



Maricela E. Marroquin

T 213.626.8484  
F 213.626.0078  
E mmarroquin@rwglaw.com

355 South Grand Avenue  
40th Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90071-3101  
rwglaw.com

September 30, 2019

Martin Truitt  
[martin117a@gmail.com](mailto:martin117a@gmail.com)

Re: Public Records Act Requests # 11586

Dear Mr. Truitt:

As you are aware, the City of Pasadena ("City") has retained our firm to respond to some Public Records Act requests. Category 3 of PRA 11586 requests "copies of all contracts, emails and any other documents reflecting communications between the City of Pasadena and HdL."

The City previously produced to you the HdL contracts, the scoring sheets for the cannabis retailer applications, and some email communications between HdL and the City. Enclosed is the remaining scoring sheet that had not previously been produced. Additionally, enclosed here: <https://app.box.com/s/f8xjys9fzw09ukgtblw2ek41gokwhokx> are the remainder of the disclosable communications between HdL and the City. The link expires on October 15, 2019.

The Public Records Act permits a local agency to withhold from disclosure records that are exempt from disclosure, or portions of such records that are covered by an exemption. (Cal. Gov. Code, § 6250 et seq.) For this production, the City is withholding records from disclosure, in part, pursuant to one or a combination of the exemptions listed below:

- A. Attorney-client privileged communications are exempt from disclosure pursuant to California Evidence Code Section 954. (Cal. Gov. Code § 6254(k)).
- B. Writings that are attorney work product are exempt from disclosure pursuant to the California Evidence Code and California Code of Civil Procedure Section 2018.030. (Cal. Gov. Code § 6254(k)).
- C. Preliminary drafts, notes, or interagency or intra-agency memorandum are exempt from disclosure. (Cal. Gov. Code § 6254(a)).

D. The records contain information that is exempt from disclosure under California Government Code section 6255, as the public interest served in not disclosing the information clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure, including the deliberative process privilege, as set forth in *Times Mirror Co. v. Superior Court* (1991) 53 Cal. 3d 1325; *Rogers v. Superior Court* (1993) 19 Cal. App. 4th 469; *California First Amendment Coalition v. Superior Court* (1998) 67 Cal. App. 4th 159.

Please note, that the attached link references an email where the Carte Blanche Holdings cannabis retailer permit application was transmitted electronically from the City to HdL. In an effort to not delay sending you the HdL related documents, this attachment was not produced as it has not been reviewed and redacted. Once the Carte Blanche Holdings cannabis retailer permit application has been reviewed and redacted, it will be posted on the City's website along with all the other applications. I will send you a follow up letter once the Carte Blanche Holding's application is posted on the website.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,



Maricela E. Marroquin

11131-0081\2342206v1.doc