

1 JOSEPH LAWRENCE (SBN 99039)
Interim City Attorney
2 joseph.lawrence@santamonica.gov
3 KIRSTEN R. GALLER (SBN 227171)
Deputy City Attorney
4 kirsten.galler@santamonica.gov
5 BRANDON D. WARD (SBN 259375)
Deputy City Attorney
6 brandon.ward@santamonica.gov
7 1685 Main Street, Room 310
Santa Monica, California 90401
8 Telephone: (310) 458-8336
Facsimile: (310) 395-6727

9 CAROL M. SILBERBERG (SBN 217658)
ROBERT P. BERRY (SBN 220271)
10 BERRY SILBERBERG STOKES PC
csilberberg@berrysilberberg.com
11 155 North Lake Avenue, Suite 800
Pasadena, CA 91101
12 Telephone: (213) 986-2688
Facsimile: (213) 986-2677

13 Attorneys for Defendant
14 CITY OF SANTA MONICA

*Exempt from filing fee pursuant to
Government Code § 6103*

15 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**
16 **FOR THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES**

17 OSCAR DE LA TORRE and ELIAS SERNA,

CASE NO.: 21STCV08597

18 Plaintiffs,

Assigned to Hon. Richard L. Fruin

19 v.

**DEFENDANT CITY OF SANTA
MONICA'S RESPONSE TO SEPARATE
STATEMENT IN OPPOSITION TO
20 PLAINTIFFS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY
21 JUDGMENT OR, IN THE ALTERNATIVE,
22 SUMMARY ADJUDICATION**

21 CITY OF SANTA MONICA,
and DOES 1 through 10, inclusive

22 Defendants.

23 Date: May 6, 2022
24 Time: 9:15 A.M.
25 Dept.: 15

26 Action Filed: March 4, 2021
27 Trial Date: June 13, 2022

Pursuant to section 437c(b)(3) of the Code of Civil Procedure and California Rule of Court 3.1350, Defendant City of Santa Monica (“City”) hereby submits its separate statement responding to each material fact that, according to the moving party, are undisputed in opposition to Plaintiffs’ Motion for Summary Judgment or, in the Alternative, for Summary Adjudication (“Motion”) and additional material facts that are pertinent to the disposition of the Motion.¹

**ISSUE #1: THE FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF SHOULD BE
RESOLVED IN FAVOR OF PLAINTIFFS BECAUSE COUNCILMEMBER DE LA TORRE
DOES NOT HAVE A PERSONAL INTEREST IN THE OUTCOME OF *PICO NEIGHBORHOOD
ASSOCIATION, ET AL. V. CITY OF SANTA MONICA.***

Plaintiffs’ Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Defendant’s Response and Supporting Evidence:
<p>1. Oscar de la Torre has advocated for district-based elections for Santa Monica’s city council since at least 2015.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> De la Torre Decl. ¶¶ 2-4, 7, 9, 15-16, Ex. A</p>	<p>Undisputed.</p>
<p>2. In April 2016, Maria Loya and the Pico Neighborhood Association filed suit in the Los Angeles Superior Court, alleging the City of Santa Monica’s at-large city council elections violated the California Voting Rights Act (“CVRA”) and the Equal Protection Clause of the California Constitution. That case is styled <i>Pico Neighborhood Association, et al. v. City of Santa Monica</i>, Case No. BC616804, and is now pending in the California Supreme Court (hereinafter, the “Voting Rights Case”.)</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Shenkman Decl. ¶¶ 3-4</p>	<p>Disputed. The matter Plaintiffs refer to as the Voting Rights Case was filed in April 2016 by the Pico Neighborhood Association, Maria Loya, and Advocates for Malibu Public Schools. (Request for Judicial Notice Ex. B.) Additionally, the Court of Appeal reversed judgment, holding that the City did not violate the CVRA or California’s Equal Protection Clause. (265 Cal.Rptr.3d 530.) The California Supreme Court granted plaintiffs’ petition for review, but only on the issue of “What must a plaintiff prove in order to establish vote dilution under the California Voting Rights Act?” (474 P.3d 635.)</p>

¹ Under the Code of Civil Procedure and Rules of Court, the City is required to list verbatim the issues and purportedly undisputed material facts from Plaintiffs’ separate statement, but the City does not make any admission by this required repetition.

Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Defendant's Response and Supporting Evidence:
	Additionally, Shenkman's declaration statements are subject to evidentiary objections. (See Evidentiary Objections Nos. 39-42.)
<p>3. The operative complaint in the Voting Rights Case seeks changes to the method of electing the Santa Monica City Council and an award of attorneys' fees and expenses, but no monetary relief for the plaintiffs.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Shenkman Decl. ¶3, Ex. A</p>	<p>Disputed. The operative complaint in the Voting Rights Case seeks two different declarations, preliminary and permanent injunctive relief, "Other relief tailored to remedy the City of Santa Monica's violation of the California Voting Rights Act of 2001," "Other relief tailored to remedy the City of Santa Monica's violation of the Equal Protection Clause of the California Constitution," "an award of Plaintiffs' attorneys' fees, costs, litigation expenses and prejudgment interest" and "such further relief as the Court deems just and proper." (Request for Judicial Notice Ex. C.)</p> <p>Additionally, Shenkman's declaration statements are subject to an evidentiary objection. (See Evidentiary Objections No. 39.)</p>
<p>4. Changing the at-large method of electing the Santa Monica City Council to a district-based method of election, would affect substantially all Santa Monica voters.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> De la Torre Decl. ¶¶ 16-18</p>	<p>Disputed. While the statement itself is vague, the cited evidence (De la Torre's opinion) does not support the asserted fact.</p> <p>Additionally, there is no admissible evidence to support the fact. (See Evidentiary Objections Nos. 26, 28, 32.)</p>
<p>5. Following a six-week trial, in February 2019 the Los Angeles Superior Court entered judgment in favor of the plaintiffs in the Voting Rights Case, and issued a Statement of Decision. Consistent with the relief requested in the operative complaint, the Los Angeles Superior Court ordered changes to the method of electing the Santa Monica City Council, and contemplated a motion for an award of attorneys' fees and expenses, but no monetary relief for the plaintiffs.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Shenkman Decl. ¶ 4, Ex. B</p>	<p>The first sentence is undisputed.</p> <p>The second sentence is disputed. The opinion of the trial court in the Voting Rights Case was not wholly consistent with the relief requested in the Voting Rights Case because the complaint requested many remedies that were not awarded, including any declaratory relief or any attorneys' fees (at least in that opinion). (<i>Pico Neighborhood Association et al. v. City of Santa Monica</i> (Super. Ct. LA County Sept. 13, 2019) 2019 WL 10854474, at *23.)</p>

Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Defendant's Response and Supporting Evidence:
	Additionally, Shenkman's declaration statements are subject to an evidentiary objection. (See Evidentiary Objections Nos. 40-42; 47.)
<p>6. Neither the plaintiffs in the Voting Rights Case, nor Oscar de la Torre, have any obligation to pay any attorneys' fees or costs in connection with the Voting Rights Case, and there is no arrangement under which any portion of the recovery of attorneys' fees or costs would flow to any of them. On the contrary, the attorneys for the plaintiffs in the Voting Rights Case agreed to litigate that case <i>pro bono</i> and pay all costs.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Shenkman Decl. ¶ 5, Ex. C; De la Torre Decl. ¶¶ 16-17</p>	<p>Disputed. The Voting Rights Case is ongoing. The Court of Appeal opinion obligates the Voting Rights Case plaintiffs to pay costs. Additionally, it is unclear what additional costs or fees those plaintiffs may be ordered to pay in the litigation. It is undisputed that the document attached as Exhibit C to the Shenkman Declaration states that Shenkman & Hughes contractually obligates itself to pay for such costs or fees on plaintiffs' behalf.</p> <p>The attorneys representing the plaintiffs in the Voting Rights Case are not litigating <i>pro bono</i>, that is without any prospect of compensation. (Black's Law Dict. 11th ed. 2019, <i>pro bono</i>.) Rather, they have requested over \$20 million in attorneys' fees exclusive of costs in June of 2019 (including over \$13.3 million for Mr. Shenkman's firm) (Request for Judicial Notice Ex. D), and may seek additional compensation for Mr. Shenkman's work in this case (Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 at 210:24 – 211:9).</p> <p>Additionally, Shenkman's declaration statements are subject to an evidentiary objection (See Evidentiary Objections Nos. 26-31, 45, 46.)</p>

Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Defendant's Response and Supporting Evidence:
<p>7. In 2020, Oscar de la Torre campaigned for a seat on the Santa Monica City Council. One of the issues in that campaign was the Voting Rights Case and, relatedly, whether the Santa Monica City Council should be elected through at-large or district-based elections. All of the incumbent council members professed their support for at-large elections, while Oscar de la Torre and his "Change Slate" colleagues (Phil Brock, Christine Parra, and Mario Fonda Bonardi) all indicated they support a switch to district-based elections). Specifically, in his campaign, Oscar de la Torre voiced his opinion that the City of Santa Monica should stop its wastefully costly fight in the Voting Rights Case.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> De la Torre Decl. ¶ 7, Ex. A</p>	<p>The first sentence is undisputed.</p> <p>The second sentence is undisputed.</p> <p>The third sentence is disputed as there is no admissible evidence as to the positions of other candidates. (Evid. Obj. Nos. 13, 37.)</p> <p>The fourth sentence is disputed, as the admissible evidence does not support this assertion. (Evid. Obj. No. 12.)</p>
<p>8. Oscar de la Torre was elected to the Santa Monica City Council in November 2020.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> De la Torre Decl. ¶ 8, Ex. B</p>	<p>Undisputed.</p>
<p>9. By a vote of 4 of 7 council members on January 26, 2021, Defendant's city council voted to exclude Councilmember de la Torre from all council meetings, discussions and decisions concerning the Voting Rights Case, based on its assertion that Councilmember de la Torre had a "common law conflict."</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> De la Torre Decl. ¶¶ 11-12, Ex. E</p>	<p>Disputed. The motion made at the January 26, 2021 meeting of the Santa Monica City Council was "to determine that Mr. de la Torre has a common law conflict of interest that disqualifies him from his involvement in any closed session or confidential conversations concerning Pico Neighborhood Association [and] Maria Loya versus City of Santa Monica [and] would disqualify him from voting on any decisions made with respect to that." (Silberberg Decl. Ex. 40 at 722.) The vote was four in favor of the motion, two opposed (including De la Torre), and one abstention. (<i>Id.</i> at 723.) Nor does the cited evidence support the assertions made.</p> <p>Additionally, Additionally, De la Torre's declaration statements are subject to an evidentiary objection (See Evidentiary Objections Nos. 17-19.)</p>

Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Defendant's Response and Supporting Evidence:
<p>10. In response to an inquiry from Defendant's interim city attorney, on February 4, 2021 the Fair Political Practices Commission concluded:</p> <p>"neither the [Political Reform] Act nor Section 1090 prohibits Councilmember de la Torre from participating in governmental decisions relating to the [Voting Rights Case], including a potential settlement agreement, where his spouse is a named plaintiff. ... Neither [Councilmember de la Torre] nor his spouse has any financial interest, direct or indirect in the outcome of the [Voting Rights Case], including any future settlement agreement. There is no obligation on the part of him or his spouse to pay any attorneys' fees or costs in connection with the litigation, and no arrangement under which any portion of any recovery from the City of attorneys' fees or costs would flow to him or his spouse."</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> De la Torre Decl. ¶ 13, Ex. F</p>	<p>Undisputed that the February 4, 2021 letter included this language, in part. However, the excerpt is incomplete and does not properly present the scope of the narrow issue before the FPPC. The FPPC letter states: "Also, note that we are not a finder of fact when rendering advice (In re Oglesby (1975) 1 FPPC Ops. 71), and any advice we provide assumes your facts are complete and accurate. If this is not the case or if the facts underlying these decisions should change, you should contact us for additional advice." (Silberberg Decl. Ex. 45 at 777.) Furthermore, the letter states that it is not providing advice "under other general conflict of interest prohibitions such as common law conflict of interest. (<i>Ibid.</i>)</p> <p>Additionally, Additionally, De la Torre's declaration statements are subject to an evidentiary objection. (See Evidentiary Objections No. 20.)</p>

ISSUE #2: THE SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR VIOLATION OF THE RALPH M. BROWN ACT SHOULD BE RESOLVED IN FAVOR OF PLAINTIFFS BECAUSE COUNCILMEMBER DE LA TORRE DOES NOT HAVE A PERSONAL INTEREST IN THE OUTCOME OF PICO NEIGHBORHOOD ASSOCIATION, ET AL. V. CITY OF SANTA MONICA, AND THE RALPH M. BROWN ACT PROHIBITS CLOSED SESSION MEETINGS OF A MAJORITY, BUT NOT ALL, OF THE CITY COUNCIL.

Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Defendant's Response and Supporting Evidence:
<p>11. This section incorporates by reference all statements and evidence in paragraphs 1-10 of this Statement of Undisputed Material Facts.</p>	<p>Defendant incorporates by reference all of its statements and evidence in its responses to paragraphs 1-10 above.</p>

Plaintiffs' Undisputed Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Defendant's Response and Supporting Evidence:
<p>12. Plaintiff Oscar de la Torre has requested that Defendant allow him to be present for all closed session meetings of the Santa Monica City Council concerning the Voting Rights Case, but Defendant has refused.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> De la Torre Decl. ¶ 14, Ex. G</p>	<p>Disputed. The evidence demonstrates that De la Torre sought to have the January 26, 2021 action by City Council reconsidered on July 22, 2021. (De la Torre Decl. Ex. G.) After the Mayor ruled against reconsideration, De la Torre appealed that decision to the full Council. (<i>Id.</i>) However, the City Council voted against such reconsideration. (<i>Id.</i>)</p>

ADDITIONAL MATERIAL FACTS THAT ARE PERTINENT TO THE DISPOSITION OF THE MOTION

The City also submits the following statement of additional material facts pursuant to California Rule of Court 3.1350(f)(3) that are pertinent to the disposition of Plaintiffs' Motion, together with references to supporting evidence.

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>1. Oscar De la Torre ("De la Torre") and Maria Loya ("Loya") have been married about 16 years.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 194:16-17); Silberberg Decl. Ex. 2 (Loya 1/25/2022 Depo. at 30:2-3)</p>	
<p>2. Loya has been a board member of the Pico Neighborhood Association ("PNA") since 2002 or 2003.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 2 (Loya 1/25/2022 Depo. at 38:19 – 39:16)</p>	

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

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>3. Loya currently serves on the PNA board as the treasurer.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 2 (Loya 1/25/2022 Depo. at 38:19-20)</p>	
<p>4. De la Torre's family has had a long history of involvement in the PNA, including being involved when the organization was founded in 1979.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 12 (CVRA Trial Testimony at 2438:14-21); Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 25:10-14)</p>	
<p>5. De la Torre's niece served as the agent for service of process for the PNA.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 12 (CVRA Trial Testimony at 2437:20 – 2438:13.)</p>	
<p>6. Around 2005, De la Torre joined the board of the PNA.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> SAC ¶ 15</p>	
<p>7. Prior to his resignation from the PNA in November 2020, De la Torre served as chair or co-chair of the PNA at various times.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> (Silberberg Decl. Ex. 6 (De la Torre CVRA PMQ Depo. 5/11/2018 at 54:12-55:3; Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 26:4-19; 27:2-5)</p>	

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

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>8. Loya and the PNA are plaintiffs in litigation against the City originally filed on or around April 12, 2016 in the Los Angeles Superior Court, styled <i>Pico Neighborhood Association, et al. v. City of Santa Monica</i>, Case No. BC616804 (the "CVRA Action"). The CVRA Action asserts that the City's at-large system of electing councilmembers violates the California Voting Rights Act ("CVRA") and the California Constitution's Equal Protection Clause.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Request for Judicial Notice at Exhibit B</p>	
<p>9. Shenkman & Hughes PC, including specifically Kevin Shenkman ("Shenkman") and Mary Hughes ("Hughes"), is one of the law firms representing the PNA and Loya in the CVRA Action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Request for Judicial Notice at Exhibit B</p>	
<p>10. De la Torre refers to himself as a plaintiff in the CVRA Action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 30:13-17)</p>	
<p>11. De la Torre played a role in preparing the original and first amended complaint in the CVRA Action and could not identify any other non-attorney who helped contribute to those pleadings.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 5 (De la Torre CVRA Depo. 5/9/20188 at 57:25-59:10.)</p>	

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

Defendant’s Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs’ Response and Supporting Evidence
12. On June 26, 2015, De la Torre had a telephone call with Shenkman regarding the potential CVRA Action. <u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 425. (Authentication – Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/2022 Depo. at 72:23-74:13.)	
13. On June 30, 2015, Shenkman met with De la Torre and Loya regarding a potential case against the City under the California Voting Rights Act (“CVRA”). <u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 425.	
14. On July 30, 2015, Shenkman, De la Torre, and Loya participated in a call regarding “progress and potential case.” <u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 426.	
15. On September 9, 2015, Shenkman met with De la Torre and Loya to discuss district election public campaign and organizing effort. <u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 427.	
16. On September 29, 2015, Shenkman met with De la Torre regarding the “Santa Monica campaign and potential case and outreach to Latino leaders.” <u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 427.	

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>17. On October 16, 2015, Shenkman again met with De la Torre and Loya about, "Santa Monica case and public campaign" and "to discuss initial findings and potential case".</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 428.</p>	
<p>18. On October 30, 2015, Shenkman met with De la Torre and Loya "to prepare materials for community activist workshop."</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 428.</p>	
<p>19. On November 17, 2015, Shenkman met with De la Torre (along with T. Vazquez) and with the Pico Center Staff.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 428.</p>	
<p>20. On November 25, 2015, Shenkman discussed with De la Torre the "report re police misconduct of SMPD" against De la Torre.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 428.</p>	
<p>21. On December 14, 2015, Shenkman met with De la Torre and Loya about a revised press release.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 429.</p>	
<p>22. On December 28, 2015, Shenkman discussed "next steps" with De la Torre regarding correspondence from the Santa Monica City Attorney concerning January 12 meeting.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 429.</p>	

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>23. On January 4, 2016, Shenkman again met with De la Torre and Loya “regarding Santa Monica, efforts to obtain districts, and potential case.”</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 429.</p>	
<p>24. On January 12, 2016, Shenkman again met with De la Torre and attended a Santa Monica City Council meeting.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 429.</p>	
<p>25. On March 15, 2016, Mary Hughes of Shenkman & Hughes LLP had a discussion with De la Torre “concerning Pico Neighborhood Association membership and interests.”</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 430.</p>	
<p>26. The first time that PNA appears in Shenkman & Hughes’s billing records is in March 2016, nine months after the first meeting with De la Torre that Shenkman recorded in his billing records.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 430.</p>	
<p>27. On April 14, 2016, Shenkman met with De la Torre and others about “retaliation by Santa Monica for case filing.”</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 431.</p>	
<p>28. On August 8, 2016, Shenkman met with De la Torre and R. Rubin.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 434.</p>	

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>29. On August 9, 2016, De la Torre attended a meeting with Shenkman and Hughes on deposition investigation, preparation, and general story/theme for CVRA Action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 435.</p>	
<p>30. On August 11, 2016, De la Torre met with Shenkman “regarding case and upcoming depositions” in the CVRA Action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 435.</p>	
<p>31. On September 23, 2016, De la Torre attended the deposition of (now former) councilmember Terry O’Day in the CVRA Action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 8 (O’Day CVRA Depo. 9/23/2016 at 1-2, 48-49); Silberberg Decl. Ex. 5 (De la Torre CVRA Depo. 5/9/2018 at 381:17-19)</p>	
<p>32. On October 14, 2016, De la Torre had a discussion with Hughes on preparation for a councilmember’s deposition (McKeown).</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 437.</p>	
<p>33. On November 2, 2016, De la Torre had another meeting with Shenkman regarding potential discrimination expert.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 438.</p>	
<p>34. On November 30, 2016, De la Torre again met with Shenkman “regarding T. Vazquez and M. Leon-Vazquez transgressions.”</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 439.</p>	

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>35. On December 5, 2016, Shenkman discussed “document request responses and production and implications” with De la Torre and Loya.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 439.</p>	
<p>36. On December 13, 2016, De la Torre again met with Shenkman “regarding case generally, document production, etc.”</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 439.</p>	
<p>37. On December 16, 2016, De la Torre attended the deposition of (now former) councilmember Kevin McKeown in the CVRA Action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 9 (McKeown CVRA Depo. 12/16/2016 at p. 3.)</p>	
<p>38. On December 19, 2016, De la Torre and Loya met with Shenkman “regarding case generally, discovery and logistics and gathering of documents for production.”</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 440. __</p>	
<p>39. On January 25, 2017, De la Torre again met with Shenkman for the CVRA Action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 441.</p>	
<p>40. Prior to the first amended complaint being filed in the CVRA Action. De la Torre read it and confirmed the accuracy of each of the allegations.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 5 (De la Torre CVRA Depo. 5/9/2018 at 59:11-60:3)</p>	

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>41. On May 30, 2017, De la Torre attended the deposition of councilmember Sue Himmelrich.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> (Silberberg Decl. Ex. 11 (Himmelrich CVRA Depo. 4/30/2017 at 4:14-5:1))</p>	
<p>42. On August 11, 2017, De la Torre met with Shenkman regarding the deposition of (now former) councilmember Pam O'Connor.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 446.</p>	
<p>43. On August 18, 2017, De la Torre met with Shenkman in Oceanside regarding public outreach on voting rights, among other issues.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 447.</p>	
<p>44. On August 28, 2017, De la Torre met with Hughes regarding discovery requests to PNA.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 447.</p>	
<p>45. On January 2, 2018, De la Torre and Loya met with Shenkman "regarding the case generally, settlement idea, and how to pursue resolution."</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 453.</p>	
<p>46. On February 3, 2018, De la Torre met with Shenkman "regarding council member misconduct and campaign finance."</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 455.</p>	

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>47. On February 9, 2018, Shenkman met with De la Torre, among others, "regarding campaign finance and council member dealings."</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 455.</p>	
<p>48. On February 26, 2018, De la Torre attended the deposition of (now former) councilmember Ted Winterer.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 10 (Winterer CVRA Depo. 2/26/2018 at p. 2.)</p>	
<p>49. To prepare for his deposition, De la Torre met with Shenkman three separate times (May 2, 4, and 8, 2018).</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 461-462.</p>	
<p>50. In May 2018, Loya was deposed in the CVRA Action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> (Silberberg Decl. Ex. 7 (Loya CVRA Depo. 5/15/2018))</p>	
<p>51. De la Torre met with Shenkman following Loya's deposition.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 28 at 463.</p>	
<p>52. De la Torre was deposed in the CVRA Action in May 2018, both in his individual capacity and as the person identified by PNA as most qualified to testify on PNA's behalf on specified topics.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Exs. 5, 6 (De la Torre Depo. 5/11/2018 and PMQ Depo. 5/15/2018)</p>	

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>53. During his individual deposition, De la Torre, in his individual capacity, was represented by Shenkman.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 5 (De la Torre CVRA Depo. 5/9/20188 at 11:16 – 12:10); Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 30:13-17)</p>	
<p>54. At the time of his trial testimony in the CVRA Action, De La Torre was the co-chair on the board of the PNA.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> (Silberberg Decl. Ex. 12 (CVRA Trial Testimony 08/22/2018 at 2436:15-20)</p>	
<p>55. De la Torre testified as a witness for the CVRA plaintiffs and as the PNA representative at the trial in the CVRA Action on August 22 and 23, 2018.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> (Silberberg Decl. Ex. 12 (CVRA Trial Testimony 08/22/2018)</p>	
<p>56. De la Torre was the representative for the PNA at trial in the CVRA Action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> (Silberberg Decl. Ex. 2 (Loya 1/25/2022 Depo. at 52:9-17)</p>	
<p>57. During the trial in the CVRA Action, the plaintiffs' attorneys filed motions seeking over \$20 million in attorneys' fees, exclusive of costs.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Request for Judicial Notice Ex. D</p>	

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>58. Shenkman & Hughes sought over \$13.3 million in attorneys' fees exclusive of costs.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Request for Judicial Notice Ex. D</p>	
<p>59. Pursuant to a stipulation between the parties, the City's response to the fee motion, and the hearings regarding costs and fees have been continued to follow the resolution of proceedings in the Court of Appeal and the California Supreme Court.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Request for Judicial Notice Ex. E</p>	
<p>60. During the 2020 election for the four open Santa Monica city council seats, De la Torre, Phil Brock, Christine Para, and Mario Fonda Bonardi formed the "Change Slate" to pool some of their campaign resources and support one another's candidacies.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> SAC ¶ 27</p>	
<p>61. All of the Change Slate candidates expressed their support for adopting district elections and ending the CVRA Action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> SAC ¶ 28</p>	
<p>62. On November 3, 2020, Santa Monica voters elected three of the Change Slate members – De la Torre, Brock, and Parra – to city councilmember seats.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> SAC ¶ 31; Silberberg Decl. Ex. 25 (De la Torre Declaration ¶ 8); Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 38:19-22)</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 218:5-13)</p>	

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>63. De la Torre resigned from the PNA board at a meeting on or about November 19, 2020.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 27:2-5)</p>	
<p>64. In November 2020, the Interim City Attorney for the City of Santa Monica sought an opinion from the Fair Political Practices Commission ("FPPC") on whether De la Torre has a financial conflict of interest relating to payments and liabilities from the CVRA Action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Anderson-Warren Decl. Ex. A at SM00022-23; SAC ¶ 33</p>	
<p>65. In December 2020, De la Torre received "preliminary legal advice" from Shenkman & Hughes.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 14 (Supp. Interrogatory Responses at p. 13); Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 46:10 – 49:6-19)</p> <p>(Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 42:14-18; 43:5-14))</p>	
<p>66. Around December 2020, De la Torre visited Shenkman's office to draft a letter to the FPPC using Shenkman's wife's computer and received Shenkman's input on the letter.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> (Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 67:1 – 70:20; Silberberg Decl. Ex. 15)</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 66:21-25; 67:5-11)</p>	

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

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>67. On December 8, 2020, De la Torre took his oath of office.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 133:24 – 134:1)</p>	
<p>68. Between January 23 and 26, 2021, De la Torre received preliminary legal advice from Shenkman & Hughes on the January 26, 2021 special agenda item concerning a determination regarding common law conflict of interest of Councilmember De la Torre.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 14 (Supp. Interrogatory Responses at p. 6)</p> <p>(Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 42:14-18; 43:5-14)</p>	
<p>69. De la Torre and Shenkman exchanged emails and had multiple calls in the days leading up to the January 26, 2021 special meeting of the Santa Monica City Council.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 94:4 – 98:18; 108:23 – 109:6) Silberberg Decl. Ex. 16</p> <p>(Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 108:23-109:16)</p> <p>Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/22 Depo. at 116:13 – 120:8, 120:24 – 126:13); Silberberg Decl. Ex. 31.</p> <p>(Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/22 Depo. at 116:18-117:20)</p>	

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

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>70. Before the January 26, 2021 special meeting of the Santa Monica City Council, Shenkman emailed De la Torre about council rules and worked with De la Torre to draft materials for De la Torre to use during the meeting.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 94:4 – 98:18; 108:23 – 109:6)</p> <p>Silberberg Decl. Ex. 16</p> <p>(Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 108:23-109:16)</p> <p>Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/22 Depo. at 116:13 – 120:8, 120:24 – 126:13) Silberberg Decl. Ex. 31.</p> <p>(Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/22 Depo. at 116:18-117:20)</p>	
<p>71. De la Torre refused to respond to questions at his deposition in this case regarding the emails and calls he had with Shenkman leading up to the January 26, 2021 meeting of the Santa Monica City Council on the grounds of attorney-client privilege.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 94:4 – 98:18)</p>	
<p>72. On January 26, 2021, the Santa Monica City Council held a special meeting prior to its regular meeting where the sole item for consideration was Councilmember De la Torre's common-law conflict of interest and disqualification.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Anderson-Warren Decl. Ex. B at SM00057-59</p>	

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

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
73. The January 26, 2021 special meeting of the Santa Monica City Council was conducted remotely. <u>Evidence:</u> Anderson-Warren Decl. Ex. B at SM00057	
74. De la Torre attended the January 26, 2021 meeting of City Council from his home. <u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 112:8-10)	
75. Shenkman was sitting in the same room close to De la Torre during the City Council special meeting on January 26, 2021. <u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 112:8 – 113:1)	
76. De la Torre did not announce Shenkman's presence at his home during the January 26, 2021 special meeting of City Council. <u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 113:2-4)	
77. At the January 26, 2021 special meeting of City Council, the City Council received the Interim City Attorney's oral report and heard public comment. <u>Evidence:</u> Anderson-Warren Decl. Ex. B	

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

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
78. The staff report for the January 26, 2021 special meeting of City Council set forth the Interim City Attorney's recommendation that the Council find that De la Torre has a common law conflict of interest. <u>Evidence:</u> Anderson-Warren Decl. Ex. A at SM00019-25	
79. The report also disclosed the Interim City Attorney posed the issue of financial conflict to the FPPC, but that any such FPPC decision would not impact the common law conflict issue. <u>Evidence:</u> Anderson-Warren Decl. Ex. A at SM00019-25	
80. The Interim City Attorney also reported that he sought guidance from the state Attorney General, but that they declined to do so as such advice was outside their regulations. <u>Evidence:</u> Anderson-Warren Decl. Ex. A (at SM00023)	
81. While some public comment on the conflict of interest agenda item supported De la Torre, other public comments supported staff's recommendation that De la Torre should be disqualified. <u>Evidence:</u> Anderson-Warren Decl. Ex. E; Silberberg Decl. Ex. 40 at 23:27 – 30:12 (SM00103 – 110)	

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>82. When asked during the meeting by a fellow councilmember if anyone had communications with Shenkman about the conflict issue, De la Torre responded, "That's privileged information, right?"</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 40 at 21:22-28 (SM00101); Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 114:18-115:3)</p>	
<p>83. At the January 26, 2021 special meeting of the City Council, De la Torre also read the materials he prepared with Shenkman.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 40 at 39:2 – 44:16 (SM00119-124; Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 108:23 – 110:20; Silberberg Decl. Ex. 16</p> <p>(Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 108:23-109:16)</p>	
<p>84. When De la Torre was presented by his City Council colleagues with the opportunity to recuse himself prior to a disqualification vote at the January 26, 2021 special meeting, he chose not to do so.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 40 at 44:17-21 (SM00124); Anderson-Warren Decl. Ex. B at SM00059</p>	
<p>85. Other councilmembers would have recused themselves under the same circumstances.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Declaration of Frank V. Zerunyan at ¶¶ 21-22</p>	

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

Defendant’s Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs’ Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>86. Rule 18 of the Rules of Order and Procedure for the Conduct of City Council Meetings states: “Every Councilmember is entitled to vote unless disqualified by reason of a conflict of interest.”</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Anderson-Warren Decl. Exs. O, P.</p>	
<p>87. Rule 20 of the Rules of Order and Procedure for the Conduct of City Council Meetings states: “Any Councilmember who is disqualified from voting on a particular matter by reason of a conflict of interest shall publicly state or have the Presiding Officer state the nature of such disqualification and shall leave the dais prior to Council consideration of the matter.”</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Anderson Warren Decl. Exs. O, P</p>	
<p>88. At the January 26, 2021 special meeting, the Council voted on a motion to exclude De la Torre from certain closed meetings of the City Council with four in favor, two opposed, and one abstention. De la Torre was one of the two councilmembers who opposed the motion.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Anderson-Warren Decl. Ex. B at SM00059</p>	
<p>89. The motion that was ultimately approved by the Council did not state that De la Torre was precluded from addressing issues separate from the CVRA litigation – e.g., the policy issue of district-based vs. at-large elections.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 40 at 46:3-8 (SM00126)</p>	

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

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>90. Neither Councilmember Brock nor Councilmember Parra has been disqualified from participating in closed sessions regarding the CVRA Action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 36:7-13; 116:23 – 117:4)</p>	
<p>91. No Councilmember is precluded from bringing the policy issue of district-based elections to the City Council.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 228:13-18)</p>	
<p>92. De la Torre has not put the issue of district-based elections on the Council agenda because he is concerned he would not have enough votes to enact it.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 222:11-21)</p>	
<p>93. In response to a public records request related to his communications with Shenkman, De la Torre asserted the attorney-client privilege.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 128:12-129:2; 132:14-17); Silberberg Decl. Ex. 17.</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 128:20-129:2)</p>	

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

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>94. The FPPC responded to the Santa Monica Interim City Attorney's letter on February 4, 2021.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 45 (P0910-P0916)</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/22 Depo. at 222:25-225:23)</p>	
<p>95. De la Torre asked multiple attorneys before finding someone to represent him in this action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> (Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 148:9 – 149:10)</p>	
<p>96. After De la Torre retained Mr. Trivino-Perez to represent him in this matter, on February 12, 2021, he notified Shenkman of the retention.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 18</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 145:22-147:22)</p>	
<p>97. On February 12, 2021, Shenkman and Mr. Trivino-Perez spoke to discuss this action and the CVRA Action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 14 (Supp. Interrogatory Responses at 6-7);</p> <p>(Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 42:14-18; 43:5-14)</p>	

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

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>98. On February 27, De la Torre sent Shenkman his verification to the complaint in this action before the complaint was filed.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 155:3 – 156:7);</p> <p>Silberberg Decl. Ex. 19</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 155:3-12)</p>	
<p>99. At his deposition in this case, Shenkman did not deny assisting Mr. Trivino-Perez in drafting the pleadings in this action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/22 Depo. at 214:16 – 215:10; 216:9 – 218:15; 219:12-24)</p>	
<p>100. On March 4, 2021, De la Torre filed this action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 44 (P0863-P0895)</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/22 Depo. at 222:25-225:23)</p>	
<p>101. Mr. Trivino-Perez forwarded Shenkman confirmation of the filing of the complaint and related documents at 8:10 AM the next morning.</p> <p><u>Evidence</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 44 (P0863-P0895)</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/22 Depo. at 222:25-225:23)</p>	

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>102. In April 2021, De la Torre, Shenkman, and Loya made a joint presentation to the Santa Monica Democratic Club.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 232:8 – 234:20; 241:6 – 244:18);</p> <p>Silberberg Decl. Ex. 26; Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/22 Depo. at 188:15-17)</p> <p>Silberberg Decl. Ex. 46 (Decl. of John Katz ¶ 4)</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 241:6-242:3)</p>	
<p>103. At the April 2021 Santa Monica Democratic Club. meeting, De la Torre, Shenkman, and Loya spoke about the policy of district-based elections and the CVRA Action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 232:8 – 234:20; 241:6 – 244:18); Silberberg Decl. Ex. 26</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 241:6-242:3)</p>	
<p>104. De la Torre, Shenkman, and Loya appeared at the April 2021 Santa Monica Democratic Club meeting remotely and together from De la Torre's home.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/22 Depo. at 189:13-20);</p> <p>Silberberg Decl. Ex. 14 (Supp. Interrogatory Responses at p. 11)</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 42:14-18; 43:5-14)</p>	

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

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>105. Prior to the April 2021 meeting, Mr. Katz, the President of the Santa Monica Democratic Club, asked that De la Torre focus the presentation on just the policy of district-based elections.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 245:1-6); Silberberg Dec. Ex. 46 (Decl. of John Katz ¶ 4 and Ex. A to Decl.)</p>	
<p>106. De la Torre recused himself from closed session discussions on litigation involving the Police Activities League because “there are some of those victims I had relationships with and it makes it very difficult for me to be impartial in this case because it’s emotional, it’s psychological, and it’s very hard.”</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 41 (Transcript excerpt of April 13, 2021 Council hearing) (SM00131-00133)</p>	
<p>107. De la Torre also recused himself from subsequent closed discussions of this PAL matter.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Anderson-Warren Decl. Ex. G at SM00162; Ex. H at SM00189; Ex. K at SM00328</p>	

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>108. When voting in favor of the City's anti-nepotism policy in November 2021, De la Torre stated that "the issue is really is [sic] like sort of the conflict, you know, as we would call a conflict, because the husband, wife, registered domestic partner, son, daughter, mother, father, brother, and sister of a Councilmember would have a hard time sort of distancing themselves or it seems like they could be compromised, right, because of their relationship with a Councilmember."</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 42 Transcript excerpt of November 9, 2021 Council hearing at SM00410-11</p>	
<p>109. In the proceedings before the Supreme Court in the CVRA Action, De la Torre filed a document entitled "Santa Monica City Council Member Oscar De La Torre's Application (In His Individual Capacity) For Leave To File Amicus Curiae Brief; [Proposed] Amicus Curiae Brief" in June 2021.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 20.</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 170:6-24).</p>	
<p>110. In July 2021, Shenkman sent materials to De la Torre for a potential discussion with newly-appointed Councilmember Negrete regarding the CVRA Action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 172:20 – 177)</p> <p>Silberberg Decl. Ex. 21.</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 174:14-24).</p>	

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>111. De la Torre and Shenkman met with Councilmember Negrete before or right after she was appointed to the City Council.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 177:2 - 178:11)</p>	
<p>112. Between July 2021 and November 2021, Shenkman, Mr. Trivino-Perez, and De la Torre have spoken at least three times about this case and the CVRA Action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 14 (Supp. Interrogatory Responses at 6-7);</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 42:14-18; 43:5-14)</p>	
<p>113. On September 30, 2021, Mr. Trivino-Perez forwarded a tentative ruling in this case to Shenkman less than ten minutes after Mr. Trivino-Perez received the ruling by email.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 37</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/2022 Depo. at 200:22-201:15)</p>	
<p>114. On October 6, 2021, Mr. Trivino-Perez forwarded a minute order from this case entered on September 30, 2021, to Shenkman.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 36</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/2022 Depo. at 198:5-17)</p>	

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>115. On October 12, 2021, Mr. Trivino-Perez forwarded a draft statement of undisputed facts to Shenkman within six minutes of receiving it.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u></p> <p>Silberberg Decl. Ex. 33</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/2022 Depo. at 161:1-20)</p>	
<p>116. On November 9, 2021, Mr. Trivino-Perez forwarded an email from the City's counsel to Shenkman within six minutes of receiving it.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u></p> <p>Silberberg Decl. Ex. 34</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/2022 Depo. at 171:6-20)</p>	
<p>117. On December 13, 2021, Mr. Trivino-Perez sent a tentative ruling in this case to Shenkman less than an hour after it was entered.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u></p> <p>Silberberg Decl. Ex. 30</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/2022 Depo. at 89:17-24)</p>	
<p>118. On December 16, 2021, Mr. Trivino-Perez sent a tentative ruling in this case to Shenkman within four minutes of receiving it.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u></p> <p>Silberberg Decl. Ex. 29</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/2022 Depo. at 86:22-88:4)</p>	

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

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>119. On December 23, 2021, Mr. Trivino-Perez forwarded an email from the City's counsel to Shenkman less than half an hour after receiving it.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 35</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/2022 Depo. at 195:21-196:5)</p>	
<p>120. In November 2021, Shenkman attended a meet and confer in this lawsuit with Mr. Trivino-Perez, De la Torre, and counsel for the City on Plaintiffs' objections to the City's discovery requests. At this meet and confer, Shenkman provided legal argument in support of Plaintiffs' objections to the City's discovery requests.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. ¶ 44</p>	
<p>121. In November 2021, Shenkman drafted a declaration entitled "KIS Decl. in Lieu of Discovery" and the declaration addresses issues relating to the deliberative process privilege in this lawsuit.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. ¶ 45, Ex. 43</p>	

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>122. Shenkman signed and submitted a declaration to support Plaintiffs' Opposition to the Motion to Compel discovery in this case.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/2022 Depo. at 205:6-23);</p> <p>Silberberg Decl. Ex. 38</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/2022 Depo. at 205:6-23; 208:2-6)</p>	
<p>123. Shenkman drafted and submitted a declaration in support of Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment in this case.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/2022 Depo. at. 208:12-16; 209:19-25; 213:6-219:24)</p> <p>Silberberg Decl. Ex. 39</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/2022 Depo. at 209:19-210:7)</p>	
<p>124. Shenkman's typical billing rate is between \$800 and \$900 per hour.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/2022 Depo. at 50:15-18)</p>	
<p>125. Shenkman's partner and associate bill at rates between \$600 and \$800 per hour.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/2022 Depo. at 50:19 – 51:1)</p>	

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>126. De la Torre has not compensated Shenkman for any of his legal work or advice.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 83:22-84:15, 126:14-127:16, 252:1-9); Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/2022 Depo. at 66:15-22)</p>	
<p>127. Shenkman may seek compensation for his work in this action via a fee motion in the CVRA Action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/2022 Depo. at 210:15-211:9)</p>	
<p>128. For the most part, De la Torre deletes his text messages daily.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 88:2-25)</p>	
<p>129. De la Torre had technical issues with his email when he was searching for documents in this case.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 84:17 – 85:6; 88:2-25)</p>	
<p>130. De la Torre's attorney did not address the technical issues but found a "creative way to answer" the questions.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 84:23-85:6)</p>	
<p>131. Shenkman provided documents for production in this case.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/2022 Depo. at 223:5 – 225:23)</p>	

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

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>132. Shenkman is De la Torre's friend.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 30:21 – 31:16; 46:10-15; 99:22 – 100:3; 145:2-9; 156:8-13)</p>	
<p>133. Shenkman is one of De la Torre's "trusted attorneys."</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 47.</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 198:16-22)</p>	
<p>134. De la Torre does not trust the City Attorney's Office.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 47.</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 198:16-22)</p>	
<p>135. De la Torre has loyalty to his wife, Loya.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 194:19-20)</p>	
<p>136. De la Torre is proud of Loya's involvement in the CVRA Action and as the lead Plaintiff, wants Loya to win.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 194:21 – 196:1)</p>	

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

Defendant’s Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs’ Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>137. Loya discusses the CVRA Action with her husband, De la Torre, and he has asserted spousal privilege with respect to any such conversations.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 13 at 28.</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 136:13-137:6)</p>	
<p>138. De la Torre refused to answer questions about discussions he had with Shenkman on grounds of attorney-client privilege.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 47:6-10; 49:6-19; 52:11-19; 97:9-15; 115:12-19, 123:3-12; 131:4-11.)</p>	
<p>139. Loya is the sole owner of Holistic Strategies Coaching & Consulting LLC (“Holistic”), which she founded in 2019.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 2 (Loya 1/25/2022 Depo. at 67:16-24; 72:2-4.)</p>	
<p>140. Loya has 25 years of experience in public policy development & advocacy, non-profit management, community organizing & leadership on a range of issues including: racial justice, immigrant rights, environmental justice, land-use, workers and women's rights.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 2 (Loya 1/25/2022 Depo. at 76:8 – 77:11; Loya Depo Ex. 51)</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 2 (Loya 1/25/2022 Depo. at 71:9-72:1)</p>	

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>141. Holistic provides “consulting for nonprofits, labor unions, or businesses” as well as life coaching.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 2 (Loya 1/25/2022 Depo. at 72:13-18.)</p>	
<p>142. Holistic works mainly on “social justice issues [and] socioeconomic issues.”</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 2 (Loya 1/25/2022 Depo. at 73:14-17.)</p>	
<p>143. Loya and De la Torre both receive financial compensation from Holistic.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 2 (Loya 1/25/2022 Depo. at 68:16-20); Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 209:4 – 210:19)</p> <p>Silberberg Decl. Exs. 22 and 24.</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 209:19-210:5; 217:1-14)</p>	
<p>144. De la Torre does not get paid on a regular schedule, but Loya typically pays De la Torre when he requests money.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 209:15-18)</p>	
<p>145. Loya counts it as a win “when an organization is able to achieve their goals in making their public policy campaign into a city ordinance.”</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 2 (Loya 1/25/2022 Depo. at 75:9-21)</p>	

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

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
146. Winning on social justice issues is good for Holistic. <u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 2 (Loya 1/25/2022 Depo. at 77:9-12)	
147. For the Court's convenience, this AMF paragraph is intentionally left blank so that all AMF paragraph numbers correspond to the SF paragraphs numbers in the City's Motion for Summary Judgment (e.g., AMF.1 is the same as SF.1).	
148. Serna has no injury in this case different from any other voter. <u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 4 (Serna 1/21/2022 Depo. at 82:2 – 83:4)	
149. For the Court's convenience, this AMF paragraph is intentionally left blank so that all AMF paragraph numbers correspond to the SF paragraphs numbers in the City's Motion for Summary Judgment (e.g., AMF.1 is the same as SF.1).	
150. The agenda for the special meeting of the Santa Monica City Council for January 26, 2021 had one staff administrative item on the agenda: "Pico Neighborhood Association and Maria Loya v. City of Santa Monica – Determination Regarding Common Law Conflict of Interest of Councilmember de la Torre." <u>Evidence:</u> Anderson-Warren Decl. Ex. A (at SM00018)	

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

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>151. The agenda for the regular meeting of the Santa Monica City Council for January 26, 2021, described the items that would be addressed at closed session, publicly stating the title of and specifically identifying the litigation to be discussed. One of those items was "Conference with Legal Counsel – Existing Litigation – Litigation has been initiated formally pursuant to Government Code Section 54956.9(d)(1): Pico Neighborhood Association and Maria Loya v. City of Santa Monica, Los Angeles Superior Court, Case No. BC 616804, Second District Court of Appeal, Case No. B295935, California Supreme Court, Case No. S263972."</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Anderson-Warren Decl. Ex. C (at SM00051)</p>	
<p>152. De la Torre has attended numerous closed meetings where other councilmembers have been absent.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Anderson-Warren Decl. Exs. I, J (at SM00248-50), L (at SM00352-54), M (at SM00367-71); N (at SM00455-56)</p>	
<p>153. On November 3, 2020, De la Torre was elected to the Santa Monica City Council</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> SAC ¶ 31</p>	
<p>154. De la Torre has claimed he is only seeking forward looking relief under the Brown Act.</p> <p>Plaintiffs' Opposition to Demurrer to FAC at 15</p>	

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>155. On February 8, 2022, the City Council disclosed that there have been repeated "leaks" from closed sessions of the Council.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 48 at 801-803, 819-820; Anderson-Warren Decl. Ex. Q at 257.</p>	
<p>156. In November 2020, the City Council for the City of Albany discussed a breach of confidentiality regarding information from closed session by a councilmember and asserted such information was shared with Kevin Shenkman.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Request for Judicial Notice Ex. G at 79 and Ex. H at p. 82-84.</p>	
<p>157. Loya testified at trial in the CVRA Action.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 2 (Loya 1/25/2022 Depo. at 8:11 – 9:17).</p>	
<p>158. De la Torre made the motion to approve a new anti-nepotism policy for the City of Santa Monica and voted in favor of adopting it.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Anderson-Warren Decl. Ex. M at 187.</p>	
<p>159. The FPPC was not presented with evidence of De la Torre's employment by Holistic, which is owned by his wife, or Shenkman's provision of free legal services to De la Torre.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 45 at 778-79; De la Torre Declaration Ex. C.</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/22 Depo. at 222:25-225:23)</p>	

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

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>160. The letter sent to Mr. Cardona from the FPPC states that “we are not a finder of fact when rendering advice.”</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 45 at 777.</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/22 Depo. at 222:25-225:23)</p>	
<p>161. The letter sent to Mr. Cardona from the FPPC also states that “any advice we provide assumes your facts are complete and accurate.”</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 45 at 777.</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/22 Depo. at 222:25-225:23)</p>	
<p>162. The letter sent to Mr. Cardona from the FPPC also states, “Please note that we are only providing advice under the [PRA] and Section 1090, not under other general conflict of interest prohibitions such as common law conflict of interest.”</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 45 at 777.</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 3 (Shenkman 1/27/22 Depo. at 222:25-225:23)</p>	

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

Defendant's Additional Material Facts and Supporting Evidence:	Plaintiffs' Response and Supporting Evidence
<p>163. De la Torre has stated in this case, "I often find myself forced to seek the legal opinions of outside attorneys because I can't trust the legal advice and opinions of the Santa Monica City Attorney's Office. I have found that the legal advice and opinions of the Santa Monica City Attorney's Office is often wrong, and is later demonstrated to be wrong. The Santa Monica City Attorney's Office is consistently biased, skewing its opinions to meet the desires of certain councilmembers, and is frequently more interested in covering up its own mistakes than providing the City Council with objective and sound legal advice."</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 47 at 796.</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1.20.22 Depo. at 198:16-22)</p>	
<p>164. De la Torre has stated in this case that "the Santa Monica City Attorney's Office treats me as an 'enemy at the gates'; on the few occasions when I have spoken with the City Attorney's Office it has felt more like an interrogation than a collegial discussion for the benefit of Santa Monica residents."</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 47 at 797.</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1.20.22 Depo. at 198:16-22)</p>	
<p>165. De la Torre has asserted attorney-client privilege objections in responding to written discovery.</p> <p><u>Evidence:</u> Silberberg Decl. Ex. 14 at 315, 317.</p> <p>Authentication: Silberberg Decl. Ex. 1 (De la Torre 1/20/22 Depo. at 42:14-18; 43:5-14)</p>	

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

Dated: March 10, 2022

BERRY SILBERBERG STOKES PC
CAROL M. SILBERBERG

By /s/ Carol M. Silberberg
Carol M. Silberberg

Attorneys for Defendant
CITY OF SANTA MONICA