

FEB 13 2019

RULING/ORDERS

Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer/Clerk  
By Neli M. Haya Deputy  
Neli M. Haya

Pico Neighborhood Association, et al. v. City of Santa Monica,  
Case No.: BC616804.

Defendant City of Santa Monica's Objections are extensive repetitions of their closing arguments. Nonetheless, the Court rules as follows:

Defendant's Objection 1:18-20 is SUSTAINED, except as the reference to dilution only. (Section 14027 refers to dilution or abridgment: "An at-large method of election may not be imposed or applied in a manner that impairs the ability of a protected class to elect candidates of its choice or its ability to influence the outcome of an election, as a result of the dilution or the abridgment of the rights of voters who are members of a protected class, as defined pursuant to Section 14026.")

Defendant's Objection 11:2-8 is SUSTAINED as to "serious" and "seriousness" only.

Defendant's Objection 11:8-15 is SUSTAINED as to "barely won" only.

Defendant's Objection 19:21 & fn. 9 is SUSTAINED as to "serious" only.

Defendant's Objection 17:4-21 is SUSTAINED as to "holistic" "serious" and "seriousness" only.

Defendant's Objection 17:25-18:1 is SUSTAINED as to "seriousness" only.

Defendant's Objection 28:18-21 is SUSTAINED as to Plaintiff's omission that "some members of the Committee on Interracial Progress supported the 1946 Santa Monica charter amendment and that none signed onto advertisements opposing it" only.

Defendant's Objection 13:10-14:8 is SUSTAINED as to Cottier v. City of Martin (8th Cir.2006) 445 F.3d 1113 only.

//

02/14/19

CLERK TO GIVE NOTICE TO ALL PARTIES.

IT IS SO ORDERED.



~~YVETTE M. PALAZUELOS~~  
YVETTE M. PALAZUELOS  
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

02/14/19