petitioners' and others' constitutional rights in connection with the verification of signatures on the Initiative petition.

### 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

#### **PRAYER**

WHEREFORE, Petitioners pray:

1. That this Court issue a peremptory writ of mandate ordering Respondents and Defendants, and all parties acting pursuant to their direction and control, to verify signatures on Petitioners' Initiative petition in accordance with the law;

That this Court issue preliminary and permanent injunctions ordering
 Respondents and Defendants, and all parties acting pursuant to their direction and control,
 to verify signatures on Petitioners' Initiative petition in accordance with the law;

That this Court determine that Respondents and Defendants, and parties

19
3. That this Court declare that Respondents and Defendants, and all parties
20
21
21
22
23
24
25
25
26
27
28
29
29
20
20
20
21
21
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
29
20
20
20
21
21
21
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
29
20
20
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
22
23
24
24
25
25
26
26
27
28
29
29
20
20
20
21
20
21
21
21
21
21
21
22
23
24
24
25
26
26
27
26
27
28
29
29
20
20
20
20
20
20
20
20
20
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
22
23
24
24
25
26
26
27
26
27
26
27
26
27
27
28
29
29
20
20
20
20
20
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21
21

- 22 23
- 24
- 25

26

27

Initiative petition in accordance with the law;

4.

5. That this Court award Petitioners costs, including attorneys' fees, pursuant to CCP section 1021.5, to be recovered from Respondents and Defendants; and

acting pursuant to their direction and control, are violating Petitioners' Federal and State

constitutional rights and therefore are required to verify signatures on Petitioners'

28

1	6. That this Court grant such other and further relief as it deems just and
2	proper.
3	Respectfully Submitted:
4	THE SUTTON LAW FIRM, PC
5	
6	Dated: April 7, 2023 By: Dodley. H.
7	Bradley W. Hertz Attorneys for Petitioners and Plaintiffs SAN DIEGO PUBLIC LIBRARY FOUNDATION
8	SAN DIEGO PUBLIC LIBRARY FOUNDATION and SAN DIEGO PARKS FOUNDATION
9	and SAN DILOO TAKKS TOONDATION
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26 27	
27 28	
20	VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE AND COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE AND DECLARATORY RELIEF $13$

1	VERIFICATION
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
3	I, PATRICK STEWART, am the Chief Executive Officer of the San Diego Public
4	Library Foundation, which is a Petitioner and Plaintiff in the above-entitled action.
5	I have read the foregoing "Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate and Complaint
6	for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief" and know the contents thereof. The matters stated
7	therein are true and correct of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are
8	stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true.
9	
10	Executed this 7th day of April, 2023 at San Diego, California.
11	
12	I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that
13	the foregoing is true and correct.
14	PATRICK STEWART
15	
16	
17 18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

1	VERIFICATION
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
2	I, MICHEL ANDERSON, am the Chair of the San Diego Parks Foundation, which
4	is a Petitioner and Plaintiff in the above-entitled action.
5	I have read the foregoing "Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate and Complaint
6	for Injunctive and Declaratory Relief" and know the contents thereof. The matters stated
7	therein are true and correct of my own knowledge, except as to those matters which are
8	stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true.
9	
10	Executed this 7 <sup>th</sup> day of April, 2023 at San Diego, California.
11	
12	I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that
13	the foregoing is true and correct.
14	mun
15	MICHEL ANDERSON
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	