

1 Christopher R. Ulrich - 271288

CUlrich@mpbf.com

2 Matthew J. Frauenfeld - 336056

MFrauenfeld@mpbf.com

3 Thomas P. Mazzucco - 139758

TMazzucco@mpbf.com

4 **MURPHY, PEARSON, BRADLEY & FEENEY**

580 California Street, Suite 1100

San Francisco, CA 94104-1001

Telephone: (415) 788-1900

6 Facsimile: (415) 393-8087

7 Attorneys for Petitioner

SHERIFF CHRISTINA CORPUS

Electronically
FILED

by Superior Court of California, County of San Mateo

ON 4/11/2025

By /s/ Kimberly Claussen
Deputy Clerk

8
9 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

10 **COUNTY OF SAN MATEO**

11
12 SHERIFF CHRISTINA CORPUS, an individual,

13 Petitioner,

14 v.

15 COUNTY OF SAN MATEO BOARD OF
16 SUPERVISORS; COUNTY EXECUTIVE
17 MIKE CALLAGY; ASSISTANT CLERK TO
THE BOARD SUKHMANI S. PUREWAL; and
DOES 1-10,

18 Respondents.

Case No.: 25-CIV-02539

**PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE TO
ENFORCE DISCLOSURE**

Date: 6/24/2025

Time: 9:30 AM

Dept: 4

Judge: FINEMAN

19
20 Petitioner Sheriff Christina Corpus (“Petitioner” or “Sheriff Corpus”), in accordance with the
21 California Public Records Act (“CPRA”) (Gov. Code, § 7920.000 et seq.) and petitions this Court for a
22 Writ of Mandate under Government Code § 7923.100 and Code of Civil Procedure § 1085 to compel
23 Respondent San Mateo County Board of Supervisors (the “Board”), and Respondent County Executive
24 Mike Callagy, and Respondent Assistant Clerk of the Board Sukhmani S. Purewal (Collectively with the
25 Board, “Respondents”) to disclose public records that have been improperly withheld under invalid
26 claims of protection under the attorney-client privilege, the attorney-work product doctrine and Evidence
27 Code Section 1040 pursuant to Government Code section 7927.705. In support of this Petition, Petitioner
28 alleges as follows:

1 **I. INTRODUCTION**

2 1. This action seeks to enforce the public’s right to access government records, a
3 fundamental principle of transparency under the CPRA and the California Constitution. (Gov. Code §
4 7921.000) (“access to information concerning the conduct of the people’s business is a fundamental and
5 necessary right of every person in this state.”) (Cal. Const., art. I, § 3(b)(1)) (“ The people have the right
6 of access to information concerning the conduct of the people’s business, and, therefore, the meetings of
7 public bodies and the writings of public officials and agencies shall be open to public scrutiny.”)

8 2. Respondents have refused to disclose certain requested records, improperly alleging the
9 attorney-client privilege, the attorney work product doctrine, and Evidence Code Section 1040 preclude
10 disclosure pursuant to Government Code § 7927.705.

11 3. In particular, Petitioner seeks access to records that fall squarely within the scope of the
12 CPRA, including:

- 13 a. The contract executed between the Board or its agents and Judge Cordell.
- 14 b. Documents reflecting the Board’s approval or allocation of public funds for the
15 contract.
- 16 c. Timesheets or invoices submitted by Judge Cordell in support of her
17 compensation.
- 18 d. Copies of checks or records of payment issued to Judge Cordell for her services.

19 4. The requested records do not fall within the narrowly construed exemptions under the
20 CPRA and should be disclosed in the interest of public accountability.

21 5. The requested records were not made in anticipation of litigation or for the purpose of
22 obtaining legal advice. The Board previously argued—and this Court noted in its February 26, 2025
23 Order—the Board commissioned Judge Cordell to perform an investigation under the Board’s legislative
24 powers in order to pass legislation.

25 6. When the requested records were created the Board did not have authority to initiate
26 punitive quasi-judicial proceedings against Sheriff Corpus, and thus could not have been created in
27 anticipation of adjudicative proceedings.

1 **II. PARTIES**

2 1. Petitioner, Christina Corpus, is an individual who had her public records request denied.
3 Petitioner is also the elected Sheriff of San Mateo County. She petitions this Court in her individual
4 capacity as someone who had their public records request improperly denied.

5 2. Respondent San Mateo County Board of Supervisors is the board of supervisors for San
6 Mateo County, and it is being sued in its official capacity.

7 3. Respondent Mike Callagy is the County Executive Officer for San Mateo County and
8 serves as Clerk of the Board. He is being sued in his official capacity.

9 4. Respondent Sukhmani S. Purewal is the Assistant Clerk of the Board and is being sued
10 in his official capacity.

11 5. The identities of Does 1-10 are presently unknown to Petitioner, and when their identities
12 become known, their true names will be substituted. On information and belief, Petitioner alleges that
13 Does 1-10 are other San Mateo County public employees who participated in the creation, transmission,
14 and/or storage of the requested records.

15 **III. JURISDICTION AND VENUE**

16 1. This Court has jurisdiction under Government Code § 7923.100, which allows any person
17 whose request for public records has been denied to seek judicial relief.

18 2. This petition is brought under Code of Civil Procedure § 1085, which authorizes writs of
19 mandate to compel public agencies to perform legally required duties.

20 3. Venue is proper in this Court because the Board is a public agency operating in San Mateo
21 County, and Mr. Purewal and Mr. Callagy are public officials as defined under the CPRA (Gov. Code §
22 7920.500 et. seq.)

23 **IV. PROCEDURAL HISTORY AND FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

24 1. On information and belief, on July 10, 2024, John Nibbelin, the County Counsel of San
25 Mateo County, retained retired judge LaDoris H. Cordell to conduct a fact-finding investigation into
26 allegations regarding Sheriff Corpus's Office.

27 2. On September 12, 2024, in a public statement, the Board stated it had commissioned
28 Judge Cordell in July 2024 to conduct the investigation.

1 3. On November 12, 2024, the Board publicly released the report issued by Judge Cordell
2 (“Cordell Report”) and attached it to the agenda for the Board’s November 13, 2024, meeting.

3 4. On November 19, 2024, the board voted unanimously to adopt an ordinance, later
4 numbered 4899, calling a special election on March 4, 2025, for the purpose of amending the San Mateo
5 County Charter. The proposed amendment was named Measure A.

6 5. On December 3, 2024, the Board voted unanimously at the second reading of ordinance
7 number 4899.

8 6. On January 10, 2025, Sheriff Corpus filed a petition and complaint challenging the rushed
9 scheduling of the election on Measure A and the Board’s bias and improper reliance on the Cordell
10 Report as a quasi-judicial fact-finding act influencing their vote on the ordinance scheduling the election.

11 7. On February 18, 2025, the Board filed its Opposition to the Sheriff’s Petition arguing in
12 part that the Board’s investigation was a legislative act rather than a quasi-judicial act and the Board
13 conducted the investigation as part of their legislative power. (Declaration of Matthew J. Frauenfeld in
14 Support of Petition for Writ of Mandate (“MJF Decl.”), Exhibit (“Ex.”) 7)

15 8. On February 26, 2025, Judge Heally issued an Order, 25-CIV-00244 - Notice of Entry of
16 Judgment Order, denying Sheriff’s Corpus’s claims, finding in part that “The Resolution to propose
17 amending the County Charter was a legislative act, notwithstanding that the Board adopted it in response
18 to the Cordell Report” and citing authority that legislative bodies can conduct investigations as part of
19 their legislative powers. (MJF Decl., Ex. 6.)

20 9. On March 7, 2025, Petitioner submitted a CPRA request to Respondents, seeking access
21 to seven identified categories of records related to the Cordell investigation including the contract
22 engaging Judge Cordell. (MJF Decl., Ex. 1)

23 10. On March 17, 2025, Respondents claimed a 14-day extension to reply to the CPRA
24 requests under Government Code section 7922.535(c) in addition to the initial 10-day time period
25 permitted under Government Code section 7922.535(a). (MJF., Ex. 2)

26 11. On April 1, 2025, Respondent denied access to the records, citing the attorney-client
27 privilege, the work-product doctrine, and Evidence Code Section 1040 pursuant to Government Code
28 section 7927.705. (MJF Decl., Ex. 3)

