

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

**34-2023-00333102-CU-MC-GDS: Danielle Creedon vs. San Juan Unified School District, a  
California Unified School District  
02/13/2024 Hearing on Motion for Summary Judgment in Department 54**

Tentative Ruling

**TENTATIVE RULING**

Defendant San Juan Unified School District's ("the District") motion for summary judgment, or alternatively, summary adjudication, against Plaintiffs Danielle Creedon, an individual and as a taxpayer on behalf of herself and the taxpayers of the San Juan Unified School District; Alex M. Davis, an individual and as a taxpayer on behalf of herself and the taxpayers of the San Juan Unified School District ("Plaintiffs") and Plaintiff's cross-motion for summary adjudication as to the first and second causes of action against the District are jointly ruled upon as follows.

The District's requests for judicial notice are GRANTED. In taking judicial notice of these documents, the court accepts the fact of their existence, not the truth of their contents. (*Steed v. Department of Consumer Affairs* (2012) 204 Cal.App.4th 112, 120-121.)

Plaintiffs filed the original Verified Complaint on January 17, 2023, and the First Amended Complaint ("FAC") on March 20, 2023. The FAC alleges five causes of action for declaratory and injunctive relief against the District under Education Code section 15284 et seq. and Code of Civil Procedure section 526a. Plaintiffs have brought this action in their capacity as individuals and as taxpayers on behalf of taxpayers of the District.

Generally, Plaintiffs seek an injunction and declaratory relief to stop the District's construction of a new school at the District's former Creekside Elementary School site, the Katherine Johnson Middle School ("KJMS") (the "Project"). Plaintiffs allege the Project is an illegal expenditure of public funds because it was not included in the Project List for Measure P, which was approved by voters in November of 2016. Measure P authorized the issuance of up to \$750 million in bonds to finance new construction projects and repair the District's facilities.

The District demurred to all causes of action, and on August 3, 2023, the Court overruled the District's demurrer to the first cause of action for bond waste prevention (Education Code Section 15284), second cause of action for taxpayer waste (Code of Civil Procedure sections 526a and 1060), fourth cause of action for school bond waste prevention (Education Code Section 15284) and fifth cause of action for taxpayer waste (Code of Civil Procedure sections 526a and 1060). The Court sustained with leave to amend Plaintiffs' third cause of action for school bond waste prevention, and Plaintiffs did not amend. Therefore, only Plaintiffs' first, second, fourth and fifth causes of action remain.

Plaintiff's now bring a motion for summary adjudication as to Plaintiffs' first cause of action for declaratory relief for bond waste prevention (Education Code Section 15284) and as to Plaintiffs' second cause of action for declaratory relief for taxpayer waste (Code of Civil Procedure sections 526a).

The District now brings a motion for summary judgment, or alternatively for summary adjudication, as to the first, second, fourth, and fifth causes of action.

**Facts**

Plaintiffs bring this action, challenging the District's decision to use bond proceeds under "Measure P" to relocate the middle school part of Encina Preparatory High School ("Encina") to

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

**34-2023-00333102-CU-MC-GDS: Danielle Creedon vs. San Juan Unified School District, a  
California Unified School District  
02/13/2024 Hearing on Motion for Summary Judgment in Department 54**

2641 Kent Drive, Sacramento, California (the “Creekside Site”). Plaintiffs argue Measure P’s Project List does not identify a new middle school at the Creekside Site and that the new middle school—which the District administratively separated and renamed “Katherine Johnson Middle School” (“KJMS”) in 2021—is not mentioned on the Project List.

The District is a unified school district serving students and families in a 75-square-mile area covering the communities of Arden-Arcade, Carmichael, Citrus Heights, Fair Oaks, Gold River and Orangevale in eastern Sacramento County. (District’s Statement of Undisputed Material Fact (“SUMF”) 1.)

The District owns the Creekside Site that once housed an elementary school called Creekside Elementary School. (SUMF 7.) In November and December 2022, the District Board of Education (“Board”) passed resolutions and notices to proceed authorizing the District to proceed with the construction of a new middle school to house KJMS after it is relocated from Encina. (SUMF 8.) The District funded the Project using proceeds from the sale of general obligation bonds through a 2016 ballot measure under Proposition 39 (Cal. Constitution Article XIII A § 1), Measure P. (SUMF 9.)

The Board placed Measure P on the November 8, 2016 ballot via Resolution No. 2809. (SUMF 10.) Measure P authorized the District to issue up to \$750 million in bonds to finance projects appearing on the Project List or in the District’s 2014 Facility Master Plan (“2014 Master Plan”). (SUMF 11.) In the November 8, 2016 election, the District’s voters passed Measure P. (SUMF 12.)

Measure P’s Project List begins with a broad description of the purpose and intended use of Measure P bond funds, and statements regarding how the Project List should be interpreted:

The Bond Project List contains more projects than the District currently estimates the Bonds can fund to provide flexibility should additional efficiencies be realized or should District priorities change. The Board may undertake repairs, improvements, acquisitions, demolitions, **relocations, new construction**, and/or furnishing or equipping of school facilities, to complete each or any of the projects listed below as may be determined desirable by the District at the time the project is undertaken.

(SUMF 15) (emphasis added).

It also authorizes the Board to “make changes to the Bond Project List in the future consistent with the projects specified in the proposition.” (SUMF 15.)

In addition, the Project List clarifies that “[s]ection headings are not part of the project list and are provided for convenience only.” (SUMF 16.) The structure of the remainder of the Project List includes a list of “district owned properties and facilities” at which the specific projects may be undertaken, followed by a list of specific types of projects that may be undertaken at all of those sites. (SUMF 17.) The Project List states that “[t]he following projects, in addition to the projects contemplated by the District’s 2014 facility master plan, which are hereby incorporated herein by reference, are authorized at all current and future district owned properties and facilities.” (SUMF 17.) The Project List follows that statement with a list of seventy-two District-

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

**34-2023-00333102-CU-MC-GDS: Danielle Creedon vs. San Juan Unified School District, a  
California Unified School District  
02/13/2024 Hearing on Motion for Summary Judgment in Department 54**

owned properties. (SUMF 17.) “Encina Preparatory High”—where KJMS is currently located—is included in the Project List. (SUMF 18, 42.) The Creekside Site is also included in the Project List as “Creekside.” (SUMF 19.)

The Project List next lists of a wide range of projects that may be undertaken at each current or future district-owned property. (SUMF 20-24.) The Project List expressly authorizes the District to construct “[a]dditional classrooms and facilities for all District schools, buildings, and sites.” SUMF 21. The District can also upgrade “restrooms, floors and roofs, . . . windows, doors, and door locks, asbestos mitigation, [facades], food service storage, preparation, and serving areas, food service equipment, administrative facilities, multi-purpose educational facilities, physical education/athletic facilities; education support facilities, counseling areas, student services areas, locker rooms, including showers and lockers, portable classrooms (including acquisition), etc.” (SUMF 21.) And “[f]or any project involving modernization or renovation of a building or the major portion of a building” the District is “authorized to proceed with new replacement construction if replacement and new construction is preferable considering the building’s age, condition and other relevant factors.” (SUMF 21.) Apart from these projects that expressly contemplate the construction of entirely new facilities, the District can also undertake facility repair and upgrade projects that touch on nearly every aspect of a given facility. (SUMF 20, 22.)

The Project List incorporates by reference the District’s 2014 Master Plan. (SUMF 25.) The District and its third-party consultant, DLR Group, prepared the 2014 Master Plan in 2013 to 2014 and it was published in June 2014. (SUMF 26.)

The District (or its pre-unification predecessor districts) have owned the Creekside Site since at least 1952. (SUMF 28.) Creekside Elementary School operated at the Creekside site until June 2005, when the District closed it as part of a consolidation of District schools. (SUMF 30.) From 2009 to 2015, an organization called Keystone Education leased the Creekside Site for use as a special needs school called Pathway to Choices. (SUMF 31.) Pathway to Choices occupied the Creekside Site at the time of the 2014 Master Plan. (SUMF 32.) In the 2014 Master Plan, the DLR Group, with the District’s input, assistance and approval, evaluated the properties the District owned, including the Creekside Site, and assigned a letter grade of A through F to each based on the physical condition of the facilities. (SUMF 33.) The District and DLR Group concluded in the 2014 Master Plan that the Creekside “[S]ite and buildings are in a state of advanced deterioration and a significant amount of work is required to bring this facility and site up to the condition needed for students and faculty to use as a genuine teaching facility.” (SUMF 34.) The facilities at the Creekside Site were assigned an “F” grade. (SUMF 35.) The condition of the facilities at the Creekside Site had not improved between the evaluation in the 2014 Master Plan and December 2022, when the District authorized the Project. (SUMF 37.) Pathway to Choices vacated the Creekside Site in 2015. (SUMF 38.)

Sometime in or before May 2016, the District began using the Creekside Site for its adult education program. (SUMF 39.) From then on it was known as the “Creekside Adult Center.” (SUMF 39.) The Creekside Site hosted adult education programs for the District in November 2016, when Measure P passed. (SUMF 40.) The District closed the Creekside Adult Center to make way for the Project on or about December 12, 2022. (SUMF 41.)

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

**34-2023-00333102-CU-MC-GDS: Danielle Creedon vs. San Juan Unified School District, a  
California Unified School District  
02/13/2024 Hearing on Motion for Summary Judgment in Department 54**

KJMS is a middle school that serves students in grades 6-8 (middle school students) and is currently located at the Encina campus (Encina currently serves high school students, those in grades 9-12). (SUMF 42-44, 59-60.) KJMS is the end result of over a decade of changes that the District undertook with respect to Encina. Before 2011, Encina served high school students drawn from “feeder” middle schools and K-8 schools within its boundaries. (SUMF 45.) In 2010, Encina was deemed a “persistently low performing school,” which made it eligible for federal grant funding and prompted the District to “redesign” Encina’s program. (SUMF 46.)

On April 12, 2011, the Board approved a redesign of Encina’s program to include both middle school and high school students (grades 6-12) and the closure of a “feeder” middle school within Encina’s boundaries. (SUMF 48.) Encina Preparatory High served both middle school and high school students when Measure P passed in November 2016. (SUMF 51.) Encina continued to underperform academic standards. (SUMF 53.) Beginning in 2018 to 2019, the District took measures to investigate and rectify Encina’s poor academic performance. (SUMF 54.)

In 2020, the District began the process of separating and relocating grades 6-8 from grades 9-12 at Encina. The District convened an “Encina Middle School District Sponsorship Team” and hired a middle school principal for the planned separate middle school. (SUMF 60.) At a March 9, 2021 meeting, the District approved the administrative separation of grades 6-8 at Encina to form “Encina Middle School” starting in the 2021/2022 school year. (SUMF 61.) On May 25, 2021, the District approved the renaming of the Encina Middle School as the Katherine Johnson Middle School. (SUMF 62.)

The District considered several options to achieve a permanent physical separation between KJMS and Encina Preparatory High. (SUMF 66.) The District chose to construct a new middle school facility at the Creekside Site and to relocate KJMS to that new facility—the Project—because it concluded that the Project best met the applicable criteria. (SUMF 8, 71.)

On January 11, 2022, the District unanimously approved the relocation of KJMS to the Creekside Site. (SUMF 72.)

Upon completion of the Project, KJMS will be completely separated from Encina, both physically and administratively, such that there will be no grades 6-8 students attending school at Encina’s campus. (SUMF 73.)

Plaintiffs add the following additional facts:

Measure P does not identify “Creekside” as a middle school. (Plaintiff’s Additional Material Fact “AMF”) 2, 14, 26.)

Measure P identifies “Creekside” only under the heading “Other Facilities.” (AMF 3, 15, 27.)

The only reference to “Encina” in Measure P is “Encina Preparatory High School” under the heading “High Schools.” (AMF 4, 16, 28.)

The Facilities Master Plan section for “Creekside Elementary School” does not identify it as a middle school. (AMF 5, 17, 29.)

The Facilities Master Plan section for “Creekside Elementary School” does not identify any

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

**34-2023-00333102-CU-MC-GDS: Danielle Creedon vs. San Juan Unified School District, a  
California Unified School District  
02/13/2024 Hearing on Motion for Summary Judgment in Department 54**

“Katherine Johnson” middle school at its location. (AMF 6, 18, 30.)

The Facilities Master Plan sections for “Creekside Elementary School” and “Encina High School” do not identify as a project the relocation of any Encina campus students to a new school to be constructed at the Creekside location. (AMF 7, 19, 31.)

The Facilities Master Plan’s “Projects and Costs” information relative to Encina Preparatory High only lists under the heading “Project Description” on-site improvements. (AMF nos. 8, 20, 32.)

The Facilities Master Plan lists Creekside as an elementary school used by a charter school, Pathway to Choices, that provides options for those with development disabilities. (AMF nos. 9, 21, 33.)

The Facilities Master Plan provides that the “Creekside site and buildings are in a state of advanced deterioration and a significant amount of work is required to bring this facility and site up to the condition needed for students and faculty to use as a genuine teaching facility.” (AMF 10, 22, 34.)

**Legal Standard**

In evaluating a motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication the Court engages in a three-step process. First, the Court identifies the issues framed by the pleadings. The pleadings define the scope of the issues on a motion for summary judgment or summary adjudication. (*FPI Dev. Inc. v. Nakashima* (1991) 231 Cal.App.3d 367, 381-382.) Next, the Court must determine whether the moving party has met its burden. A defendant moving for summary judgment or summary adjudication bears the burden of persuasion that one or more elements of the plaintiff’s cause of action cannot be established, or that there is a complete defense to the cause of action. (*Aguilar v. Atlantic Richfield Co.* (2001) 25 Cal. 4th 826, 850, quoting Code Civ. Proc. § 437c(p)(2).) Once the moving party has met its burden, the burden shifts to the opposing party to show that a material factual issue exists as to the cause of action alleged or a defense to it. (Code Civ. Proc. §437c(p).) In ruling on the motion, the Court must consider the evidence and inferences reasonably drawn from the evidence in the light most favorable to the party opposing the motion. (*Aguilar*, supra, at 843.)

**Ballot Measure Interpretation Standard**

Plaintiffs cite two cases for the proposition that Measure P’s language should be “construed strictly” against the District. (Plaintiff’s Opposition, at 4, citing *Methodist Hosp. of Sacramento v. Saylor* (1971) 5 Cal.3d 685, 691; and *Pacific Legal Foundation v. Brown* (1981) 29 Cal.3d 168, 180). The District argues that *Saylor* and *Brown* are inapposite, holding that constitutional provisions (i.e., like Proposition 39, Cal. Const. art. XIII A, § 1) that place limits on the legislature’s power to enact laws must be strictly (i.e., narrowly) construed. See *Saylor*, supra, 5 Cal.3d at 691; *Brown*, supra, 29 Cal.3d at 180.

The District argues that for ordinary ballot measures like Measure P, ordinary principles of statutory interpretation apply, citing to *Monette-Shaw v. San Francisco Bd. of Supervisors* (2006) 139 Cal.App.4th 1210, 1215. (District’s Reply, 1:26 – 2:10.)

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

**34-2023-00333102-CU-MC-GDS: Danielle Creedon vs. San Juan Unified School District, a  
California Unified School District  
02/13/2024 Hearing on Motion for Summary Judgment in Department 54**

The Court concludes that ordinary principles of statutory interpretation apply to ballot measures. (*Monette-Shaw*, supra, 139 Cal.App.4th at 1215.) The basic principle in interpreting a statute is that every word and clause is given effect so that no part or provision is useless, deprived of meaning, or contradictory. (*Green v. Workers' Comp. Appeals Bd.* (2005) 127 Cal. App. 4th 1426, 1435. Words must be given their plain ordinary meaning. (*Foothill-De Anza Cmty. Coll. Dist. v. Emerich* (2007) 158 Cal. App. 4th 11, 18-19.) The language must be construed in the context of the statute as a whole, consistent with the overall scheme. (*McLaughlin v. State Bd. of Educ.* (1999) 75 Cal.App.4th 196, 211.)

**Analysis**

The parties agree that most material facts are undisputed by the parties, and that the questions at issue are questions of law properly before the Court to be decided on summary judgment / summary adjudication.

**Plaintiff's First Cause of Action - Education Code section 15284**

Education Code section 15284 provides an action may be brought to obtain an order restraining and preventing any expenditure of funds received by a school district through the authorized sale of bonds if it appears that any of the following conditions are present: "(1) An expenditure of funds received by a school district or community college district through the sale of bonds authorized by this chapter is for purposes other than those specified in paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of Section 1 of Article XIII A of the California Constitution. (2) The expenditure is not in compliance with paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of Section 1 of Article XIII A of the California Constitution. That an expenditure in violation of paragraph (3) of subdivision (b) of Section 1 of Article XIII A of the California Constitution will be made or will continue to be made during the litigation that would produce waste or great or irreparable injury. (4) The governing board of a school district or community college has willfully failed to appoint the citizens' oversight committee in violation of the requirements of Section 15278." (Educ. Code § 15284(a).

**Plaintiff's Second Cause of Action - Code of Civil Procedure section 526a**

Code of Civil Procedure section 526a provides "[a]n action to obtain a judgment, restraining and preventing any illegal expenditure of, waste of, or injury to, the estate, funds, or other property of a local agency, may be maintained against any officer thereof, or any agent, or other person, acting in its behalf, either by a resident therein, or by a corporation, who is assessed for and is liable to pay, or, within one year before the commencement of the action, has paid, a tax that funds the defendant local agency, including, but not limited to, the following: ... (3) A property tax, including a property tax paid by a tenant or lessee to a landlord or lessor pursuant to the terms of a written lease."

The District moves for summary judgment as to Plaintiff's causes of action brought under Education Code section 15284 and Code of Civil Procedure section 526a based on the grounds that the plain language of Measure P authorized the Project.

Measure P provides, in part:

"The Bond Project List below describes the projects the San Juan Unified School District proposes to finance with proceeds of voter approved bonds. ...The Board

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

**34-2023-00333102-CU-MC-GDS: Danielle Creedon vs. San Juan Unified School District, a  
California Unified School District  
02/13/2024 Hearing on Motion for Summary Judgment in Department 54**

may undertake repairs, improvements, acquisitions, demolitions, relocations, new construction, and/or furnishing or equipping of school facilities, to complete each or any of the projects listed below as may be determined desirable by the District at the time the project is undertaken. ... [¶] The following projects, in addition to the projects contemplated by the District's 2014 facility master plan, which are hereby incorporated herein by reference, are authorized at all current and future district owned properties and facilities, including but not limited to: (age of school in parentheses):" (1AC at Exh. B, p. 3 (emphasis in original).)

The Measure P Project List then lists "Creekside" under "Other Facilities" and "Encina Preparatory High" under "High Schools." (*Id.*) Creekside is not listed under the "Middle Schools" category. Neither side contests that there is no reference to KJMS or Encina Middle School anywhere on the Project List.

Measure P states the District can add "classrooms and facilities for all District schools, buildings, and sites"; "acqui[re] real property"; and "proceed with new replacement construction if replacement and new construction is preferable considering the building's age, condition and other relevant factors." (*Id.* at p. 4.) The District may also engage in incidental work such as "demolition of existing facilities and reconstruction of facilities" and "necessary site preparation/restoration in connection with new construction." (*Id.* at p. 5.)

After voters approved Measure P, the District approved the construction of KJMS at the Creekside site.

The District argues the plain language of Measure P authorizes the District to engage in the construction of new classrooms and facilities at any District-owned property, including the Creekside site, for all District schools and allows for relocations of schools like KJMS. The District relies on the inclusion of Encina Preparatory High under the "High Schools" heading as support that Measure P authorized the Project because Encina Middle School was operating within Encina Preparatory High. The District explains that from 2011-2021, KJMS was part of Encina Preparatory High, which operated a grade 6-12 program, and KJMS was only recently separated and renamed. In support of the separation of Encina Middle School from Encina Preparatory High, and then the subsequent renaming of Encina Middle School as KJMS, the District relies upon the Board of Education meeting minutes.

Plaintiffs emphasize that the Court previously denied the District's demurrer to the first and second causes of action, finding in part that the "District concedes that the Project List set forth in Measure P does not describe any new middle school to be constructed at the Creekside location....", and that "[t]here is nothing in Measure P or the District's 2014 Facilities Master Plan that would alert a voter that a completely new middle school was going to be constructed...." (August 3, 2023, Minute Order...) (Plaintiffs' Memo. Of Ps & As in Support of Summary Adjudication, 2:20-25.)

However, as noted by the Court in its August 3, 2023 Order, "On this demurrer the Court is confined to the four corners of the pleading and matters of which judicial notice can be properly taken. There are no allegations in the 1AC regarding KJMS/Encina Middle School being a part of Encina Preparatory High. Thus, the Court cannot accept the foregoing as true. However, the Court does accept as true the allegations of the 1AC that Encina Middle School has been

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

**34-2023-00333102-CU-MC-GDS: Danielle Creedon vs. San Juan Unified School District, a  
California Unified School District  
02/13/2024 Hearing on Motion for Summary Judgment in Department 54**

renamed KJMS in years since the passage of the Bond and that Encina Middle School is not on the Measure P Project List or the District's 2014 Facilities Master Plan. (1AC ¶¶ 28-29.)" (August 3, 2023, Minute Order.)

Here, on these motions, the Court is not assuming as true the allegations of the pleading, but is instead looking to items of undisputed material fact, supported by evidence.

The undisputed facts include that the middle school that is now KJMS, was previously Encina Middle School, and prior to that was part of Encina High School. At the time of the passage of Measure P, the middle school that is now KJMS was a part of Encina High School. (SUMF 43-44, 50-51, 61-62.)

Plaintiffs counter that nothing in Measure P or the 2014 Facilities Master Plan informs voters that the existing Creekside Elementary School for the developmentally disabled would be demolished and replaced with a new middle school comprised of students from the existing Encina Middle School. Plaintiffs cite to Proposition 39, which governs the expenditure of Measure P funds and requires that any local bond measure must include a "list of the specific school facilities projects to be funded and certification that the school district board, community college board, or county office of education has evaluated safety, class size reduction, and information technology needs in development that list." (Cal. Const., art. XIII A, § 1, subd. (b)(3).)

Plaintiffs contend the Project List submitted for voter approval only permitted "relocations" to "complete each or any of the projects listed below ..." and the subsequent list does not refer to Encina Middle School (now named KJMS) at all or a new middle school named KJMS despite its purported existence in 2016.

However, Plaintiffs' argument ignores that the Project List did include Encina Preparatory High School, which at the time Measure M was passed, included what is now KJMS. Relocations for Encina Preparatory High School were specifically included, and relocating a part of Encina Preparatory High School (what is now called KJMS) was allowed for under the plain ordinary meaning of Measure P.

Constitutional Challenge

Plaintiffs argue, "For the District to establish that it has complied with the specificity requirement of the California Constitution at Article XIII A, Section 1, subd. (b)(3)(B), the Project list in Measure P must "clearly apprise the voters, the auditors, and public oversight committees of the types of projects for which the money is intended to be used...." (*Foothill-De Anza Community College District v. Emerich* (2007) 158 Cal.App.4<sup>th</sup> 11, 24.)" (Plaintiffs' Memo. Of Ps & As, 6:24-28.)

The District counters that "the proper vehicle to challenge the constitutionality of Proposition 39 bond measures is a reverse validation action under Civ. Proc. Code § 860 et seq. Gov't Code § 53511; Educ. Code § 15110; see *Foothill*, 158 Cal. App. 4<sup>th</sup> at 16 (addressing a reverse validation action evaluating the sufficiency of a ballot measure in light of Proposition 39)."

Validation and reverse validation actions have a 60-day limitations period; after that period expires, any challenges that could have been raised in a validation action are foreclosed. (Civ.



**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

**34-2023-00333102-CU-MC-GDS: Danielle Creedon vs. San Juan Unified School District, a  
California Unified School District  
02/13/2024 Hearing on Motion for Summary Judgment in Department 54**

Proc. Code § 860, 863 (60- day limitations); Civ. Proc. Code § 870 (a validation judgment is “forever binding and conclusive, as to all matters therein adjudicated or which at that time could have been adjudicated”); *City of Ontario v. Superior Ct.* (1970) 2 Cal.3d 335, 341-42.

As correctly pointed out by the District, this lawsuit was filed in January 2023—seven years after Measure P passed and six years after the District first issued bonds. The District argued that any argument that Measure P’s Project List is too vague to satisfy Proposition 39 is therefore time-barred. (District’s Reply, 7:6-17.) The Court agrees.

The Court concludes that to the extent Plaintiffs challenges the constitutionality of Measure M, such claims are time-barred.

Plaintiffs’ Fourth and Fifth Causes of Action

Plaintiffs do not move for summary adjudication as to their fourth and fifth causes of action. Further, on the District’s motion, Plaintiffs fail to address the challenge to Plaintiffs’ fourth and fifth causes of action, and therefore concede the District’s argument that the certification issue turns on whether the Project is included in Measure P’s Project List. For the reasons set forth above, the Court concludes that the Project was covered by Measure P’s Project List, and therefore, Defendant’s motion for summary adjudication as to the fourth and fifth causes of action in the FAC is GRANTED.

In conclusion, Plaintiffs’ motion for summary adjudication is DENIED. The District’s motion for summary judgment is GRANTED.

The District’s counsel shall submit a proposed order and judgment pursuant to CCP § 437c and CRC 3.1312.

**NOTICE:**

Consistent with Local Rule 1.06(B), any party requesting oral argument on any matter on this calendar must comply with the following procedure:

To request limited oral argument, on any matter on this calendar, you must call the Law and Motion Oral Argument Request Line at (916) 874-2615 by 4:00 p.m. the Court day before the hearing and advise opposing counsel. At the time of requesting oral argument, the requesting party shall leave a voice mail message: a) identifying themselves as the party requesting oral argument; b) indicating the specific matter/motion for which they are requesting oral argument; and c) confirming that it has notified the opposing party of its intention to appear and that opposing party may appear via Zoom using the Zoom link and Meeting ID indicated below. If no request for oral argument is made, the tentative ruling becomes the final order of the Court.

Unless ordered to appear in person by the Court, parties may appear remotely either telephonically or by video conference via the Zoom video/audio conference platform with notice

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA  
COUNTY OF SACRAMENTO**

**34-2023-00333102-CU-MC-GDS: Danielle Creedon vs. San Juan Unified School District, a  
California Unified School District  
02/13/2024 Hearing on Motion for Summary Judgment in Department 54**

to the Court and all other parties in accordance with Code of Civil Procedure §367.75. Although remote participation is not required, the Court will presume all parties are appearing remotely for non-evidentiary civil hearings. The Department 53/54 Zoom Link is <https://saccourt-ca.gov.zoomgov.com/my/sscdept53.54> and the Zoom Meeting ID is 161 4650 6749. To appear on Zoom telephonically, call (833) 568-8864 and enter the Zoom Meeting ID referenced above. NO COURTCALL APPEARANCES WILL BE ACCEPTED.

Parties requesting services of a court reporter will need to arrange for private court reporter services at their own expense, pursuant to Government code §68086 and California Rules of Court, Rule 2.956. Requirements for requesting a court reporter are listed in the Policy for Official Reporter Pro Tempore available on the Sacramento Superior Court website at <https://www.saccourt.ca.gov/court-reporters/docs/crtrp-6a.pdf>. Parties may contact Court-Approved Official Reporters Pro Tempore by utilizing the list of Court Approved Official Reporters Pro Tempore available at <https://www.saccourt.ca.gov/court-reporters/docs/crtrp-13.pdf>.

A Stipulation and Appointment of Official Reporter Pro Tempore (CV/E-206) is required to be signed by each party, the private court reporter, and the Judge prior to the hearing, if not using a reporter from the Court's Approved Official Reporter Pro Tempore list.

Once the form is signed it must be filed with the clerk. If a litigant has been granted a fee waiver and requests a court reporter, the party must submit a Request for Court Reporter by a Party with a Fee Waiver (CV/E-211) and it must be filed with the clerk at least 10 days prior to the hearing or at the time the proceeding is scheduled if less than 10 days away. Once approved, the clerk will forward the form to the Court Reporter's Office and an official reporter will be provided.