

THE CODE-ENFORCEMENT WRIT (11.39.b) — Cotton v. City of San Diego, No. 26CU043242C

*The writ compelling the City to act on the code-enforcement complaint it opened and left sitting.
Dated 2026.08.31; updated as the record grows.*

TOP 3 — jump straight to what matters:

1. [The complaint the City opened and abandoned](#) — Code Enforcement Case CE-0541944 — “Case Opened,” uninspected for more than six weeks. [Petition \(ROA-5\)](#), p. 2
2. [What the court is asked to compel](#) — not an outcome — only that the City take up and act on its own opened case. [Petition \(ROA-5\)](#), Prayer, p. 6
3. [The sworn factual record behind it](#) — Cotton’s declaration and the authenticated exhibits. [Declaration \(ROA-11\)](#), pp. 1–2

[2026.08.07 — Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate — 3242 \(ROA-5\)](#)

A verified petition for writ of mandate (Code Civ. Proc. §§ 1085, 1060) asking the Court to compel the City of San Diego to take up and act on its own opened Code Enforcement complaint (Case CE-0541944) — which had sat in “Case Opened” status, uninspected, for more than six weeks. It seeks no particular outcome, only that the City exercise the authority the law already vests in it.

Off-ramps — jump straight to the record:

- [► What it seeks — and the “Case Opened” complaint](#) — CE-0541944, opened and never acted on. p. 2
- [► The Prayer for Relief](#) — the order requested. p. 6

[2026.08.14 — Cotton Declaration ISO PWOM — 3242 \(ROA-11\)](#)

The sworn declaration supporting the petition — the first-hand factual record and the authenticated exhibits the writ rests on.

Off-ramps — jump straight to the record:

- [► The verified facts and exhibits](#) — signed under penalty of perjury. pp. 1–2