

1 Richard P. Fajardo, Esq., State Bar No. 104013  
David A. Luna, Esq., State Bar No. 61953  
2 **LUNA & FAJARDO**  
3540 Wilshire Blvd., Suite 417  
3 Los Angeles, California 90010  
(213) 383-1664  
4 Attorneys for Petitioner WCVI

5 David H. Martin, Esq., State Bar No. 189755  
Mark Ravis, M.D., J.D., State Bar No. 137479  
6 **RAVIS & MARTIN**  
270 N. Canon Dr., Third Floor  
7 Beverly Hills, California 90210  
310-251-6065  
8 Attorneys for Petitioner CORE-CA/LDEF

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO

WILLIAM C. VELASQUEZ )  
INSTITUTE, a Texas Non-Profit )  
Corporation, CONGRESS ON RACIAL )  
EQUALITY OF CALIFORNIA LEGAL )  
DEFENSE FUND, a California Non-Profit )  
Corporation, )

Petitioner,

v.

BRUCE McPHERSON, as Secretary of )  
State for the State of California, and )  
GEOFF BRANDT, as the Acting State )  
Printer with the Office of the State )  
Publishing, )

Respondents.

EDWARD J. ("TED") COSTA, SIDNEY )  
S. NOVARESI, ARTHUR LAFFER, )  
JIMMIE JOHNSON, )

Real Party In Interest.

CASE NO.:  
**PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
MANDATE**  
**[Code Civ. Proc. §1085]**  
**STATEWIDE ELECTION MATTER**  
**IMMEDIATE ACTION REQUESTED**

1 **INTRODUCTION**

2 Petitioner William C. Velasquez Institute (“WCVI”) and the Congress on Racial  
3 Equality of California (CORE-CA) brings this petition for writ of mandate asking the  
4 Court to issue a peremptory writ of mandate compelling respondents Bruce Mcpherson, as  
5 Secretary of State for the State of California, and Geoff Brandt, as the Acting State Printer  
6 with the Office of the State Publishing, to remove all materials pertaining to Initiative No.  
7 SA2004RF037, Amdt.#1-NS and any materials pertaining to the initiative that have been  
8 designated by the Secretary of State as Proposition 77 from (1) the Voter Information  
9 Guide for the November 8, 2005 Special Statewide Election (2) posting on the Secretary  
10 of State website and (3) the ballot for the for the November 8, 2005 Special Statewide  
11 Election.

12 On or about December 7, 2004, the Real Parties in Interest, submitted a proposed  
13 initiative to the Attorney General so that he could prepare a title and summary of the  
14 proposed initiative as required by law. Cal. Const., Art. II, §10(d), Cal. Elec. Code §9002.  
15 Subsequently, the proponents circulated a petition for signature which contained the title  
16 and summary prepared by the Attorney General but did not include the text of the  
17 initiative for which the title and summary were prepared. Subsequently, this unreview and  
18 different petition was submitted to the Secretary of State for certification and placement  
19 on the November 2005 Special Election ballot.

20 Petitioners seek this relief because the Real Parties in Interest, Edward J. (“Ted”)  
21 Costa, Sidney S. Novaresi, Arthur Laffer, Jimmie Johnson, the proponents of the proposed  
22 measure, failed to submit the text of the proposed initiative to the Attorney General for  
23 preparation of a title and summary prior to circulating the proposed measure to the voters  
24 as required by Article II, Section 10(d) of the California Constitution. Instead the  
25 proponents of the initiative circulated a petition with a different and revised text of a  
26 proposed initiative in violation of the Constitution and statutory requirements. This  
27 failure to comply with the Constitutional and statutory requirements of the initiative  
28

1 process disqualifies the petitions circulated but not submitted to the Attorney General  
2 purporting to be Proposition 77 from the ballot.

3 Time is of the essence in this matter since the printing deadlines for the ballot  
4 pamphlet are pending. Therefore, Petitioners will have to have this matter heard and  
5 decided, including appeals by Monday, August 15, 2005, at 5 p.m.

6 Petitioner, by this Petition, alleges:

7 1. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure  
8 section 1085.

9 **PARTIES**

10 2. Petitioner WILLIAM C. VELASQUEZ INSTITUTE (“WCVI”) is an  
11 organization with a direct, vital interest in this litigation. WCVI is dedicated to the  
12 empowerment of disenfranchised voters, especially those in the Latino community. To  
13 that end, WCVI regularly conducts polls to measure Latino attitudes on the major issues  
14 of the day, develops policy positions on those issues, asserted such policy position on  
15 behalf of the Latino community, and conducts education campaigns to inform members of  
16 the Latino Community on issues that affect them.

17 3. In addition, WCVI has been actively involved in promoting active participation  
18 in the political process, especially of disenfranchised communities. This includes  
19 encouraging Latinos to register, vote, and become involved in the political process.

20 4. WCVI was active in 1990 and 2000 California Redistricting process, including  
21 making redistricting mapping technology and data available to communities in California  
22 so that they could participate in the restricting process. WCVI conducted community  
23 outreach sessions throughout the state of California, explained to community groups how the  
24 redistricting process worked, assembled community of interest data, and showed  
25 community members how to redistrict their area. WCVI assisted in developing  
26 redistricting plans during the 1990 and 2000 California redistricting process for the  
27 California Assembly, Senate, and Congressional delegation which were submitted to the

1 Legislature.

2 5. Prior to June 23, 2005, WCVI learned of possible discrepancies between the text  
3 attached to the petitions being circulated for signature on behalf of the proposed initiative  
4 and the text of the initiative SA2004RF0037, Amdt. #1-NS submitted to the Attorney  
5 General by the proponents for which the Attorney General prepared the title and  
6 summary. On or about June 23, 2005, Antonio Gonzalez, President of WCVI, sent a letter  
7 to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General on behalf of WCVI, requesting that  
8 they investigate the matter and determine if any additional action was required. A true  
9 and correct copy of the Gonzalez’s Letter is attached hereto as Exhibit A and incorporated  
10 herein by reference. WCVI is dedicated to the empowerment of disenfranchised voters,  
11 especially those in the Latino community.

12 6. Petitioner CONGRESS OF RACIAL EQUALITY OF CALIFORNIA LEGAL  
13 DEFENSE FUND (“CORE-CA/LDEF”) is a direct development from the Congress of  
14 Racial Equality, and it is an organization with a long-standing, direct and vital interest in  
15 securing the rights of voters throughout the state of California. The original antecedent,  
16 CORE, was the third oldest of the major historical Civil Rights organizations of the  
17 United States, and was originated in the 1940’s by inventing the Non-Violent Freedom  
18 Rides and Sit-Ins of the 40’s, 50’and 60’s. It was the antecedents of CORE-CA, founded  
19 by James Farmer in Chicago in 1942, which introduced the concept of full-scale  
20 confrontation through Non-Violent Resistance to laws that were immoral but which had  
21 been adhered to since the end of Reconstruction and the Plessy v. Ferguson decision by  
22 which the past Supreme Court had enshrined the fallacious concept of ‘Separate but Equal  
23 as the law of the land.

24 7. CORE-CA has also established a Legal Defense and Education Fund (“CORE-  
25 CA/LDEF”), and is therefore uniquely situated – with its widespread membership among  
26 the African-American community, to represent that community. The community and  
27 People represented by CORE-CA/LDEF, together with the membership and populations  
28

1 represented by the co-Petitioners, stand to be particularly adversely impacted by the  
2 unlawful conduct of the State with respect to voting and redistricting rights unlawfully  
3 impacted by the redistricting initiative, as described herein.

4 8. CORE-CA, and now its subsidiary CORE-CA/LDEF, has also had significant  
5 historical involvement in the efforts to enact changes to the law regarding redistricting in  
6 both the 1991 and 2001 redistricting processes. In the 1991 California Redistricting that  
7 was based on the 1990 Decennial Census, CORE-CA submitted a complete set of maps  
8 and provided testimony at all of the Assembly and Senate Committee Hearings on  
9 Redistricting and also met with the Governor's Office to represent basic concerns of the  
10 minority "communities of interest.". When the Legislature and the Governor (then from  
11 opposite political parties) became deadlocked and the decision was referred to a Panel of  
12 Special Masters, Adrian Dove, the principal representative of CORE-CA/LDEF, was  
13 admitted to the bar to present Oral Arguments before the panel of masters on behalf of the  
14 State Supreme Court.. CORE-CA/LDEF, alongside MALDEF, in the Redistricting after  
15 the 2000 Census was one of the only Civil Rights organizations which prepared a  
16 complete and comprehensive set of proposed redistricting maps covering the entire state.  
17 Some of the CORE-CA/LDEF recommended lines and concepts were adopted in both the  
18 1991 and 2001 Statewide Redistricting and by the County of Los Angeles in their 1992  
19 and 2002. Redistricting processes. CORE-CA/LDEF and its Legal Defense and  
20 Education Fund have conducted Outreach and Awareness campaigns in the  
21 African-American, Hispanic, Asian-American and Low-Income Non-Hispanic White  
22 communities for participation in the Censuses of 1990 and 2000. CORE-CA has  
23 designed, organized and conducted effective campaigns of public information via media  
24 and has conducted public rallies and hearings to raise awareness of census and  
25 redistricting issues for inner-city voters and potential voters. CORE-CA is a 501-c-3,  
26 non-profit California Corporation which is headquartered in Los Angeles. It was founded  
27 by General Celes King III and is today Chaired by Adrian Dove a former White House  
28

1 Budget Analyst and Writer.

2 9. Respondent BRUCE McPHERSON, is the Secretary of State for the State of  
3 California. The Secretary of State is charged by statute with the duty to issue instruction  
4 to county clerks and registrars of voters regarding the verification of petition signatures; to  
5 receive from the county clerks and registrars of voters their certificates as to the number of  
6 valid signatures submitted in support of an initiative. Cal. Elec. Code §§9081, 9082,  
7 9086. As the chief elections officer, the Secretary of State has the duty to ensure the  
8 integrity of the elections process and to ensure that proposed measures have met all  
9 constitutional and statutory requirements for presentment to and circulation among the  
10 voters before those initiatives can be placed on the ballot.

11 10. Respondent GEOFF BRANDT, is the Acting State Printer with the Office of  
12 the State Publishing, and is sued in his official capacity only. The State Printer is charged  
13 by statute with the duty to print the ballot pamphlets as furnished by the Secretary of State  
14 (Cal. Elec. Code §9082), and in particular, printing the Voter Information Guide for the  
15 November 8, 2005, Special Statewide Election.

16 11. The real parties in Interest EDWARD J. (“TED”) COSTA, SIDNEY S.  
17 NOVARESI, ARTHUR LAFFER, and JIMMIE JOHNSON, (real parties) are the  
18 proponents of a proposed initiative constitutional amendment designated by the Secretary  
19 of State as Proposition 77. Real parties are also the proponents of a proposed  
20 constitutional amendment review by the Attorney General, and designated by him as  
21 SA2004RF0037, Amdt.#1-NS.

## 22 **STATEMENT OF FACTS**

23 12. On June 10, 2005, the Secretary of State announced that he had certified  
24 Proposition 77 for inclusion on the next statewide ballot. The Secretary of State  
25 announced that based on random sample verifications, Proposition 77 had received a  
26 projected 677,977 signatures, more than the 657,916 signatures needed to qualify. On  
27 June 13, 2005, California Governor Arnold Schwarzenegger issued a proclamation calling

1 for a statewide special election for November 8, 2005.

2 13. This matter must be decided as soon as possible in order to comply with the  
3 time requirements in the Elections Code section 9092 and the Government code Section  
4 88006 that this case not interfere with the printing and distribution of the Voter  
5 Information Guide.

6 14. The California Constitution and Elections Code dictate the requirements for  
7 handling the initiative petitions.

8 15. The California Constitution requires that an initiative is proposed by presenting  
9 to the Secretary of State a petition that sets forth the text of the proposed statute or  
10 amendment to the Constitution.” Cal. Const., Art. II, §10(b). The Secretary of State must  
11 then submit the measure at the next general or special election (at least 131 days after it  
12 qualifies). Cal. Const., Art. II, §10(c).

13 16. The Constitution requires that a copy of the initiative be circulated among  
14 voters must be first delivered to the Attorney General with a request for the preparation of  
15 a title and summary. Cal. Const., art II, §10(d); Cal. Elec. Code §9002. The California  
16 Constitution also provides that the “Legislature shall provide the manner in which  
17 petitions shall be circulated, presented, and certified, and measures submitted to the  
18 electors.” Cal. Const., art II, §10(e).

19 17. The California Legislature has adopted statutes requiring that upon receipt of  
20 the petition, the Attorney General shall prepare a “summary of the chief purposes and  
21 points of the proposed measure.” Cal. Elec. Code §9004.

22 18. The California Legislature has adopted statutes which require the Attorney  
23 General, immediately upon completion of the title and summary, “to transmit copies of the  
24 measure and summary to the Senate and Assembly.” Cal. Elec. code §9007. The  
25 Attorney General is also required to transmit a copy of the title and summary to the  
26 Secretary of State “within 15 days of receipt of the final version of a proposed initiative  
27 measure,” or within 15 days after “receipt of the fiscal estimate or opinion prepared by the  
28

1 Department of Finance and the Joint Legislative Budget Committee” if required. Id.

2 19. The California Legislature has adopted statutes governing the specific formats  
3 for initiative’s petition to be circulated for signatures. The Elections Code requires that  
4 every proposed initiative measure, prior to circulation, shall include at the top of the  
5 petition (a) the summary prepared by the Attorney General (on each petition’s page), (b)  
6 the summary prepared by the Attorney General (on petition section preceding the text),  
7 and (c) the statement “Initiative measure to be submitted directly to the voters” before the  
8 Attorney General’s summary. Cal. Elec. Code §9008.

9 20. The California Legislature has adopted statutes which require the manner in  
10 which the heading of a proposed initiative measure must appear. Cal. Elec. Code. §9002.  
11 “Any initiative or referendum petition may be presented in sections, but each section shall  
12 contain a full and correct copy of the title and text of the proposed measure.” Cal. Elec.  
13 Code §9014.

14 21. The California Legislature has adopted statutes which require the manner in  
15 signed petitions must be submitted to the local elections official who must certify the  
16 signatures on the petitions. Cal. Elections Code. §9030. These Officers required by law  
17 to receive or file in their offices any initiative or referendum petition shall not receive or  
18 file any initiative or referendum petition not in conformity with this article. Cal. Elec.  
19 Code §9014.

20 22. On or about December 7, 2004, the proposed initiative was received from real  
21 party Ted Costa, and was assigned a docket number SA2004RF0037 by the Attorney  
22 General. On the same day the Attorney General requested that the Department of Finance  
23 and the Legislative Analyst’s Office provide an analysis of the fiscal impacts the measure  
24 would have on the state and local governments.

25 23. On or about January 28, 2005, Mr. Costa submitted a technical and non  
26 substantive amendment to the proposed measure which added real parties Sidney S.  
27 Novaresi, Dr. Arthur Laffer, Jimmie Johnson, as proponents. The initiative was



1 renumbered to SA2004RF0037, Amdt. #1-NS to reflect the change. The proponents  
2 proposed no other changes to the proposed measure and submitted a copy of the  
3 initiative's text originally filed with the Attorney General.

4 24. On or about February 3, 2005, the Attorney General issued his title and  
5 summary for SA2004RF0037, Amdt. #1-NS to the Secretary of State. On the same date,  
6 the Attorney General sent the title, summary and text of proposed initiative  
7 SA2004RF0037, Amdt. #1-NS to the Chief Clerk of the Assembly and the Secretary of  
8 the Senate.

9 25. Prior to June 23, 2005, WCVI learned of possible discrepancies between the  
10 text attached to the petitions being circulated for signature on behalf of the proposed  
11 initiative and the text of the initiative SA2004RF0037, Amdt. #1-NS submitted to the  
12 Attorney General by the proponents for which the Attorney General prepared the title and  
13 summary. On or about June 23, 2005, Antonio Gonzalez, President of the WCVI sent a  
14 letter to the Secretary of State and the Attorney General requesting that they investigate  
15 the matter and determine if any additional action was required. A true and correct copy of  
16 Mr. Gonzalez's Letter is attached as Exhibit A to the declaration of Antonio Gonzalez,  
17 hereto, and incorporated herein by reference.

18 26. When the Attorney General's Office compared the circulating petition filed  
19 with Yuba County against the proposed redistricting initiatives submitted since the  
20 November 2004 statewide general election, the Attorney General determined that the  
21 petition circulated for signatures were never submitted to the Attorney General for  
22 preparation of the title and summary, as required by the Constitution and Elections code.

23 27. On or about July 1, 2005, Undersecretary of State William P. Wood advised  
24 the Senior Assistant Attorney General Louis R. Mauro "The initiative in question has been  
25 given the title 'Reapportionment. Initiative Constitutional Amendment.' by your office.  
26 We have been informed by the proponent that the text printed on the petitions that were  
27 circulated for this initiative differs from the text that was submitted to your office for the

1 preparation of the Attorney General’s title and summary.” Petitioners are informed and  
2 believe and upon such information and belief allege that the letter enclosed a  
3 memorandum dated June 10, 2005, from Daniel M. Kolkey, who Mr. Wood identified as  
4 counsel for the Initiative’s proponents (“Kolkey Memorandum”). The Kolkey  
5 Memorandum included an attached chart that listed differences between the Initiative as  
6 submitted to the Attorney General and the text printed on the circulating petitions. A true  
7 and correct copy of Mr. Wood’s Letter is attached as Exhibit B, hereto and incorporated  
8 herein by reference. True and correct copy of this chart listing differences between the  
9 Initiative as submitted to the Attorney General and the text printed on the circulating  
10 petitions is attached as Exhibit C, and in incorporated herein by reference.

11 28. There exist substantial and material differences between the text of the  
12 initiative certified by the Secretary of State for inclusion on the California November 2005  
13 ballot and the proposed initiative reviewed by the Attorney General for which he prepared  
14 a title and summary. These changes do not reflect correction of typographical errors,  
15 misspellings, minor word omissions, or other technical problems. The differences appear  
16 to reflect a conscious, systematic series of changes designed to correct substantive  
17 deficiencies or problems in the proposed initiative submitted to the Attorney General, and  
18 are material and substantial in nature and effect.

19 29. The text of Proposition 77 was never submitted to the Attorney General so that  
20 he could prepare a title and summary for that proposed initiative. Thus, Proposition 77  
21 cannot qualify for the ballot since it was circulated in violation of the California  
22 Constitution, Art. II, §10(d) and Election Code Section 9002. The proposed initiative  
23 presented to the Attorney General, SA2004RF0037, Amdt. #1-NS, has not been circulated  
24 to obtain the appropriate number of signatures. This proposed initiative cannot qualify for  
25 the ballot since it violates California Elections Code 9035.

26 30. Respondent Secretary of State has a mandatory duty to certify only those  
27 proposed measures which comply with state law, and he has no discretion to certify  
28

1 proposed measures that do not conform to the law. A writ of mandate should issue  
2 commanding respondent Secretary of State to (1) decertify Proposition 77, (2) inform the  
3 election officials of each County in the State of California that Proposition 77 has been  
4 decertified, (3) remove any and all materials pertaining to Proposition 77 or Initiative No.  
5 SA2004RF0037, Amdt #1-NS from the Secretary of State's website, and (4) prohibit  
6 respondent from posting any further such materials pertaining to Proposition 77 or  
7 Initiative No. SA2004RF0037, Amdt #1-NS on the website. A writ of mandate should  
8 further issue commanding respondent Secretary of State and the Acting State Printer to  
9 not permit any materials pertaining to Proposition 77 or Initiative No. SA2004RF0037,  
10 Amdt #1-NS to appear in (1) Voter Information Guide for the November 8, 2005, Special  
11 Election, or (2) on the ballot for the November 8, 2005, Special Statewide Election.

12 31. The California Constitution and Election codes have been violated, and  
13 Petitioners have no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law. (Code Civ. Proc. §1085.)  
14

15 WHEREFORE, Petitioners WCVI and CORE-CA/LDEF prays for the following  
16 relief:

17 1. That this Court set this matter for hearing at the earliest time consistent with its  
18 calendar.

19 2. That this Court issue a peremptory writ of mandate commanding:

20 a. Respondent, Bruce McPherson, Secretary of State for the State of  
21 California, to decertify Proposition 77, and inform the election officials of each  
22 County in the State of California that Proposition 77 has been decertified; and

23 b. Respondents, Bruce McPherson, Secretary of State for the State of  
24 California, to remove any and all materials pertaining to Proposition 77 or Initiative  
25 No. SA2004RF0037, Amdt #1-NS from the Secretary of State's website; that he be  
26 prohibited from posting any further such materials on the website; and  
27

1 c. Respondents, Bruce McPherson, Secretary of State for the State of  
2 California, and Geoff Brandt, the Acting State Printer with the Office of the State  
3 Publishing, to not allow any materials pertaining to Proposition 77 or Initiative No.  
4 SA2004RF0037, Amdt #1-NS to appear in (1) Voter Information Guide for the  
5 November 8, 2005, Speciall Election, or (2) on the ballot for the November 8,  
6 2005, Special Statewide Election.

7 3. For such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.  
8

9 Dated: July 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted by:  
**LUNA & FAJARDO**

11  
12 By: \_\_\_\_\_

Richard P. Fajardo  
Attorney for WCVI

13  
14 Dated: July 18, 2005

Respectfully submitted by:  
**RAVIS & MARTIN**

15  
16  
17 By: \_\_\_\_\_

David H. Martin  
Attorney for CORE-CA/LDEF

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

**VERIFICATION**

I, ANTONIO GONZALEZ, declare as follows:

I am the President of the William C. Velasquez Institute (“WCVI”), a Texas non profit corporation, qualified to do business in the State of California, and a Petitioner in the above entitled matter. I have read the foregoing Petition for Writ of Mandate and know its contents. In addition, I read and reviewed the Petition for Writ of Mandate filed by the Attorney General in Lockyer v. McPherson, et al. (Ted Costa, et al, the Real Parties in Interest) Case No. 05CS00998 (filed Sacramento County, July 8, 2005), the Exhibits in support thereof, the Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support of the Attorney General’s Petition for a Writ of Mandate, and the Declaration of Tricia Knight, and the Exhibits in support thereof, which were filed by the Attorney General in Lockyer v. McPherson, et al. (Ted Costa, et al, the Real Parties in Interest) Case No. 05CS00998 (filed Sacramento County, July 8, 2005). The facts stated therein are true and within my personal knowledge, except as to those matters which are alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true; and except as to those matters contained in the materials filed in matter of Lockyer v. McPherson, et al. (Ted Costa, et al, the Real Parties in Interest) Case No. 05CS00998 (filed Sacramento County, July 8, 2005), and of which the Court can take Judicial Notice, and as to those matters I believe them to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on July \_\_\_\_, 2005, at Los Angeles, California.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Antonio Gonzalez

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

**VERIFICATION**

I, ADRIAN DOVE, declare as follows:

I am the Chairman of the Congress of Racial Equality of California (“CORE-CA”), a California non-profit corporation, and also the Chairman of its subsidiary, the CORE-CA Legal Defense and Educational Fund (“CORE-CA/LDEF”), also a California non-profit corporation. CORE-CA/LDEF is a Petitioner in the above entitled matter, and, as Chairman, am authorized to sign on its behalf. I have read the foregoing Petition for Writ of Mandate and know its contents. In addition, I read and reviewed the Petition for Writ of Mandate filed by the Attorney General in Lockyer v. McPherson, et al. (Ted Costa, et al, the Real Parties in Interest) Case No. 05CS00998 (filed Sacramento County, July 8, 2005), the Exhibits in support thereof, the Memorandum of Points and Authorities in support of the Attorney General’s Petition for a Writ of Mandate, and the Declaration of Tricia Knight, and the Exhibits in support thereof, which were filed by the Attorney General in Lockyer v. McPherson, et al. (Ted Costa, et al, the Real Parties in Interest) Case No. 05CS00998 (filed Sacramento County, July 8, 2005). To the best of my knowledge ,the facts stated therein are true and within my personal knowledge, except as to those matters which are alleged on information and belief, and as to those matters, I believe them to be true; and except as to those matters contained in the materials filed in matter of Lockyer v. McPherson, et al. (Ted Costa, et al, the Real Parties in Interest) Case No. 05CS00998 (filed Sacramento County, July 8, 2005), and of which the Court can take Judicial Notice, and as to those matters I believe them to be true.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on July 18, 2005, at Los Angeles, California.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Adrian Dove  
Chairman, Congress of Racial Equality  
Of California Legal Defense and Educational  
Fund