

# EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OF EVIDENTIARY FINDINGS & CPRA VIOLATIONS

Re: City of Sacramento Code Enforcement Case #23-009185

Prepared for Legal Counsel

This document summarizes a documented pattern of alleged data manipulation, spoliation of evidence, falsified government records, and systemic California Public Records Act (CPRA) violations attributed to the City of Sacramento and Inspector Paul Lovato. The evidentiary basis described includes digital forensics, synchronized CCTV footage, and the City's own database/portal records.

## How to use this document (read-aloud friendly)

Each section below follows the same structure: a plain-language claim, a short evidence summary, and a one-sentence statement of why the conduct matters under the CPRA or related public-integrity duties.

### 1. “Algorithmic Taxation” and Fraudulent Billing (The 88 Words)

The City has charged over \$30,000 in “monitoring fees” and administrative penalties, which (as alleged) require actual physical inspection activity to justify the charges.

- **The audit:** Natural Language Processing (NLP) classification indicates that 99.947% of the 590-page, 165,487-word case file consists of automated boilerplate generated by the Accela/Citizenserve system.
- **The human input:** Over approximately 2.5 years, Inspector Lovato's total original, human-typed input in the official case log is alleged to be exactly 88 words.
- **The portal signal:** A scan of publicly accessible portal listings (1,018 open housing and 155 vacant building cases) reportedly yielded zero identical B31+B59 violation combinations, suggesting this property is being uniquely targeted by the automated system.

Why it matters: Billing large sums for “phantom work” without the required on-site inspections, if proven, supports claims of fee fraud and falsification of official records.

### 2. Falsified Government Logs Caught on CCTV

Inspector Lovato is alleged to have entered false narratives into the official database to justify billing and penalties.

- **April 26 “Response Fee” entry:** The log states he “knocked and announced,” but seven synchronized CCTV cameras allegedly show he was on the porch for 37 seconds and in the driveway for 33 seconds. The resident is physically disabled and allegedly requires more than eight minutes to reach the door.
- **October 22 “drive-by” entry:** The log states he “happened to be driving by” and “stopped to talk with someone,” which the synchronized CCTV coverage allegedly shows did not occur.

Why it matters: Entering fabricated events into a municipal database to trigger financial penalties, if proven, is actionable fraud and a serious public-trust violation.

### 3. Spoliation of Evidence and PDF Metadata Stripping

The Records Department is alleged to have destroyed or degraded electronic evidence by converting native image files into a flattened PDF in a way that removes metadata and renders content unusable.

- **The file delivery:** The City produced a large (approximately 1.7 GB) PDF case file.
- **Metadata stripping:** A forensic hash analysis allegedly indicates the City flattened native .JPG files into the PDF, destroying EXIF metadata (timestamps and geolocations).
- **Rendering failure:** Photographic evidence reportedly drops off and fails to render after page 74.

Why it matters: The CPRA requires agencies to produce electronic records in any electronic format in which they hold the information (Gov. Code § 7922.570(b)(1)). Intentionally corrupting native files into a broken PDF, if proven, supports spoliation claims.

### 4. Withheld “Off-Book” Communications and Personal Photos

Lovato is alleged to conduct City business outside official channels to avoid scrutiny, resulting in missing photos and communications that should exist in the record set.

- **The “laptop spin” photo:** In an April 2023 meeting, Paul Lovato and Doug Pierson allegedly showed the homeowner a photo of a tarped structure on a laptop. That photo is alleged to be omitted from the City’s “complete” case file.
- **Lawyer/contractor photos:** Lovato’s logs for Aug 25, Sept 16, and Oct 22–23 allegedly state he emailed photos to the owner’s friend (Karen Owens) and the owner’s attorney (Mark Saakian). Those attachments and related communications are alleged to be missing from the official file.

Why it matters: Under *City of San Jose v. Superior Court* (2017), communications about public business on personal devices or private accounts can be public records subject to disclosure.

### 5. Data Manipulation and 311 Filtering

The City is alleged to have manipulated raw data exports to conceal the case origin by filtering out earlier intake entries.

- **Multiple exports:** The City produced three different versions of 311 intake reports.
- **Date filter:** The exports allegedly filter “Date/Time Opened” to begin on March 20, 2023, cutting off the originating complaint from March 17 (Ticket #230317-1609966).

Why it matters: Filtering database exports to omit specific dates can violate the CPRA’s duty to assist (Gov. Code § 7922.600) and can function as an unlawful redaction absent a cited exemption.

## 6. The Rogue 11-Point “Correction Notice” (Scope Creep)

Lovato is alleged to have used informal paperwork to bypass due process and expand demands beyond the official Notice and Order.

- **September 16, 2025:** Instead of legally amending the official Notice and Order, Lovato allegedly handed a contractor an edited 11-point “Correction Notice.”
- **New demands:** The list allegedly required items not in the official notice, including reducing a workshop to 120 square feet and altering fence heights.

Why it matters: Unfiled, undocumented “scope creep” used to threaten contractors and compel compliance may fall outside municipal-code procedures and supports claims of harassment or unlawful coercion.

## 7. Liability for Rolling Extensions (The Gilroy Precedent)

The City’s Records Department is alleged to be using repetitive 14-day extensions to delay disclosure and avoid exposure, despite statutory limits.

- **Rolling notices:** Request #26-71 allegedly received repeated extension notices: Jan 20 to Feb 3, to Feb 17, to Mar 3, to Mar 17.
- **Statutory cap:** Gov. Code § 7922.535(b) caps the “unusual circumstances” extension at a maximum of 14 days total (beyond the standard determination period).
- **Constructive denial:** Once the statutory deadline passes, continued delay can be characterized as constructive denial.

Why it matters: Under *City of Gilroy v. Superior Court* (California Supreme Court, 2026), abusive CPRA processing practices and repeated stonewalling can expose an agency to declaratory relief and mandatory attorney’s fees, even if records are eventually produced.

**Note:** This executive summary is a narrative condensation of the statements provided. It is intended for counsel review and should be cross-checked against the underlying exhibits (CCTV clips, portal captures, hashes, native exports, email headers, and database logs) before filing.