		APP-002
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY:	STATE BAR NUMBER: 339846	
NAME: Michael S. Cohen	nortmont of Justice	FOR COURT USE ONLY
FIRM NAME: Attorney General's Office, California De STREET ADDRESS: 1300 St.	partment of Justice	
CITY: Sacramento	STATE: CA ZIP CODE: 94244-2550	
TELEPHONE NO.: (916) 210-6090	FAX NO.: (916) 324-8835	
EMAIL ADDRESS: Michael.Cohen@doj.ca.gov		
ATTORNEY FOR (name): Plaintiffs/Petitioners		
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF C	DRANGE	
STREET ADDRESS: 700 Civic Center Dr. West		
MAILING ADDRESS: CITY AND ZIP CODE: Santa Ana, CA 92701		
BRANCH NAME: Central Justice Center		
PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: The People of the Sta	ate of California, et al	
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: City of Huntington Be		
		CASE NUMBER: 30-2024-01393606-CU-WM-CJC
(UNLIMITED CIV	IL CASE)	00 202+ 0 1000000 00 Will 000
has been completed and a copy served,	the original may then be filed w	vith the court with proof of service.
1. NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that:	G	
a. (Name): Plaintiffs/Petitioners	appeals from a judgment or or	
 b. The judgment or order was entered on (lis May 28, 2025 	t the date or dates the judgment and	each order being appealed were entered):
c. The appeal is from the following order or ju	udgment (check all that apply):	
Judgment after jury trial		
Judgment after court trial	ON	
Default judgment		
Judgment after an order granting a s		
	of Civil Procedure, §§ 581d, 583.250,	583.360, of 583.430
x Judgment of dismissal after an order	-	
An order after judgment under Code	, . ,	
An order or judgment under Code of		
Other (describe and specify the code	e section or other authority that author	rizes this appeal):
 d The judgment or order being appeale (name): 	ed directs payment of sanctions by an appeals.	attorney for a party. The attorney
2. For cross-appeals only:		
a. Date notice of appeal was filed in original	appeal:	
b. Date superior court clerk mailed notice of	original appeal:	
c. Court of Appeal case number <i>(if known)</i> :		
3. x The judgment or order being appealed is	s attached (optional)	
Date: May 28, 2025	1000 C	Mult
Michael S. Cohen		Michoel & Cohen
(TYPE OR PRINT NAME)	<u>r</u> :	(SIGNATURE OF PARTY OR ATTORNEY)

Form Approved for Optional Use Judicial Council of California APP-002 [Rev. January 1, 2024]

NOTICE OF APPEAL/CROSS-APPEAL—UNLIMITED CIVIL CASE (Appellate)

Page 1 of 1 Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.100 www.courts.ca.gov

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE Central Justice Center 700 W. Civic Center Drive Santa Ana, CA 92702

SHORT TITLE: The People of the State of California vs. City of Huntington Beach

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/ELECTRONIC	CASE NUMBER:
SERVICE	30-2024-01393606-CU-WM-CJC

I certify that I am not a party to this cause. I certify that a true copy of the above Judgment dated 05/28/25 has been placed for collection and mailing so as to cause it to be mailed in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid pursuant to standard court practice and addressed as indicated below. This certification occurred at Santa Ana, California on 5/28/25. Following standard court practice the mailing will occur at Sacramento, California on 5/29/25.

R. MATTHEW WISE P.O. BOX 944255 SACRAMENTO, CA 94244	R. MATTHEW WISE 1300 I STREET STE 125 SACRAMENTO, CA 94244	
ROB BONTA 1300 I STREET STE 125 SACRAMENTO, CA 94244	ACTOOKET.COM	
	Clerk of the Court, by: S , Him, <u>I</u>	Deputy

I certify that I am not a party to this cause. I certify that that the following document(s), Judgment dated 05/28/25, was transmitted electronically by an Orange County Superior Court email server on May 28, 2025, at 9:32:05 AM PDT. The business mailing address is Orange County Superior Court, 700 Civic Center Dr. W, Santa Ana, California 92701. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1013b, I electronically served the document(s) on the persons identified at the email addresses listed below:

ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP ADASKAS@AWATTORNEYS.COM

ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP SSOLTANI@AWATTORNEYS.COM

MICHAEL E GATES MVIGLIOTTA@SURFCITY.HB.ORG

MICHAEL S COHEN MICHAEL.COHEN@DOJ.CA.GOV ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP ATAYLOR@AWATTORNEYS.COM

MICHAEL E GATES MICHAEL.GATES@SURFCITY-HB.ORG

MICHAEL E GATES PEGGY.HUANG@SURFCITY-HB.ORG

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/ELECTRONIC SERVICE

Clerk of the Court, by: , Deputy

REFRIENTED FROM DEMOCRACYDOCKET, CON

. Ele 30-2024-0139	tronically Received by Superior Court of California, Co 8606-CU-WM-CJC - ROA # 150 - DAVID H. YAMASAI	ounty of Orange, 04/15/2025 12:51:00 PM. KI, Clerk of the Court By L. Sanchez, Deputy Clerk. [Exempt From Frimg Fee Government Code § 6103]
	MICHAEL J. VIGLIOTTA, State Bar No. 20763 City Attorney <u>mvigliotta@surfcity-hb.org</u> PEGGY HUANG, State Bar No. 192125 Deputy City Attorney <u>peggy.huang@surfcity-hb.org</u> ANDREW KORNOFF, State Bar No. 283626 Deputy City Attorney <u>andrew.kornoff@surfcity-hb.org</u> 2000 Main St. P.O. Box 190 Huntington Beach, CA. 92648-2702 Telephone (714) 536-5538 Facsimile: (714) 374-1590	FILED SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF ORANGE MAY 2 8 2025 DAVID H. YAMASAKI, Clerk of the Court BY:,DEPUTY
13	ALYSSA R. DASKAS, State Bar No. 359379 <u>adaskas@awattornevs.com</u> 1 Park Plaza Ste. 1000 Irvine, California 92614 Telephone: (949 223-1170 Facsimile: (949) 223-1180	
15	Attorneys for Respondents CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH and ROBIN ESTANISLAU, IN HER OFFICIAL CAPACITY AS THE CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH CITY CLERK SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	E STATE OF CALIFORNIA
18 19	COUNTY OF ORANGE, CI	ENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER
20 21	THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, ex rel. ROB BONTA, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, et al	Case No. 30-2024-01393606-CU-WM-NJC ASSIGNED FOR ALL PURPOSES TO: HON. NICO DOURBETAS / DEPT C25]
22 23 24	Petitioners v.	[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF RESPONDENTS ROBIN ESTANISLAU AND CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH
25 26 27	CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH; ROBIN ESTANISLAU, in her official capacity as the City of Huntington Beach City Clerk; DOES 1 through 50, inclusive Respondents	Action Filed: 04/15/24 Trial Date: 04/03/25
28	01433.0018/1066787.2	1- N FAVOR OF RESPONDENTS

RECITALS

WHEREAS, on April 15, 2024, Petitioners, the People of the State of California, appearing
through California Attorney General Rob Bonta and California Secretary of State Dr. Shirley N.
Weber (collectively, "Petitioners") filed a petition for writ of mandate challenging a voter approved
charter amendment of Respondent City of Huntington Beach (the "City") that permitted the City to
require that voters provide identification before voting at municipal elections starting in 2026.
Petitioners named both the City and City Clerk Robin Estanislau, in her official capacity only, as
Respondents in the action (collectively, "Respondents").

9 WHEREAS, after the matter was fully briefed, on April 3, 2025, the Court held the hearing
10 on the merits in this case. Petitioners were represented by Deputy Attorney General Michael S.
11 Cohen and Respondents were represented by Anthony R. Taylor of Aleshire & Wynder LLP and by
12 Deputy City Attorney Peggy Huang.

WHEREAS, after the Court took the matter under submission on April 3, 2025,
subsequently on April 7, 2025, the Clerk of the Court served on counsel for the parties the Court's
minute order denying the petition, which is attached hereto as Exhibit A.

16 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED
17 that Judgment is entered in favor of the Respondents and against Petitioners. Any claims by
18 Respondents for their costs as the prevailing parties shall be made through a memorandum of costs
19 and any claims for attorneys' fees by Respondents shall be made through a noticed motion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: 5.28.25

The Honorable Nico Dourbetas Judge of the Superior Court



01433.0018/1066787.2

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

1

[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF RESPONDENTS

EXHIBIT A

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE CENTRAL JUSTICE CENTER

MINUTE ORDER

DATE: 04/07/2025

TIME: 07:45:23 AM DEPT: C25

JUDICIAL OFFICER PRESIDING: Nico Dourbetas CLERK: S. Hill REPORTER/ERM: None BAILIFF/COURT ATTENDANT: F. Camandang

CASE NO: **30-2024-01393606-CU-WM-CJC** CASE INIT.DATE: 04/15/2024 CASE TITLE: **The People of the State of California vs. City of Huntington Beach** CASE CATEGORY: Civil - Unlimited CASE TYPE: Writ of Mandate

EVENT ID/DOCUMENT ID: 74528925 EVENT TYPE: Under Submission Ruling

APPEARANCES

There are no appearances by any party.

The Court, having taken the above-entitled matter under submission on 04/03/2025 and having fully considered the arguments of all parties, both written and oral, as well as the evidence presented, now rules as follows:

The State of California's Petition for Writ of Mandate is DENIED.

Petitioner seeks to invalidate Section 705 of the City Charter of the City of Huntington Beach, which provides:

"Section 705. SPECIAL PROVISIONS RELATING TO MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS

As in Section 300, the City Charter shall determine the term of the City's elective officers, the length of term, and the election cycle in which the election for those offices occur for the City's elective officers. (a) Beginning in 2026, for all municipal elections:

(1) "Elector" means a person who is a United States citizen 18 years of age or older, and a resident of the City on or before the day of an election.

(2) The City may verify the eligibility of Electors by voter identification.

(3) The City may provide at least 20 Americans with Disabilities Act compliant voting locations for in-person voting dispersed evenly throughout the City, in addition to any City facility voting locations.

(4) The City may monitor ballot drop boxes located within the City for compliance with all applicable laws."

California Constitution, art. XI, §5, reserves for charter cities authority to "make and enforce all ordinances and regulations in respect to municipal affairs..." Subd. (b) provides that the "conduct of city elections" and "to provide ... the method by which, the times at which, and the terms for which the several municipal officers and employees whose compensation is paid by the city shall be elected or appointed..."

"The provision represents an affirmative constitutional grant to charter cities of all powers appropriate for a municipality to possess ... and [includes] the important corollary that so far as municipal affairs are

CASE 30-2024-01393606-CU-WM-CJC

concerned, charter cities are supreme and beyond the reach of legislative enactment." (State Building & Construction Trades Council of California v. City of Vista (2012) 54 Cal.4th 547, 556 [internal quotes omitted].)

"Under the state Constitution, the ordinances of charter cities supersede state law with respect to 'municipal affairs' (Cal. Const. art. CI, §5), but state law is supreme with respect to matters of 'statewide concern'" (Id. at 552.)

In assessing an invocation of the so-called home rule doctrine, courts are to apply the four-step analysis. (Id. [citing California Fed. Savings & Loan Assn. v. City of Los Angeles (1991) 54 Cal.3d 1 ("CalFed")].)

"First, a court must determine whether the city ordinance at issue regulates an activity that can be characterized as a "municipal affair." [citation] Second, the court "must satisfy itself that the case presents an actual conflict between [local and state law]." [citation] Third, the court must decide whether the state law addresses a matter of "statewide concern." [citation] Finally, the court must determine whether the law is "reasonably related to ... resolution" of that concern [citation] and "narrowly tailored" to avoid unnecessary interference in local governance [citation]. "If ... the court is persuaded that the subject of the state statute is one of statewide concern and that the statute is reasonably related to its resolution [and not unduly broad in its sweep], then the conflicting charter city measure ceases to be a 'municipal affair' pro tanto and the Legislature is not prohibited by article XI, section 5(a), from addressing the statewide dimension by its own tailored enactments." (Id.)

Petitioners contend that Charter Section 705 conflicts with Elections Code Section 10005, which provides:

"A local government shall not enact or enforce any charter provision, ordinance, or regulation requiring a person to present identification for the purpose of voting or submitting a ballot at any polling place, vote center, or other location where ballots are cast or submitted, unless required by state or federal law. For the purpose of this section, "local government" means any charter or general law city, charter or general law county, or any city and county."

A. Municipal Affair

There is no reasonable dispute that the charter provision concerns a municipal affair, as it is addressed toward the conduct of city elections.

B. Conflict

For there to be an "actual conflict" there must be a finding of a genuine conflict, meaning that the conflict must be "unresolvable short of choosing between one enactment and the other." (CalFed, Supra. 54 Cal.3d at 16-17.)

Petitioner argues that there is a clear conflict between a charter provision that requires voter identification and a state statute that prohibits charter cities from requiring voter identification. Respondent argues that there is no conflict because Section 10005 does not explicitly expand its scope to municipal elections in charter cities that are not consolidated with statewide elections. Respondent argues that the Court should not "infer an intent to contravene that authority [to conduct city elections] without more explicit guidance from the Legislature" (City of Redondo Beach v. Padilla (2020) 46 Cal.App.5th 902, 918.)

C. Matter of Statewide Concern

In Jauregui v. City of Palmdale (2014) 226 Cal.App.4th 781 it was held that the California Voting Rights Act implicated a matter of statewide concern and was thus effective to preclude a charter city from holding an at large election of city council members where there was evidence that this format of election

CASE 30-2024-01393606-CU-WM-CJC

led to the dilution of votes of minority members of the municipality. The Jauregui court reasoned that vote dilution implicated both the California Constitutional right to vote and also compromised the integrity of the electoral process.

Respondents argue that Jauregui is inapposite because that case turned upon the finding that there was actual vote dilution that resulted from the manner in which the respondent municipality actually administered elections.

Unlike Jauregui, the challenged charter provision does not violate the right to vote and does not implicate the integrity of the electoral process.

Jauregui recognizes that "the Fourteenth Amendment and article I, section 2" of the California Constitution provide "comparable protections in voting rights cases." (Jauregui, 226 Cal.App.4th at 800 [citing Canaan v. Abdelnour (1985) 40 Cal.3d 703, 715, overruled on other grounds in Edelstein v. City and County of San Francisco (2002) 29 Cal.4th 164, 183.].)

In Crawford v. Marion County Election Board (2008) 553 U.S. 181, the Supreme Court of the United States held that voter identification requirements do not violate the Fourteenth Amendment. Since the Fourteenth Amendment provides "comparable" protection of the right to vote, Crawford demonstrates that a voter identification requirement does not violate the right to vote.

There is no showing that a voter identification requirement compromises the integrity of a municipal election. Municipal election results do not lack integrity because only residents of a municipality who are eligible to vote participated in the election.

Since the procedures Respondent seeks to implement in conjunction with its municipal elections do not implicate matters of statewide concern, there is no need to assess whether Elec. Code §10005 is reasonably related to the achievement of any statewide concern.

Clerk is ordered to give notice.

ý

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE Central Justice Center 700 W. Civic Center Drive Santa Ana, CA 92702	
SHORT TITLE: The People of the State of California vs. City of Huntington Beach	
CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/ELECTRONIC SERVICE	CASE NUMBER: 30-2024-01393606-CU-WM-CJC

I certify that I am not a party to this cause. I certify that a true copy of the above Minute Order dated 04/07/25 has been placed for collection and mailing so as to cause it to be mailed in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid pursuant to standard court practice and addressed as indicated below. This certification occurred at Santa Ana, California on 4/7/25. Following standard court practice the mailing will occur at Sacramento, California on 4/8/25.

R. MATTHEW WISE P.O. BOX 944255 SACRAMENTO, CA 94244 R. MATTHEW WISE 1300 I STREET STE 125 SACRAMENTO, CA 94244

ROB BONTA 1300 I STREET STE 125 SACRAMENTO, CA 94244

Clerk of the Court, by: _____, Deputy

I certify that I am not a party to this cause. I certify that that the following document(s), Minute Order dated 04/07/25, was transmitted electronically by an Orange County Superior Court email server on April 7, 2025, at 7:46:51 AM PDT. The business mailing address is Orange County Superior Court, 700 Civic Center Dr. W, Santa Ana, California 92701. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1013b, I electronically served the document(s) on the persons identified at the email addresses listed below:

ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP ADASKAS@AWATTORNEYS.COM

ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP SSOLTANI@AWATTORNEYS.COM

MICHAEL E GATES MVIGLIOTTA@SURFCITY.HB.ORG

MICHAEL S COHEN MICHAEL.COHEN@DOJ.CA.GOV ALESHIRE & WYNDER, LLP ATAYLOR@AWATTORNEYS.COM

MICHAEL E GATES MICHAEL.GATES@SURFCITY-HB.ORG

MICHAEL E GATES PEGGY.HUANG@SURFCITY-HB.ORG

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/ELECTRONIC SERVICE

Clerk of the Court, by: , Deputy

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/ELECTRONIC SERVICE

,

,

1	PROOF OF SERVICE
2	The People of the State of California v. City of Huntington Beach/ Robin Estanislau Case No. 30-2024-01393606-WM-NJC
3	STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE
4	At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age and not a party to this action. I am
5 6	employed in the County of Riverside, State of California. My business address is 3880 Lemon Street, Suite 520, Riverside, CA 92501.
7	On April 15, 2025, I served true copies of the following document(s) described as [[PROPOSED] JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF RESPONDENTS ROBIN ESTANISLAU AND CITY OF HUNTINGTON BEACH on the interested parties in this action as follows:
8	SEE ATTACHED SERVICE LIST
9 10	BY E-MAIL OR ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION: I caused a copy of the document(s) to be sent from e-mail address pyasquez@awattorneys.com to the persons at the e-
11	mail addresses listed in the Service List. I did not receive, within a reasonable time after the transmission, any electronic message or other indication that the transmission was unsuccessful.
12	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.
13	Executed on April 15, 2025 at Riverside, California.
14	
15	<u> </u>
16	Patricia A. Vasquez
17	
18	
19 20	
20 21	
21	
22	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	01433.0018/1066787.2 -3- [PROPOSED] JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF RESPONDENTS
	[IKOLOSED] JODOMENT IN LAVOK OF KESKONDENTS

l		
1	SERVIC	CE LIST
2	The People of the State of California v. Ci	
3		
4	MICHAEL J. VIGLIOTTA, State Bar No. 207630	
5	City Attorney PEGGY HUANG, State Bar No. 192125	City Of Huntington Beach And Robin Estanislau, In Her Official
6	Sr. Deputy City Attorney 2000 Main St. P.O. Box 190	Capacity As The City Of Huntington Beach City Clerk
7	Huntington Beach, CA. 92648-2702 Telephone (714) 536-5538	
8	Facsimile: (714) 374-1590 mvigliotta@surfcity-hb.org	
9	peggy.huang@surfcity-hb.org chris@surfcity-hb.org	
10	<u>michele.hoffman@surfcity-hb.org</u> Rob Bonta -Attorney General of California	Attorneys for Petitioner,
11	R. Matthew Wise-Supervising Deputy Attorney General	The People Of The State Of California;
12	Michael S. Cohen, Esq. – Deputy Attorney General	Secretary Of State And Dr. Shirley N. Weber In Her Official Capacity As California Secretary
13	Office of the Attorney General 1300 I St., Ste. 125	Of State
14	P.O. Box 944255 Sacramento, CA. 94244-2550	
15	Tel: (916) 210-6090 Facsimile: (916) 324-8835	
16	michael.cohen@doj.ca.gov	
17	Orange County Superior Court 700 Civic Center Drive West	Courtesy Copy to Dept. C25
18	Santa Ana, CA 92701	
19		
20		
21		
22		
23 24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	01400 0010/1066797 0	1-
	01433.0018/1066787.2 [PROPOSED] JUDGMENT IN	-
ļ		

PROOF OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE

Case Name:	The People of the State of California, et al. v.	
	City of Huntington Beach, et al.	
Case Number:	30-2024-01393606-CU-WM-CJC	
Party Represented:	The People of the State of California; California Secretary of State	

Declaration of Electronic Service

- 1. I am at least 18 years of age and not a party to this matter.
- 2. I am employed in the Office of the Attorney General of the State of California. My business address is 300 South Spring Street, Suite 1702, Los Angeles, CA 90013-1230, Los Angeles County.
- 3. My electronic service address is Linda.Zamora@doj.ca.gov.
- 4. On May 28, 2025, I electronically served the following document[s]:

a. APP-002-NOTICE OF APPEAL

5. I electronically served the aforementioned document[s] by emailing them to the following individual[s]:

Michael J. Vigliotta, City Attorney Email: mvigliotta.@surfcity-hb.org Peggy Huang, Email: peggy.huang@surfcity-hb.org Senior Deputy City Attorney Huntington Beach City Attorney's Office Attorneys for City of Huntington Beach and Robin Estanislau, Huntington Beach City Clerk

> Email: ataylor@awattorneys.com Email: ssoltani@awattorneys.com Email: adaskas@awattorneys.com

Anthony R. Taylor Sunny K. Soltani Alyssa R. Daskas Aleshire & Wynder, LLP Attorneys for City of Huntington Beach and Robin Estanislau, Huntington Beach City Clerk

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct, and that this declaration was executed on May 28, 2025.

L. Zamora

<u>Signature</u>

Declarant SA2025300608