



Christopher Foley &lt;christophertf@gmail.com&gt;

---

**Corrections for City Code compliance**

8 messages

**Mark Saakian** <mark@saakianlaw.com>

Thu, Oct 16, 2025 at 9:51 AM

To: "christophertf@gmail.com" &lt;christophertf@gmail.com&gt;

Cc: Jackie Baritell &lt;baritelljm@gmail.com&gt;

Hello, Chris,

I received your text message. From my conversation with Arthur, I understand that all of the corrections outlined in the letter and the checklist compiled by the city inspectors have been completed. Please confirm that you have the packet with photos that the inspectors dropped off after the last inspection and that all items have been addressed and corrected.

Once I hear from you I will contact Paul and Bo so they can visit, reinspect and sign off.

I look forward to hearing from you.

Regards,

Mark Saakian  
Attorney

**Saakian Law, APC**  
3500 Douglas Blvd., Suite 180  
Roseville, CA 95661  
(916) 597-0770  
Mark@SaakianLaw.com  
[www.SaakianLaw.com](http://www.SaakianLaw.com)

**EMAIL DISCLAIMER AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** The contents of this message may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, do not disseminate, disclose, copy or use this message without the permission of the author. Nothing contained in this message or in any attachment shall satisfy the requirements for a writing, and nothing contained herein shall constitute a contract or electronic signature. If this message has been received in error, please delete it immediately.

**SERVICE NOTICE:** This office, its attorneys or staff, do not accept or consent to the service of process, motions, pleadings, documents, or any other items by electronic format. Correspondence via electronic format does not indicate agreement or consent to acceptance of service in that format unless specifically agreed to (Rule 8.78).

---

**Christopher Foley** <christophertf@gmail.com>

Thu, Oct 16, 2025 at 11:24 AM

To: Mark Saakian &lt;mark@saakianlaw.com&gt;

I can confirm that all violations listed on the recent Notice & Order have been corrected.

There are, however, a few additional items — such as the west-side siding, back fence height, and remaining window trim — that were discussed previously but not included in the official N&O. Those are currently in progress.

My goal is to ensure the next inspection not only confirms the listed violations are remedied, but also leaves no opportunity for new issues to arise. I want this matter fully closed, and completing these remaining improvements will help guarantee that outcome.

If time is of the essence, I can pivot and have the property ready for a visit as early as the end of this week. However, with even a bit more time — as little as a week — the property could be significantly improved, things painted and presented well beyond expectations.

Please let me know how the timing looks on your end and what next steps you'd recommend.

Mark Saakian <mark@saakianlaw.com>

Thu, Oct 16, 2025 at 11:37 AM

To: Christopher Foley <christophertf@gmail.com>

Cc: Arthur Popov <arthur@bestofremodel.com>, Karin Owens <kowensfoley@gmail.com>, Jackie Baritell <baritelljm@gmail.com>

Chris,

I spoke with the city inspectors today. Once the violations are reported, a permit is needed to address and correct the violations. I understand that most issues are no longer there. I asked Arthur to coordinate the minimal permit with the inspectors, have it filed and then bring them in to confirm that the work is completed per code.

Thanks for the work you have done. While the permitting is underway, you can continue to ensure that there will be no issues once a visit is scheduled.

Thank you,

Mark Saakian  
Attorney  
Saakian Law, APC  
916.597.0770

Sent from a mobile device.

**EMAIL DISCLAIMER AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** The contents of this message may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, do not disseminate, disclose, copy or use this message without the permission of the author. Nothing contained in this message or in any attachment shall satisfy the requirements for a writing, and nothing contained herein shall constitute a contract or electronic signature. If this message has been received in error, please delete it immediately.

**SERVICE NOTICE:** This office, its attorneys or staff, do not accept or consent to the service of process, motions, pleadings, documents, or any other items by electronic format. Correspondence via electronic format does not indicate agreement or consent to acceptance of service in that format unless specifically agreed to (Rule 8.78).

On Oct 16, 2025, at 11:24 AM, Christopher Foley <christophertf@gmail.com> wrote:

[Quoted text hidden]

---

Christopher Foley <christophertf@gmail.com>

Thu, Oct 16, 2025 at 5:42 PM

To: Mark Saakian <mark@saakianlaw.com>

Mark,

I need to be absolutely clear on this point: there is no permit requirement under the current Notice & Order. If a permit were actually required, the City would have stated that explicitly in writing, with the specific code reference and instructions to obtain one. That's how the process works.

Instead, what's happening here is irregular — the City is trying to get you to pressure a contractor into filing an undefined permit for unspecified work.

That alone confirms that no permit requirement exists.

If one did, there would be no need for these back-channel discussions or for Arthur to “coordinate” anything. The City would simply issue a notice stating: “A permit is required for X, under section Y.”

Arthur himself confirmed during his visit that no permit is needed, and I have that on record, along with audio and video of prior conversations where both Doug, Paul, and Bo said the same.

The attempt to now manufacture a permit path — after the fact — appears designed to retroactively justify actions that weren't authorized.

I have full CCTV recordings of their visits (including audio) showing this entire chain of events, as well as documentation showing that no permit requirement was ever stated.

If the City now believes a permit is required, they need to issue a new Notice & Order that identifies the specific violation and cites the applicable code section.

And honestly — if a permit was really needed, the City had three years to say something. Waiting this long and suddenly trying to pull a fast one now isn't just bad faith, it's laches — an unreasonable delay that flat-out prejudices Jackie and undermines the legitimacy of anything new they try to pull.

Until that happens, there's nothing to "file," and no lawful reason to involve Arthur or anyone else in some made-up permit.

Also, for the record, any attempt to move forward with a permit that's not based on an actual cited violation could expose everyone involved — including you — to serious procedural and ethical issues.

It would effectively give cover to actions the City never lawfully required in writing, and I don't want you caught in the middle of that.

At this point, I'm not playing their games.

If the City wants something, they can put it in writing, cite the code, and issue it properly. Otherwise, this back-channel pressure to create a permit out of thin air stops here.

[Quoted text hidden]

---

Mark Saakian <mark@saakianlaw.com>

Mon, Oct 20, 2025 at 9:53 AM

To: Christopher Foley <christophertf@gmail.com>

Cc: Jackie Baritell <baritelljm@gmail.com>, Arthur Popov <arthur@bestofremodel.com>, Karin Owens <kowensfoley@gmail.com>

Good morning, Chris,

The Notice and Order DOES contain requirements to obtain a permit. Some excerpts here:

4. If you elect to repair the building(s), all required **permits for repair shall be secured** and the work physically commenced within 30 days from the date of this Order and completed within 60 days.
5. If you elect to demolish the building(s), all **demolition permits required shall be secured** and demolition commenced within 30 days from the date of this Order and completed within 60 days from date permit is issued. Demolition work shall include the removal of all structure(s) or portions thereof, foundations, trash and debris, and the lot shall be made compliant with Chapter 15.44 of the Sacramento City Code.

If you are referring to the printouts that were provided at the meeting at the property, it was done to facilitate the corrections. The printouts with photos were based on the Notice and Order and were not the actual new Notice and Order. With that, I do not think we need to get into a debate regarding the assessment of the document here. The goal is to have the unpermitted work reversed and signed off so the violation case can be closed as soon as possible. I appreciate your cooperation and I am sure Jackie does as well.

Even if the work is done to correct the violations, a signed off permit may be required to clear the case. The City Inspectors are willing to cooperate to make the permit process simple. Let's take advantage of that and get to the bottom of this. Arguments akin to what has transpired for the past couple of years will only exacerbate the situation and will result in more fines against Jackie which may be irreversible.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Regards,

Mark Saakian  
Attorney

**Saakian Law, APC**  
3500 Douglas Blvd., Suite 180  
Roseville, CA 95661  
(916) 597-0770  
Mark@SaakianLaw.com  
[www.SaakianLaw.com](http://www.SaakianLaw.com)

**EMAIL DISCLAIMER AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** The contents of this message may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, do not disseminate, disclose, copy or use this message without the permission of the author. Nothing contained in this message or in any attachment shall satisfy the requirements for a writing, and nothing contained herein shall constitute a contract or electronic signature. If this message has been received in error, please delete it immediately.

**SERVICE NOTICE:** This office, its attorneys or staff, do not accept or consent to the service of process, motions, pleadings, documents, or any other items by electronic format. Correspondence via electronic format does not indicate agreement or consent to acceptance of service in that format unless specifically agreed to (Rule 8.78).

[Quoted text hidden]

---

Mark Saakian <mark@saakianlaw.com>

Wed, Oct 22, 2025 at 9:40 AM

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

Cc: Jackie Baritell <baritelljm@gmail.com>

Chris,

I left a message for you earlier today. The City is on notice of the violations and they will not simply sign off without the proper process. Unfortunately, that's how it works.

I am attaching the list that the inspectors gave Arthur to correct. I understand that most of the work to correct the violations is done. A permit to correct, and an inspection to ensure that the corrections are done to code, will allow for this case to close. Per my prior conversation with Jackie, this is the goal.

I understand you have been trying to fix the siding. If so, please know that if it is done, they will need to make sure that it is done to code, i.e. with paper underneath, etc.. This is a quick reference of what work need to have a permit to have the work done: <https://www.cityofsacramento.gov/community-development/building/permit-services/required-permits>

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Regards,

Mark Saakian  
Attorney

**Saakian Law, APC**  
3500 Douglas Blvd., Suite 180  
Roseville, CA 95661  
(916) 597-0770  
Mark@SaakianLaw.com  
[www.SaakianLaw.com](http://www.SaakianLaw.com)

**EMAIL DISCLAIMER AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** The contents of this message may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, do not disseminate, disclose, copy or use this message without the permission of the author. Nothing contained in this message or in any attachment shall satisfy the requirements for a writing, and nothing contained herein shall constitute a contract or electronic signature. If this message has been received in error, please delete it immediately.

**SERVICE NOTICE:** This office, its attorneys or staff, do not accept or consent to the service of process, motions, pleadings, documents, or any other items by electronic format. Correspondence via electronic format does not indicate agreement or consent to acceptance of service in that format unless specifically agreed to (Rule 8.78).

On Mon, Oct 20, 2025 at 10:33 AM Mark Saakian <[mark@saakianlaw.com](mailto:mark@saakianlaw.com)> wrote:

Ok. Thanks.

Regards,

Mark Saakian  
Attorney

**Saakian Law, APC**  
3500 Douglas Blvd., Suite 180  
Roseville, CA 95661  
(916) 597-0770  
Mark@SaakianLaw.com  
[www.SaakianLaw.com](http://www.SaakianLaw.com)

**EMAIL DISCLAIMER AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** The contents of this message may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, do not disseminate, disclose, copy or use this message without the permission of the author. Nothing contained in this message or in any attachment shall satisfy the requirements for a writing, and nothing contained herein shall constitute a contract or electronic signature. If this message has been received in error, please delete it immediately.

**SERVICE NOTICE:** This office, its attorneys or staff, do not accept or consent to the service of process, motions, pleadings, documents, or any other items by electronic format. Correspondence via electronic format does not indicate agreement or consent to acceptance of service in that format unless specifically agreed to (Rule 8.78).

On Mon, Oct 20, 2025 at 10:24 AM Arthur Popov | Best of Remodel <[arthur@bestofremodel.com](mailto:arthur@bestofremodel.com)> wrote:

Sorry Mark, I am am not placing myself into this. It is talking too much of my time. All the listed items are done. I do not feel comfortable pulling permit for anything they ask and be stuck with this misc items. I am out



**Arthur Popov | Best Of Remodel Inc.**

Project Manager

📞 916.402.9372 cell

✉ [arthur@bestofremodel.com](mailto:arthur@bestofremodel.com)

📍 6929 Sunrise Blvd 105E, [Citrus Heights, CA 95610](#)

🌐 [www.bestofremodel.com](http://www.bestofremodel.com)



Follow on Instagram



Watch on YouTube

Excellent ★★★★★ 5.0 | 96 + reviews

**Confidentiality Notice:** The information contained in this e-mail and any accompanying attachment(s) is intended only for the use of the intended recipient and may be confidential and/or privileged. If any reader of this communication is not the intended recipient, unauthorized use, disclosure or copying is strictly prohibited, and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please delete/destroy this email and notify the sender you have received this message.

[Quoted text hidden]

**2 attachments**



**DOC102225-10222025093301.pdf**  
6738K



**DOC102225-10222025093249.pdf**  
4525K

**Karin Owens** <[kowensfoley@gmail.com](mailto:kowensfoley@gmail.com)>  
To: Chris Foley <[christophertf@gmail.com](mailto:christophertf@gmail.com)>  
Cc: Jackie Baritell <[baritelljm@gmail.com](mailto:baritelljm@gmail.com)>

Wed, Oct 22, 2025 at 10:35 AM

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Mark Saakian <[mark@saakianlaw.com](mailto:mark@saakianlaw.com)>  
**Date:** October 22, 2025 at 9:41:36 AM PDT  
**To:** Christopher Foley <[christophertf@gmail.com](mailto:christophertf@gmail.com)>, Karin Owens <[kowensfoley@gmail.com](mailto:kowensfoley@gmail.com)>  
**Cc:** Jackie Baritell <[baritelljm@gmail.com](mailto:baritelljm@gmail.com)>  
**Subject:** **Re: Corrections for City Code compliance**

[Quoted text hidden]

|||

If you are referring to the printouts that were provided at the meeting at the property, it was done to facilitate the corrections. The printouts with photos were based on the Notice and Order and were not the actual new Notice and Order. With that, I do not think we need to get into a debate regarding the assessment of the

document here. The goal is to have the unpermitted work reversed and signed off so the violation case can be closed as soon as possible. I appreciate your cooperation and I am sure Jackie does as well.

Even if the work is done to correct the violations, a signed off permit may be required to clear the case. The City Inspectors are willing to cooperate to make the permit process simple. Let's take advantage of that and get to the bottom of this. Arguments akin to what has transpired for the past couple of years will only exacerbate the situation and will result in more fines against Jackie which may be irreversible.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Regards,

Mark Saakian  
Attorney

**Saakian Law, APC**  
3500 Douglas Blvd., Suite 180  
Roseville, CA 95661  
(916) 597-0770  
Mark@SaakianLaw.com  
[www.SaakianLaw.com](http://www.SaakianLaw.com)

**EMAIL DISCLAIMER AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** The contents of this message may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, do not disseminate, disclose, copy or use this message without the permission of the author. Nothing contained in this message or in any attachment shall satisfy the requirements for a writing, and nothing contained herein shall constitute a contract or electronic signature. If this message has been received in error, please delete it immediately.

**SERVICE NOTICE:** This office, its attorneys or staff, do not accept or consent to the service of process, motions, pleadings, documents, or any other items by electronic format. Correspondence via electronic format does not indicate agreement or consent to acceptance of service in that format unless specifically agreed to (Rule 8.78).

On Thu, Oct 16, 2025 at 5:42 PM Christopher Foley <[christophertf@gmail.com](mailto:christophertf@gmail.com)> wrote:

Mark,

I need to be absolutely clear on this point: there is no permit requirement under the current Notice & Order. If a permit were actually required, the City would have stated that explicitly in writing, with the specific code reference and instructions to obtain one. That's how the process works.

Instead, what's happening here is irregular — the City is trying to get you to pressure a contractor into filing an undefined permit for unspecified work.

That alone confirms that no permit requirement exists.

If one did, there would be no need for these back-channel discussions or for Arthur to "coordinate" anything. The City would simply issue a notice stating: "*A permit is required for X, under section Y.*"

Arthur himself confirmed during his visit that no permit is needed, and I have that on record, along with audio and video of prior conversations where both Doug, Paul, and Bo said the same.

The attempt to now manufacture a permit path — after the fact — appears designed to retroactively justify actions that weren't authorized.

I have full CCTV recordings of their visits (including audio) showing this entire chain of events, as well as documentation showing that no permit requirement was ever stated.

If the City now believes a permit is required, they need to issue a new Notice & Order that identifies the specific violation and cites the applicable code section.

And honestly — if a permit was really needed, the City had three years to say something. Waiting this long and suddenly trying to pull a fast one now isn't just bad faith, it's laches — an unreasonable delay that flat-out prejudices Jackie and undermines the legitimacy of anything new they try to pull.

Until that happens, there's nothing to "file," and no lawful reason to involve Arthur or anyone else in some made-up permit.

Also, for the record, any attempt to move forward with a permit that's not based on an actual cited violation could expose everyone involved — including you — to serious procedural and ethical issues. It would effectively give cover to actions the City never lawfully required in writing, and I don't want you caught in the middle of that.

At this point, I'm not playing their games.

If the City wants something, they can put it in writing, cite the code, and issue it properly. Otherwise, this back-channel pressure to create a permit out of thin air stops here.

On Thu, Oct 16, 2025 at 11:37 AM Mark Saakian <[mark@saakianlaw.com](mailto:mark@saakianlaw.com)> wrote:

Chris,

I spoke with the city inspectors today. Once the violations are reported, a permit is needed to address and correct the violations. I understand that most issues are no longer there. I asked Arthur to coordinate the minimal permit with the inspectors, have it filed and then bring them in to confirm that the work is completed per code.

Thanks for the work you have done. While the permitting is underway, you can continue to ensure that there will be no issues once a visit is scheduled.

Thank you,

Mark Saakian  
Attorney  
Saakian Law, APC  
916.597.0770

Sent from a mobile device.

EMAIL DISCLAIMER AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this message may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, do not disseminate, disclose, copy or use this message without the permission of the author. Nothing contained in this message or in any attachment shall satisfy the requirements for a writing, and nothing contained herein shall constitute a contract or electronic signature. If this message has been received in error, please delete it immediately.

SERVICE NOTICE: This office, its attorneys or staff, do not accept or consent to the service of process, motions, pleadings, documents, or any other items by electronic format. Correspondence via electronic format does not indicate agreement or consent to acceptance of service in that format unless specifically agreed to (Rule 8.78).

On Oct 16, 2025, at 11:24 AM, Christopher Foley <[christophertf@gmail.com](mailto:christophertf@gmail.com)> wrote:

I can confirm that all violations listed on the recent Notice & Order have been corrected.

There are, however, a few additional items — such as the west-side siding, back fence height, and remaining window trim — that were discussed previously but not included in the official N&O. Those are currently in progress.

My goal is to ensure the next inspection not only confirms the listed violations are remedied, but also leaves no opportunity for new issues to arise. I want this matter fully closed, and completing these remaining improvements will help guarantee that outcome.

If time is of the essence, I can pivot and have the property ready for a visit as early as the end of this week. However, with even a bit more time — as little as a week — the property could be significantly improved, things painted and presented well beyond expectations.

Please let me know how the timing looks on your end and what next steps you'd recommend.

---


4 attachments


5. If you wish to delete the building paper, all demolition permits required shall be associated with demolition permit with 22 days from the date of this Order and compliance within 75 days from date permit is issued. Submit for each 22 days, the removal of all structural or exterior finish, including, but not limited to, and the contractor shall submit a copy of the approved city code.

image.png  
24K

6. If you wish to repair the building paper, all repairs shall be completed within 10 days of the date of this order.

image.png  
18K

 DOC102225-10222025093301.pdf  
6738K

 DOC102225-10222025093249.pdf  
4525K

---

Mark Saakian <mark@saakianlaw.com>  
To: Christopher Foley <christophertf@gmail.com>, Karin Owens <kowensfoley@gmail.com>  
Cc: Jackie Baritell <baritelljm@gmail.com>

Thu, Oct 23, 2025 at 10:01 AM

Christopher,

In a follow up to our conversation yesterday, I got this email from Paul today. Please note the last paragraph regarding the need for inspection of the underlayer on the siding and the siding style. I hope additional work and issues involving other departments and their inspectors can be avoided. This is very important.

"Mark,

I tried calling you yesterday and I received your voicemail. I had not heard back from you, so I was following up with this email.

I happened to be driving by the property yesterday (10/22/25) and I could see the siding is being replaced at the fireplace area. It showed at that time it was ready for an inspection of the building paper prior to installing the siding. So, I stopped to talk with whoever was installing the siding to let them know they were at a time an inspection is required before installing the siding. There was no answer when I was at the area where work was being performed. The front door was wide open, and I announced myself at the door and no one answered.

So, I want to let you know if the building paper is covered up, once the permit is issued, the siding will need to be removed in order to verify the paper is installed correctly. Also, the siding that is being installed is not the same siding as the rest of the house. If Jackie would like to change the siding at the fireplace to a different siding, that can be listed with the scope of work then planning could visit the site to verify if the siding she wants could be approved for her residence. "

Regards,

Mark Saakian  
Attorney

**Saakian Law, APC**  
3500 Douglas Blvd., Suite 180  
Roseville, CA 95661  
(916) 597-0770  
Mark@SaakianLaw.com  
[www.SaakianLaw.com](http://www.SaakianLaw.com)

**EMAIL DISCLAIMER AND CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE:** The contents of this message may be confidential. If you are not the intended recipient, do not disseminate, disclose, copy or use this message without the permission of the author. Nothing contained in this message or in any attachment shall satisfy the requirements for a writing, and nothing contained herein shall constitute a contract or electronic signature. If this message has been received in error, please delete it immediately.

**SERVICE NOTICE:** This office, its attorneys or staff, do not accept or consent to the service of process, motions, pleadings, documents, or any other items by electronic format. Correspondence via electronic format does not indicate agreement or consent to acceptance of service in that format unless specifically agreed to (Rule 8.78).

[Quoted text hidden]