

November 15, 2021

**VIA EMAIL AND MAIL**

Eric Seib  
Chief of Administration  
Office of the District Attorney of Santa Cruz  
701 Ocean Street, Room 200  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
Email: [eric.seib@santacruzcounty.us](mailto:eric.seib@santacruzcounty.us)

**Re: California Public Records Act Request**

Dear Mr. Seib:

I write in response to your August 16, 2021 email regarding our CPRA Request. Thank you for your response.

Your response lacks some legally required information. To the extent you intend to deny access to a requested record, you must justify that denial by demonstrating either (1) that the “record in question” – that is, the particular record we have requested – falls under a specific legal exemption, which you must cite, or (2) that the public interest served by your denial for that particular record “clearly outweighs” the public interest that would be served by its disclosure.<sup>1</sup> You must also provide the names and titles or positions of each person responsible for the denial.<sup>2</sup>

In your response, you provided conditional objections, asserting not that an exemption applies to a particular record we requested – as required under the law – but rather that, as a general matter, you will not produce records that fall under particular exemptions if our request seeks such records. Because we are not able to effectively respond to these objections without the more specific information described above and required by law, we ask that you provide it now.

For prosecutorial trainings requested under Request #2, you have asserted copyright exemptions for trainings produced by CDAA. We continue to find copyright exemptions unpersuasive as grounds for withholding documents related to the training of employees of public agencies. Further, many counties throughout the state have provided such trainings and

---

<sup>1</sup> Gov’t Code § 6255(a).

<sup>2</sup> Gov’t Code § 6253(d)(3).

November 15, 2021

Page 2

CDAAs have even given several of them permission to turn over their trainings to us. We kindly ask that you reconsider withholding responsive documents on a basis not statutorily permissible.

Regarding the requested records (or portions of records) you have identified and asserted clear grounds for withholding, we would like to know if you would consider waiving any, or all, of the asserted exemptions. Exemptions, as you know, are permissive, not mandatory, and it is our goal – and yours, we imagine – to avoid unnecessary litigation, which can be costly and time consuming. If you are open to this possibility, please let us know. We would be happy to discuss this matter over the phone if you believe we may be able to find a solution that satisfies everyone. We would also be willing to provide further legal support and explanation for why we do not believe that the exemptions you have asserted are legally sound in this instance.

However, if you do not believe further discussions would be helpful and intend to deny some of our requests, please advise us of this position and tell us whether your office has adopted a formal process for an administrative appeal. Should we determine that we are entitled to documents you have refused to produce – whether before an administrative appeal or after – we may litigate to obtain them. In that event, we will seek all attorney's fees and costs for the litigation.<sup>3</sup>

To the extent you have not yet produced any records for which you do not claim an exemption, please let us know the status of these records and produce them promptly and on a rolling basis.

Thank you again for your response to our earlier letter and, generally, for your assistance with our requests. We look forward to any further discussion and your production of records.

Very truly yours,



Ellen V. Leonida

---

<sup>3</sup> Gov't Code § 6259(d). We note that courts have awarded costs and fees if even a single document was improperly withheld. *See, e.g., Los Angeles Times v. Alameda Corridor Transp. Auth.*, 88 Cal. App. 4th 1381, 1391 (2001).