Case 3:20-cv-04537-SI Document 27 Filed 09/25/20 Page 1 of 4

- 1 -

Counsel for Sue Anzilotti has belatedly discovered that Anzilotti's Reply brief (Reply; Dkt. #22), filed herein on September 3, 2020, does not include the bolding that was intended and supplied, as indicated by the multiple statements therein re "bolding supplied".

This omission was inadvertent and may have deprived the court, counsel and parties of components of Anzilotti's argument. This *errata* is therefore filed at this late date to provide clarity to the extent possible.

Specifically, at 6:11 of the Reply, the "bolding supplied" statement was intended to reference the following language on 6:10 that was supposed to have been bolded: "to deprive one's constitutional rights."

At 6:13 of the Reply, the "bolding supplied" statement was intended to reference the following language on 6:12-13 that was supposed to have been bolded: "an agreement or 'meeting of the minds' to violate constitution rights must be shown."

At 8:10 of the Reply, the "bolding supplied" statement was intended to reference the following language on 8:6-7 that was supposed to have been bolded: "A relationship of cause and effect between the complaint and the prosecution is not sufficient, or every citizen who complained to a prosecutor would find himself in a conspiracy."

At 9:15 of the Reply, the "bolding supplied" statement was intended to reference the following language on 8:28 that was supposed to have been bolded: "plaintiff must state specific facts to support the existence of the claimed conspiracy", and also to the following language on 9:2 that was supposed to have been bolded: "the mere furnishing of information to police officers does not constitute a conspiracy or "joint action" under color of state law."

And at 9:26 of the Reply, the "bolding supplied" statement was intended to reference the following language on 9:23 that was supposed to have been bolded: "fair prosecution

1 PROOF OF SERVICE BY ELECTRONIC DELIVERY 2 (Borges v. County of Mendocino, Case No.: 3:10-cv-04537 SI) 3 4 I am employed in the County of Mendocino, State of California. I am over the age of eighteen years and not a party to the within action. My business address is 305 N. Main 5 Street, Ukiah, California, 95482. 6 7 On September 25, 2020, I served the attached document, entitled *ERRATA* BY DEFENDANT SUE ANZILOTTI RE REPLY BRIEF ON MOTION TO DISMISS 8 COMPLAINT PURSUANT TO F.R.C.P. 12(b)(6) on the interested parties BY 9 ELECTRONIC MAIL at the addressee(s) listed below, as follows: 10 John Houston Scott, Esq. 11 john@scottlawfirm.net 12 Christian M. Curtis, Esq., County Counsel 13 cocosupport@mendocinocounty.org 14 15 Joseph T. Urbanic, Esq., JACOBSON MARKHAM L.L.P. jurbanic@jacobsonmarkham.com 16 17 18 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on September 25, 2020, at Ukiah, California. 19 20 21 /s/ Brian C. Carter Brian C. Carter 22 23 24 25 26 27 28