1	DISTRICT COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT
3	DIVISION ONE
4	
5	AMY SHERLOCK, ET AL., , CERTIFIED TRANSCRIPT
6	Plaintiffs & Appellants,) District Court of Appeal No. D081109
7	vs.) Case No.37-2021-00050889
8	GINA M. AUSTIN, ET AL.,,
9	Defendants & Respondents.
10	
11	
12	
13	FROM THE SUPERIOR COURT OF SAN DIEGO COUNTY HONOrable JAMES MANGIONE, Judge
14	Department 75
15	Reporter's Appeal Transcript
16	Volume 1 of 1 August 12, 2022
17	(Pages 1 - 7)
18	
19	
20	Appearances:
21	For The Plaintiffs Andrew Flores, Esq. & Appellants: 427 C Street, Suite 220
22	San Diego, Cálifornia 92101
23	For the Defendants Pettit Kohn Ingrassia Lutz & Dolin PC
24	& Respondents: 11622 El Camino Real, Suite 300 San Diego, California 92130
25	Douglas Pettit, Esq.
26	Darla Kmety, RPR, CSR No. 12956
27	Court-Approved Pro-Tem Official Court Reporter San Diego Superior Court
28	

1	In The Superior Court Of The State Of California
2	In And For The County Of San Diego
3	Department 75; Hon. JAMES MANGIONE, Judge
4	
5	AMY SHERLOCK, ET AL.,,)
6	Plaintiff, }
7	vs. 2 Case No. 37-2021-00050889
8	GINA M. AUSTIN, ET AL.,
9	Defendants. $\stackrel{)}{\downarrow}$
10	<i></i>
11	Reporter's Transcript
12	AUGUST 12, 2022
13	
14	Appearances:
15	For The Plaintiffs Andrew Flores, Esq.
16	For The Plaintiffs Andrew Flores, Esq. & Appellants: 427 C Street, Suite 220 San Diego, California 92101
17	San Brego, Carriornia 32101
18	For the Defendants Pettit Kohn Ingrassia Lutz & Dolin PC & Respondents: 11622 El Camino Real, Suite 300
19	For the Defendants Pettit Kohn Ingrassia Lutz & Dolin PC & Respondents: 11622 El Camino Real, Suite 300 San Diego, California 92130 Douglas Pettit, Esq.
20	bougius recerc, Esq.
21	
22	
23	Darla Kmety RPR CSR 12956
24	Darla Kmety, RPR, CSR 12956 Court-Approved Pro-Tem Official Court Reporter San Diego Superior Court
25	San Diego, California 92101
26	
27	
28	

AUGUST 12, 2022; San Diego, California;9:15 A.M. -- 000 --

THE COURT: Let's hear Item 15, the Sherlock matters.

MR. FLORES: Good morning. Once again Andrew Flores on behalf of the plaintiffs. We received the tentative ruling of the court. I think where I'd like to spend primarily my time, as I did in the response or opposition, is the issue of legality.

I think the court has laid out that illegality exception is one that is rarely used, and that it's only used in rare circumstances. I think this is one of those circumstances, your Honor. In essence, what the defendants have done in this case, your Honor, is they have convinced the court that what they're doing is legal, and it's clearly illegal.

They have conspired with their clients to submit fraudulent documents to a government agency in order to acquire an illegal interest in a marijuana dispensary. That's, in essence, what we're talking about in this case, your Honor. This is why -- this is why we brought the complaint in the first place.

I think the issue that the court is not taking into account is this illegality happens in the exception. It's not even -- it's not petitioner activity. It's actually the underlying scheme of this group of individuals trying to obtain these illegal interests.

The scheme of legal marijuana in California,

your Honor, is predicated on disclosure of these individuals who are attempting to get these interests. Transparency is key and what, in essence, the defense has done is they supplied their clients through the proxy practice with these straw men to apply for these licenses and obtain them so that they don't get found out that the fact they've been engaged in illegal marijuana activity prior to the legalization

So the Business & Professions Code clearly lays out this is illegal. The Penal Code clearly lays out this is illegal. You cannot provide a false document to a government agency with the intention of fraud, which is clearly what they're doing.

I think as far as the first prong of the anti-SLAPP, I don't even think we get there, your Honor, because of the illegality issue. now, even if we were to get past --

THE COURT: Let me interrupt you for a second.

MR. FLORES: Sure.

THE COURT: What evidence have you submitted, and I do mean evidence vis-a-vis the illegality?

MR. FLORES: Your Honor the defendants' own declarations states it. They don't -- they're hiding behind the guise of this is discretionary and, therefore, not illegal. It's not. They -- there's no question that they're using -- engaging in the proxy practice and they're not disclosing their principals, and that's admitted by their own declaration.

It's part of the reason why I didn't submit anything else, your Honor. I want to be very clear that this a very limited issue as to whether or not this is legal or not. I think that they've admitted to the fact they've done these acts. They just don't think they're illegal, or they're arguing they're not illegal

With my reading of the CCP, your Honor, you have to take everything, even their declaration. Their declaration admits it. I mean, that's as far as it goes.

THE COURT: All right. Let me hear from Mr. Smith. Go ahead, sir.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

Your Honor, your question was exactly correct:
There is no evidence to support the illegality issue.
There's nothing. Nothing in the declarations as to
legality. If fact, the vast majority of Ms. Austin's
declaration is saying, I didn't participate in the
connection with this submission or this submission or this
submission because the complaint lodges -- lumps together
a bunch of different parties with a bunch of different
activities.

The law is as clear as the court set out in its tentative. There are only two ways you can establish the illegality exception is if we admit, we concede, which we don't, or they submit evidence on it, and they haven't. This really is a pretty clear one, and the tentative is 100 percent correct.

I'm happy to answer any question the court may

have; otherwise, I'd ask the court to confirm the tentative.

THE COURT: I'm going to keep a running score from now of the phrase "the law is clear" or "the facts are clear." There's a lot of clarity going on in Department 75. Okay. Final word from the plaintiff.

MR. FLORES: Your Honor, I think the issue here is that the facts have been admitted to. So their interpretation that it's illegal or not illegal is really up to the court. I think the court has to decide whether or not the Business & Professions Code has been violated, whether the Penal Code has been violated by their submission of these documents that they know are submitted to acquire an interest in a marijuana dispensary when their clients are legally barred from obtaining that.

THE COURT: Well, the criminal exception, as you know, is only applied in rare cases in which there is uncontroverted and uncontested evidence that establishes the crime as a matter of law. I just don't see it in this case. So I'm going to confirm the tentative.

MR. FLORES: Thank you, your Honor.

MR. SMITH: Thank you.

THE COURT: You saw, Mr. Smith, at the end -not that I'm inviting it -- but if you so desire to file a
motion for attorney fees it will be in a separate
pleading, do you understand that, separate proceeding?

MR. SMITH: Understood.

THE COURT: Very well. Thank you, both.

1	STATE OF CALIFORNIA
2	COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO
3	
4	I, Darla Kmety, Official Pro-Tem Reporter for
5	the Superior Court of the State of California, do hereby
6	certify:
7	
8	That as such reporter, I reported in machine
9	shorthand the proceedings held in the foregoing case;
10	
11	That my notes were transcribed into typewriting
12	under my direction and the proceedings held on
13	August 12, 2022, are a true and correct transcription, to
14	the best of my ability.
15	
16	
17	Dated this 28th of November 2022.
18	
19	
20	Wall AL. O
21	Darla Kmety, CSR 12956
22	Court Reporter
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	