



Christopher Foley <christophertf@gmail.com>

violations and case

2 messages

Christopher Foley <christophertf@gmail.com>
To: Mom <Kowensfoley@gmail.com>

Tue, Jan 6, 2026 at 11:11 AM

you can look this up if you want but i attached a PDF of the same findings.

Visit

<https://www.citizenserve.com/Sacramento/CitizenController?Action=DisplaySearchPage&CtzPagePrefix=Sa&InstallationID=43>

enter our case number at the top in the Case# window space

23-009185

and hit SEARCH.

then select the ONLY case that pops up

the on the next page click VIEW VIOLATION LISTING at the top

doing this will get your the current live and active violation list, the WHAT the city wants.

Paul keeps adding "extra" stuff that isn't actually written in the City's official Notice & Order (or on the case's posted violation list). That matters because the only things we should treat as *required* are what the City has put in writing for this case. If they want new requirements, they're supposed to update the paperwork (basically: add it officially), not just say it in emails or over the phone.

If we start doing random extra items that aren't officially listed, a few bad things happen:

- The "to-do list" can keep changing forever, and we'll never be "done."
- It weakens our argument that the City needs to follow the proper process and can't just move the goalposts.
- It can look like we're admitting those extra things were violations, even if the City never formally cited them.
- It can cost real money (permits, contractors, inspections) for stuff that wasn't even officially required.

So if we do anything that's not on the official list, it should be for a very specific reason like: it's a real safety issue, it's truly needed to complete something that *is* on the list, or it's cheap and helps de-escalate. Otherwise, the right move is: "Put it in the official paperwork first, then we'll treat it as required."

and here is all the LEGAL SHIT MAKING THIS TRUE. And call me because something else very important just surfaced pertaining to Pauls boss, BO.

What's relevant and why (with citations)

1. **The City's own public case lookup is real, and it's meant for checking current/closed cases by case number or address.**

City of Sacramento "Code Case Search" page (links out to the case search tool). [City of Sacramento](#)

2. **The enforceable scope is supposed to be bounded by a formally issued Notice & Order.**

For nuisance abatement, the code says the City's Notice & Order must **specify the nuisance conditions and the action required**, and it must include the compliance deadline and appeal language. [American Legal Publishing](#)

For Housing Code "substandard building" cases, the Notice & Order must include a **brief description of the substandard conditions and the action required to be taken** (plus appeal language). [American Legal Publishing](#)

For Dangerous Buildings, the Notice & Order must include a **brief description of the conditions** making it dangerous, and it lays out repair/demolish timelines and appeal language. [American Legal Publishing](#)

3. **If the City wants to change/add scope, the code explicitly contemplates "amended or supplemental" Notice & Orders, and those must be formally served and posted.**

Nuisances: "The notice and order, **and any amended or supplemental notice and order**, shall be served... and posted..." [American Legal Publishing](#)

Housing Code: same "**amended or supplemental** notice and order" service/posting requirement. [American Legal Publishing](#)

Dangerous Buildings: same "**amended or supplemental** notice and order" service/posting requirement. [American Legal Publishing](#)

Why doing "extra items" (not on the Notice/Order or formal case scope) can be harmful

- **Scope creep / moving target:** If you treat off-list demands as mandatory, you're letting the City effectively expand the case **without issuing the formal amended/supplemental order** the code already provides for. [American Legal Publishing+2American Legal Publishing+2](#)
- **Due-process positioning:** Your clean argument is "we complied with the written, served order." The more you chase unwritten demands, the easier it is for the other side to blur what was actually ordered vs. what you volunteered. (The code is built around written notice specifying conditions + required action.) [American Legal Publishing+2American Legal Publishing+2](#)
- **Cost/permit exposure:** Extra work can trigger permits, inspections, re-inspections, and "monitoring" type follow-ons. If it's not required, you want it clearly framed as **voluntary strategy**, not **required compliance**. (The Notice & Order process itself is what starts the official clock and enforcement pathway.) [American Legal Publishing+2American Legal Publishing+2](#)

When "extra items" *might* still be smart (but only with the label attached)

Sometimes you do extra things because they're cheap risk reduction (real safety issue), a prerequisite to complete a listed item, or a de-escalation move. That's fine, **as long as everyone is honest in writing that it's voluntary and not an admission that it was required** (and not treated like "compliance with the Order").

 **JackiesCURRENTcaselist.pdf**
150K

Karin Owens <kowensfoley@gmail.com>
To: Christopher Foley <christophertf@gmail.com>

Tue, Jan 6, 2026 at 8:16 PM

Just read this and we believe the first "stage" is actually doing the things on the permit. You've done most of it already but attorney said yesterday to replace the dry rotted window trim as best you can do without affecting siding. Siding is an issue to be discussed but not taken care of now.

Before you built the lean to in back east corner, did you trim down the fence a foot to be 6 ft? Also have you put covers over the outlets in garage?

Do you have the wood for the window frame?

Sent from my iPhone

On Jan 6, 2026, at 11:11 AM, Christopher Foley <christophertf@gmail.com> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]

<JackiesCURRENTcaselist.pdf>