

1 **VERONICA A. F. NEBB**  
City Attorney, SBN 140001  
2 **BY: KATELYN M. KNIGHT**  
Assistant City Attorney, SBN 264573  
3 **KRISTOFFER S. JACOB**  
Assistant City Attorney, SBN 320286  
4 **SUKHNANDAN NIJJAR**  
Deputy City Attorney, SBN 352942  
5 **CITY OF VALLEJO**, City Hall  
6 555 Santa Clara Street, 3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Vallejo, CA 94590  
7 Tel: (707) 648-4545  
8 Email: [katelyn.knight@cityofvallejo.net](mailto:katelyn.knight@cityofvallejo.net)

9 Attorneys for Respondent CITY OF VALLEJO  
10

11 **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

12 **COUNTY OF SOLANO**

13 VALLEJO SUN, LLC,

14 Petitioner,

15 vs.

16 CITY OF VALLEJO,

17 Respondent.  
18

Case No. CU25-10261

**RESPONDENT CITY OF VALLEJO'S  
ANSWER TO VERIFIED PETITION  
FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF AND  
WRIT OF MANDATE**

Assigned to Hon. Stephen Gizzi, Dept. 3

19  
20 Respondent City of Vallejo answers Petitioner Vallejo Sun, LLC's Verified Petition for  
21 Declaratory Relief and Writ of Mandate under the California Public Records Act as follows:

22 **INTRODUCTION**

23 1. Answering the first paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal conclusions  
24 and argument requiring no response. To the extent that the paragraph contains factual allegations,  
25 the City denies all remaining allegations in this paragraph.

26 2. Answering the second paragraph, Respondent admits that Petitioner made a  
27 request under the Public Records Act for any AB748 video of the August 29, 2025 officer-  
28 involved shooting of Alexander Schumann. The remaining allegations therein consist of legal  
theory, conclusions, and argument requiring no response.



1 paragraph.

2 15. Answering the fifteenth paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal theory,  
3 conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

4 16. Answering the sixteenth paragraph, Respondent denies the allegations in this  
5 paragraph.

6 17. Answering the seventeenth paragraph, Respondent denies the allegations in this  
7 paragraph.

8 18. Answering the eighteenth paragraph, Respondent denies the allegations in this  
9 paragraph.

10 19. Answering the nineteenth paragraph, Respondent lacks sufficient information or  
11 belief to admit or deny the allegations in this paragraph due to the lack of specificity of the  
12 allegations and on that basis denies the allegations therein.

13 20. Answering the twentieth paragraph, Respondent admits that criminal charges were  
14 filed against Alexander Schumann. Respondent lacks sufficient information or belief to admit or  
15 deny the remaining allegations in this paragraph and on that basis denies the remaining allegations  
16 therein.

17 21. Answering the twenty-first paragraph, Respondent lacks sufficient information or  
18 belief to admit or deny the allegations in this paragraph due to the lack of specificity of the  
19 allegations and on that basis denies the allegations therein.

20 22. Answering the twenty-second paragraph, Respondent lacks sufficient information  
21 or belief to admit or deny the allegations in this paragraph due to the lack of specificity of the  
22 allegations and on that basis denies the allegations therein.

23 23. Answering the twenty-third paragraph, Respondent lacks sufficient information  
24 or belief to admit or deny the allegations in this paragraph due to the lack of specificity of the  
25 allegations and on that basis denies the allegations therein.

26 24. Answering the twenty-fourth paragraph, Respondent admits that a Town Hall  
27 Meeting regarding the officer-involved shooting incident was held on September 11, 2025, and  
28 that a recording is posted online. Respondent denies the remaining allegations contained therein.

25 25. Answering the twenty-fifth paragraph, Respondent admits that video footage and  
26 911 calls were included in the meeting presentation. Respondent denies the remaining allegations

1 contained therein.

2 26. Answering the twenty-sixth paragraph, Respondent admits the allegations therein.

3 27. Answering the twenty-seventh paragraph, Respondent lacks sufficient information  
4 or belief to admit or deny the allegations in this paragraph due to the lack of specificity of the  
5 allegations and on that basis denies the allegations therein.

6 28. Answering the twenty-eighth paragraph, Respondent lacks sufficient information  
7 or belief to admit or deny the allegations in this paragraph due to the lack of specificity of the  
8 allegations and on that basis denies the allegations therein.

9 29. Answering the twenty-ninth paragraph, Respondent admits that the faces of  
10 officers who are witnesses to the incident have been blurred in all publicly released video footage.  
Respondent denies the remaining allegations contained therein.

11 30. Answering the thirtieth paragraph, Respondent denies the allegations in this  
12 paragraph.

13 31. Answering the thirty-first paragraph, Respondent denies the allegations in this  
14 paragraph.

15 32. Answering the thirty-second paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal  
16 theory, conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

17 33. Answering the thirty-third paragraph, Respondent admits that Petitioner made a  
18 request under the Public Records Act for any AB748 video of the August 29, 2025 officer-  
19 involved shooting of Alexander Schumann, which is request 25-1048 in the City's online portal.  
20 Respondent denies the remaining allegations therein.

21 34. Answering the thirty-fourth paragraph, Respondent admits that the quoted  
22 language was issued in response to the referenced request. Respondent denies the remaining  
23 allegations in this paragraph.

24 35. Answering the thirty-fifth paragraph, Respondent admits that the e-mail exchange  
25 attached to the Petition as Exhibit 2 is true and correct. Respondent denies the remaining  
26 allegations in this paragraph.

27 36. Answering the thirty-sixth paragraph, Respondent admits that the e-mail exchange  
28 attached to the Petition as Exhibit 2 is true and correct. Respondent denies the remaining  
allegations in this paragraph.

1           37.     Answering the thirty-seventh paragraph, Respondent admits the allegations in this  
2 paragraph.

3           38.     Answering the thirty-eighth paragraph, Respondent admits that the City provided  
4 a further response on October 28, 2025, and included the language quoted, in addition to a  
5 timeframe for further update on the status of the request for further records. Respondent denies  
6 the remaining allegations.

7           39.     Answering the thirty-ninth paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal  
8 theory, conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

9           40.     Answering the fortieth paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal theory,  
10 conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

11           41.     Answering the forty-first paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal theory,  
12 conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

13           42.     Answering the forty-second paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal  
14 theory, conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

15           43.     Answering the forty-third paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal theory,  
16 conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

17           44.     Answering the forty-fourth paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal  
18 theory, conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

19           45.     Answering the forty-fifth paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal theory,  
20 conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

21           46.     Answering the forty-sixth paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal  
22 theory, conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

23           47.     Answering the forty-seventh paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal  
24 theory, conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

25           48.     Answering the forty-eighth paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal  
26 theory, conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

27           49.     Answering the forty-ninth paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal  
28 theory, conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

          50.     Answering the fiftieth paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal theory,  
conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

1 **CAUSE OF ACTION**

2 **(Unlawful Refusal to Disclose Public Records)**

3 51. Answering the fifty-first paragraph, Respondent incorporates its responses to  
4 paragraphs 1 through 50, as set forth above.

5 52. Answering the fifty-second paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal  
6 theory, conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

7 53. Answering the fifty-third paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal theory,  
8 conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

9 54. Answering the fifty-fourth paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal  
10 theory, conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

11 55. Answering the fifty-fifth paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal theory,  
12 conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

13 56. Answering the fifty-sixth paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal theory,  
14 conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

15 57. Answering the fifty-seventh paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal  
16 theory, conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

17 58. Answering the fifty-eighth paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal  
18 theory, conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

19 59. Answering the fifty-ninth paragraph, the allegations therein consist of legal theory,  
20 conclusions, and argument requiring no response.

21 **FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

22 Respondent alleges that the Petition fails to state sufficient facts to constitute a cause of  
23 action.

24 **SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

25 Respondent alleges that the Petition is barred to the extent it asserts claims outside the  
26 applicable statute of limitations.

27 **THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

28 Respondent alleges that the Petition is barred by virtue of the doctrines of waiver and  
estoppel.

///

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

**FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

Respondent alleges that by Petitioner’s own conduct, representations, and omissions, the Petition is barred by the doctrine of unclean hands.

**FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

Respondent alleges that it has at all times acted in good faith and with a reasonable belief that its redaction, release, and withholding of records respectively are permissible and/or required under existing law.

**SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE**

Respondent alleges that the Petition fails to set forth facts that would constitute a basis for an award of attorney’s fees and costs.

**PRAYER**

WHEREFORE the City prays for judgment as follows:

1. That no writ issue;
2. That declaratory relief be issued in favor of the City;
3. That injunctive relief be denied;
4. That the Court issue judgment in favor of the City on the entire Petition;
5. That Petitioner’s action be dismissed with prejudice;
6. That Petitioner take nothing by its Petition;
7. That the City be awarded costs of suit; and
8. For such other and further relief as the Court deems proper.

DATED: December 11, 2025

Respectfully submitted,



KATELYN M. KNIGHT  
Assistant City Attorney  
Attorney for Respondent  
CITY OF VALLEJO

1 **PROOF OF SERVICE**

2 I am over the age of eighteen (18) and not a party to the within entitled action. I am  
3 employed as a Paralegal for the City Attorney’s Office, City of Vallejo, and my business address  
4 is City Hall, 555 Santa Clara Street, Vallejo, California 94590.

5 On the date below, I served the following document(s):

- 6 • ***Respondent City of Vallejo’s Answer to Verified Petition for Declaratory Relief  
and Writ of Mandate***

7 on all interested parties, addressee(s) attached hereto to said action by the following means:

8  **BY MAIL:** By placing a true copy thereof, enclosed in a sealed envelope, for collection  
9 and mailing on that date following ordinary business practices, at the Office of the City  
10 Attorney, City of Vallejo, City Hall, 555 Santa Clara Street, Vallejo, CA 94590, addressed  
11 as shown below. I am readily familiar with the City government’s practice of collection  
12 and processing correspondence for mailing with the United States Postal Service. Under  
13 that practice it would be deposited with the United States Postal Service on that same day  
14 it was placed for collection and processing, with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the  
15 ordinary course of business. Said envelope was addressed to the parties as shown below.

16  **BY PERSONAL SERVICE:** By causing a true copy thereof to be delivered by hand to  
17 the office of the person(s) as shown below.

18  **BY ELECTRONIC TRANSMISSION:** By sending a true copy thereof via e-mail to the  
19 person(s) at the e-mail address(es) as shown below. No electronic message or other  
20 indication that the transmission was unsuccessful was received within a reasonable time  
21 after the transmission.

22 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the  
23 foregoing is true and correct.

24 Executed on this 11<sup>th</sup> day of December 2025, at Vallejo, California.

25   
26 \_\_\_\_\_  
27 SARAH CHESSER  
28

**\*\*ATTACHMENT\*\***

David Loy  
Aaron R. Field  
FIRST AMENDMENT COALITION  
534 4<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite B  
San Rafael, CA 94901  
Tel: (415) 460-5060  
Email: [dloy@firstamendmentcoalition.org](mailto:dloy@firstamendmentcoalition.org)  
[field@firstamendmentcoalition.org](mailto:field@firstamendmentcoalition.org)

**Counsel for Petitioner:**

**VALLEJO SUN, LLC**

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