2	The Law Office of Brian Gurwitz, A 1422 Edinger Avenue, Suite 100	FILED FILED
	Tustin, California 92780 Phone: (714) 880-8800	SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ORANGE CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER
3	Fax: (714) 880-8801	DEC 13 2011
4	Brian@gurwitzlaw.com	ALAN CARLSON, Clerk of the Court
5	Attorney for Defendant	R. du een By R. LUCEY
6		
7	Superior Cour	t of California
8	COUNTY OF ORANGE, CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER	
9	COUNTY OF ORANGE, C	LIVITAL JOUTTOL GLIVILA
10		30-2011
11	Cathy Thomas,	Case No. 00529489
12	Petitioner,	Verified Petition for Writ Of Mandate
13	VS.	Code of Civ. Proc., §§ 1085-1086;
14	Anthony Rackauckas, Jr., in his capacity as Orange County District Attorney,	Govt. Code, § 6258.
16	Respondent.	
17	100000000000000000000000000000000000000	
18	Intro	duction
19	This writ proceeding arises out o	of the recent homicide of Kelly Thomas,
20	a mentally ill, homeless man killed by members of the Fullerton Police	
21	Department. The district attorney's office is prosecuting two of the involved	
22	police officers with murder and mans	laughter charges.
23	Petitioner Cathy Thomas is the	mother of Kelly Thomas. As her son's
24	legal representative, she is statutorily	entitled through the California Public
25	Records Act (CPRA) to obtain specific	ed records from the district attorney in
26	relation to the case, even though crim	ninal charges are pending. (See Gov.
27	Code, § 6254, subdivision (f).)	
28		

While conceding that petitioner falls within the class of individuals normally entitled to these documents, the district attorney has denied her CPRA request for various, conclusory reasons. The denial letter shows a startling lack of respect for his CPRA duties, insofar as the district attorney seeks to exempt *every single document in his possession*. Even if the district attorney's purported justifications for CPRA exemption had merit as to certain records (a point petitioner does not concede), it is inconceivable that this rationale would apply to every record in his possession, and that other remedies (e.g., redaction and/or protective orders) would not protect the interests he advances.

This writ petition is therefore necessary to compel the district attorney to fulfill the duties imposed upon him by law.

Allegations

By way of this verified petition, petitioner affirmative alleges the following:

- Petitioner Cathy Thomas is a resident of the County of Orange,
 State of California.
- Respondent Anthony Rackauckas, Jr., is the Orange County
 District Attorney.
- 3. Petitioner is the mother of Kelly Thomas, a homeless schizophrenic man who was unlawfully killed by members of the Fullerton Police Department.
- 4. Respondent is prosecuting two police officers for Mr. Thomas's homicide in *People v. Cicilnelli*, *et al.* (Orange Co. Sup. Ct. No. 11CF2575).
- 5. In a letter dated October 7, 2011 (and attached hereto as Exhibit A), petitioner made a California Public Records Act (CPRA) request of respondent, seeking "access to, and copies of, all records that [his] office

possessed relating to [his] investigation of the case against his killers, to the extent the materials are subject to disclosure under Government Code section 6254, subdivision (f)."

- 6. Section 6254, subdivision (f), generally provides crime victims with access to specified records in a criminal prosecution, even though the case is still pending.
- 7. Respondent wrongly denied Ms. Thomas's request in a letter dated October 14, 2011. (See Exhibit B, attached.)
- 8. In that letter, respondent conceded that as the murder victim's mother, Ms. Thomas "does indeed fall within the classification of individuals listed in Government Code section 6254, subdivision (f)."
- 9. Respondent nonetheless denied access to, and copies of, the records at issue, based on the conclusory grounds that their release could result in witnesses intimidation, jeopardize the investigation and prosecution of the defendants, prevent the empaneling of a jury, and deny a fair trial.
- 10. The district attorney made no good faith effort to comply with the CPRA. Even assuming for argument's sake that there was some justification to withhold one or more records, it strains credulity to believe that this justification would apply to each and every document in his possession.
- number of reasons. These reasons will be addressed in detail depending on the contents of his answer if any to this petition. Suffice it to say, the records requested are not confidential materials that remain exclusively within the possession of law enforcement. To the contrary, this is discovery that has presumably been released already to the defendants in the underlying criminal case. Just as Penal Code section 1054 et seq. required the disclosure to these defendants, Government Code section 6254, subdivision

(f), requires disclosure to the victim's next-of-kin.

12. This writ proceeding is authorized by Government Code section 6258 as the remedy to enforce petitioner's right to review the records at issue here.

Request for Relief

Petitioner respectfully seeks the following:

- 1. That the court issue an alternative writ of mandate ordering respondent to release the records sought by petitioner, or show cause why such an order should not issue.
- 2. That attorney fees and costs be paid by the Orange County
 District Attorney, as required by Government Code section 6259, subdivision
 (d).

Respectfully submitted this 13th day December, 2011.

The Law Office of Brian Gurwitz, APC

Brian N. Gurwitz

Counsel for Petitioner

Verification

I, Brian Gurwitz, declare:

I represent petitioner in this writ proceeding. I have prepared this petition and know its contents. I have knowledge of all matters set forth herein and know them to be true, except as to those matters stated on information and belief, 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 this 13th day of December, 2011 in Tustin, California.

Brian N. Gurwitz

Eth A.



CERTIFIED CRIMINAL LAW SPECIALISE / STATE BAR OF CALIFORNIA / BOARD OF LEGAL SPECIALIZATION

1422 Edinger Avenue, Suite 100, Tustin, CA 92780
tti: 714-880-8800
fAS: 714-880-8801
CHI: 714-925-2675
fMAU Brian@Gurwitzlaw.com
www.Gurwitzlaw.com

October 7, 2011

Tony Rackauckas
Orange County District Attorney
401 Civic Center Drive West
Santa Ana, California 92701

Re: California Public Records Act Request concerning *People v. Cicinelli, et al.* (11CF2575)

Dear Tony:

As you know, I represent Cathy Thomas in connection with the murder of her son, Kelly Thomas.

I respectfully request that we be provided access to, and copies of, all records that your office possesses relating to your investigation of the case against his killers, to the extent the materials are subject to disclosure under the Government Code section 6254, subdivision (f).

Ms. Thomas falls within the classification of individuals entitled to receive these records for two reasons. First, she is a "victim" of the "incident" investigated by your office. (See, e.g., Cal. Const., Art. I, § 28, subd. (e) [defining "victim" to include the parents of a deceased crime victim].) Second, my client is an "authorized representative" of her son since he died intestate, and without children or a spouse, and thus she is statutorily entitled to pursue wrongful death and survivorship claims against the perpetrators of his homicide. (See, e.g., Code of Civ. Proc. § 377.60.)

The requested records include, but are not limited to, all audio and video recordings of Mr. Thomas's beating. These recordings are subject to disclosure insofar as they memorialize the "statements of the parties involved in the incident." (Govt. Code, § 6254, subd. (f); see also Govt. Code, § 6252, subd. (e) [defining "public records" to include audiovisual recordings, as opposed to simply transcripts of the statements contained on the recordings].)

I will note that neither my client nor I desire to release into the public domain any material that might jeopardize your ability to obtain a conviction against the defendants in this case. To that end, I am willing to receive the copies of the records

subject to a mutually-agreeable court order that prohibits me or my client from making further copies of the records, or publicizing the contents thereof.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Brian N. Gurwitz

Counsel for Cathy Thomas



OFFICE OF THE

DISTRICT ATTORNEY

ORANGE COUNTY, CALIFORNIA

TONY RACKAUCKAS, DISTRICT ATTORNEY

October 14, 2011

Mr. Brian N. Gurwitz 1422 Edinger Avenue Suite 100 Tustin, CA 92780

Re: Public Records Act Request concerning People v. Cicinelli, et al.

Dear Mr. Gurwitz:

JIN TANIZANI SENDA GRINDA

SENIOR ASSISTANT D.A. VERTICAL PROSECUTIONS/ VIOLENT CRIMES

WILLIAM FECCIA SENIOR ASSISTANT D.A. SPECIAL PROJECTS

MARY ANNE NCCAULEY SENIOR ASSISTANT D.A. BRANCH COURT OPERATIONS

JOSEPH B'AGOSTINO SENIOR ASSISTANT D.A. GENERAL FELONIES/ ECONOMIC CRIMES

JEFF #CLAUGHLIN CHIEF BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

LISA BOHAN - JOHNSTON DIRECTOR ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES

SUSAN KANG SCHROEDER CHIEF OF STAFF

In compliance with Government Code Section 6253, this letter addresses your Public Records Act request dated October 7, 2011, which this office received the same day via email. This letter constitutes our formal response, which is made within that statutorily required time, to your public record demand.

In your letter, you requested the following information: "[A]ccess to, and copies of, all records that your office possesses relating to your investigation of the case against his [Kelly Thomas'] killers, to the extent the materials are subject to disclosure under the Government Code section 6254, subdivision (f)."

Since the materials are being requested on behalf of Cathy Thomas, the mother of Kelly Thomas, she does indeed fall within the classification of individuals listed in Government Code Section 6254, subdivision (f), who would be entitled, at some point in time, to the information contained within that subdivision, including the names & addresses of persons involved in, or witnesses other than confidential informants to, the incident, the description of any property involved, the date, time, and location of the incident, all diagrams, statements of the parties involved in the incident, and the statements of all witnesses, other than confidential informants.

However, as you are aware, our office is currently prosecuting Manuel Anthony Ramos and Jay Patrick Cicinelli for their criminal participation in the beating-death of Kelly Thomas, as reflected in Orange County Superior Court case number 11CF2575. As such, to release the materials at this juncture, including the names and addresses of all persons involved in or witnesses to the incident, along with statements of all of the witnesses, would clearly endanger the successful completion of the investigation and the case against the defendants.

Furthermore, the suggested "mutually-agreeable court order" prohibiting further copies of the records or publicizing of the contents of the material, along with the asserted aversion to releasing the material or jeopardizing the ability to obtain a conviction, will not be sufficient to prevent endangerment of the successful completion of the investigation and prosecution. The premature release of any information

will not only make it difficult to impanel an impartial jury, but it may also tend to prevent a fair trial. Moreover, permitting the review of the materials in the investigative file at this point could result in potential interference with witnesses due to influence, or even intimidation. While there may be a shared interest in the prosecution of these defendants, our office has a separate and compelling interest in the criminal prosecution and bringing the perpetrators to justice, an interest that will be jeopardized by the premature disclosure of the investigative materials.

Therefore, notwithstanding the rights of Ms. Thomas to the information listed in Government Code Section 6254, subdivision (f), we are asserting the exception to Government Code Section 6254, subdivision (f), and will not be releasing the information at this time. We will consider this request pending and will release the information as soon as there is a change of circumstance.

If you disagree with the positions I have taken in this letter, I am willing to reconsider my views based on any reasons you wish to present or any legal authorities you wish to cite.

Sincerely,

Rebecca L. Olivieri

Senior Deputy District Attorney Special Prosecutions Unit

•	PU5-040
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name, State Ber number, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY
Brian N. Gurwitz 171862	
1422 Edinger Avenue, Suite 100	
Tustin, California 92780 TELEPHONE NO.: 714-880-8800 FAX NO. (Optional): 714-880-8801	
E-MAIL ADDRESS (Optional): Brian@Gurwitzlaw.com	
ATTORNEY FOR (Name):	
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF Orange	
STREET ADDRESS: 700 Civic Center Drive West	
mailing address: city and zip code. Santa Ana, CA 92701	
BRANCH NAME: Central	
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Cathy Thomas	
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT Anthony Rackauckas, Jr.	CASE NUMBER:
PROOF OF SERVICE—CIVIL	TBD
Check method of service (only one):	
By Personal Service By Mail By Overnight Delivery	JUDGE:
By Messenger Service By Fax By Electronic Service	DEPT.:
(Do not use this proof of service to show service of a Summor	ns and complaint.)
1. At the time of service I was over 18 years of age and not a party to this action.	
2. My residence or business address is:	
1422 Edinger Avenue, Suite 100 Tustin, California 92780	
3. The fax number or electronic notification address from which I served the documen electronic service):	nts is (complete if service was by fax or
4. On (date): I served the following documents (specify):	
Verified Petition for writ of mandate.	
The documents are listed in the Attachment to Proof of Service–Civil (Documents	Served) (form POS-040(D)).
5. I served the documents on the person or persons below, as follows:	
a. Name of person served: Orange County District Attorney Tony Rackaucka	s
b. Complete if service was by personal service, mail, ovemight delivery, or messer	nger service.)
Business or residential address where person was served;	
401 Civic Center Drive West, Santa Ana, CA 92701	
c. (Complete if service was by fax or electronic service.)	
(1) Fax number or electronic notification address where person was served:	
(2) Time of service:	
The names, addresses, and other applicable information about persons served is	on the Attachment to Proof of
Service—Civil (Persons Served) (form POS-040(P)).	
6. The documents were served by the following means (specify):	
a.	torney's office by leaving the documents, with a receptionist or an individual in ening. (2) For a party, delivery was made
between the hours of eight in the morning and six in the evening. (Continued on back)	

	POS-04
CASE NAME	CASE NUMBER:
Thomas v. Rackauckas	TBD
6. b. By United States mail. I enclosed the documents in a seale addresses in item 5 and (specify one):	ed envelope or package addressed to the persons at the
(1) deposited the sealed envelope with the United Stat	tes Postal Service, with the postage fully prepaid.
with this business's practice for collecting and proc	owing our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar cessing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that g, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the with postage fully prepaid.
I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing (city and state):	occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at
c. By overnight delivery. I enclosed the documents in an envious carrier and addressed to the persons at the addresses in item and overnight delivery at an office or a regularly utilized drop	m 5. I placed the envelope or package for collection
d. By messenger service. I served the documents by placing at the addresses listed in item 5 and providing them to a pro the messenger must accompany this Proof of Service or be	fessional messenger service for service. (A declaration by
e. By fax transmission. Based on an agreement of the partie to the persons at the fax numbers listed in item 5. No error record of the fax transmission, which I printed out, is attached	es to accept service by fax transmission, I faxed the documents was reported by the fax machine that I used. A copy of the ed.
f. By electronic service. Based on a court order or an agreed I caused the documents to be sent to the persons at the electron within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electron unsuccessful.	ment of the parties to accept service by electronic transmission, ctronic notification addresses listed in item 5. I did not receive, sic message or other indication that the transmission was
I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Californ	nia that the foregoing is true and correct.
Date: B. (-74RW/17-Z	▶ R. Jan
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF DECLARANT)	(SIGNATURE OF DECLARANT)
(If item 6d above is checked, the declaration below must be completed or a sepa	arate declaration from a messenger must be attached.)
DECLARATION OF	MESSENGER
By personal service. I personally delivered the envelope or particle addresses listed in item 5. (1) For a party represented by an attornation office by leaving the documents in an envelope or package, which with a receptionist or an individual in charge of the office, between For a party, delivery was made to the party or by leaving the document 18 years of age between the hours of eight in the morning a	orney, delivery was made to the attorney or at the attorney's och was clearly labeled to identify the attorney being served, en the hours of nine in the morning and five in the evening. (2) cuments at the party's residence with some person not younger
At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age. I am not a par	ty to the above-referenced legal proceeding.
I served the envelope or package, as stated above, on (date):	•
	arnia that the foregoing is true and correct
I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Califo	in that the foregoing is that and correct.
I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of Califo Date:	mina that the foregoing is that and correct.
	A
	(SIGNATURE OF DECLARANT)