
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO



JAMES LACY, et al.,

Case No. CPF-22-517714

Plaintiffs/Petitioners,

VS.

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR STAY

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, et al.,

Defendants/Respondents.

Defendants' "motion to stay judgment pending appeal" is denied.

Defendants argue that the judgment should be stayed because this matter presents "difficult questions of law" and "the fruits of a reversal would be irrevocably lost unless the status quo is maintained." (Memo. 4:8-12, quoting *Daly v, San Bernardino Board of Supervisors* (2021) 11 Cal.5th 1030, 1039.) I disagree.

As articulated in the court's order granting motion for writ of mandate (incorporated here by reference), defendants' ordinance 206-21 violates unequivocal provisions of the California Constitution and state statute; this is not a

difficult or close question. Should an appellate court opine differently, ordinance 206-21 could be reinstated; no irrevocable loss would occur.

Dated: August 12, 2022

Richard B. Ulmer Jr.

Achol BUY

Judge of the Superior Court

CPF-22-517714 JAMES V. LACY ET AL VS. CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO ET AL

I, the undersigned, certify that I am an employee of the Superior Court of California, County Of San Francisco and not a party to the above-entitled cause and that on August 12, 2022 I electronically served the foregoing order on the following counsel of record by causing a copy thereof to be sent by email to the email addresses indicated below.

Date: August 12, 2022

By: SEAN KANE

CHAD D. MORGAN, ESQ. chad@chadmorgan.com LAW OFFICE OF CHAD D. MORGAN P.O. BOX 1989 PMB 342 40729 VILLAGE DRIVE #8 BIG BEAR LAKE, CA 92315

ALEXANDER E. TOMESCU, ESQ. ae_tomescu@yahoo.com 30011 IVY GLENN DRIVE STE 223 LAGUNA NIGUEL, CA 92677

JAMES M. EMERY, ESQ.
Jim.Emery@sfcityatty.org
DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY
1 DR CARLTON B GOODLETT PLACE
CITY HALL, ROOM 234
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102