

1 **MICHAEL A. CONGER, ESQUIRE (State Bar #147882)**  
2 **LAW OFFICE OF MICHAEL A. CONGER**  
3 16236 San Dieguito Road, Suite 4-14  
4 **Mailing:** P.O. Box 9374  
5 Rancho Santa Fe, California 92067  
6 Telephone: (858) 759-0200  
7 Facsimile: (858) 759-1906

FILED  
CIVIL BUSINESS OFFICE 3  
CENTRAL DIVISION  
2009 JAN 14 PM 3:31  
CLERK-SUPERIOR COURT  
SAN DIEGO COUNTY, CA

8 Attorney for Plaintiff San Diego Police Officers' Association

9  
10  
11 **SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**  
12 **FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO**

13 SAN DIEGO POLICE OFFICERS' ASSOCIATION,	)	CASE NO:
	)	<b>37-2009-00081659-CU-WM-CTL</b>
14 Plaintiff,	)	
15 v.	)	COMPLAINT FOR WRIT OF
16 CITY OF SAN DIEGO, and DOES 1 to 20,	)	MANDATE AND DECLARATORY
17 inclusive,	)	RELIEF
18 Defendants.	)	

19 1. Plaintiff San Diego Police Officers Association ("SDPOA") is a mutual benefit  
20 corporation organized and doing business as a State of California sanctioned employee  
21 organization representing police officers holding the rank of lieutenant and below who are  
22 employed by the City of San Diego ("City"). The scope of the SDPOA's representation of San  
23 Diego Police officers in negotiating labor-management agreements, and the City's duty to meet  
24 and confer in good faith, are set forth in the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act ("MMBA"). (Gov. Code,  
25 §§ 3500-3510.)

26 2. The City is a municipal corporation with all municipal powers, functions, rights,  
27 privileges and immunities authorized by the Constitution and laws of the State of California. The  
28 City is a "charter city" under Article XI of the California Constitution, which authorizes the  
organization of municipal corporations (cities) as either "general law cities" or "charter cities."  
The City is authorized to enact ordinances consistent with its charter and is required to adhere to

1 its own ordinances.

2 3. The true names or capacities, whether individual, corporate, associate, or  
3 otherwise, of defendants DOES 1 to 20, inclusive, are unknown to plaintiff, who therefore sues  
4 said defendants by such fictitious names.

5 4. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each of the defendants  
6 designated herein as a DOE is responsible in some manner for the events and happenings herein  
7 referred to and caused injury and damages as herein alleged. Plaintiff will seek leave of court to  
8 amend this complaint, if necessary, to set forth the true names and capacities of such named  
9 defendants when their identities become known to it.

10 5. Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereon alleges that each defendant named  
11 in this action, including DOE defendants, at all relevant times, was the agent, ostensible agent,  
12 servant, employee, representative, assistant, joint venturer, and/or co-conspirator of each of the  
13 other defendants and was at all times acting within the course and scope of his, her, or its  
14 authority as agent, ostensible agent, servant, employee, representative, joint venturer, and/or  
15 co-conspirator, and with the same authorization, consent, permission or ratification of each of the  
16 other defendants.

17 6. "In 1961, the Legislature enacted the George Brown Act (Stats. 1961, ch. 1964,  
18 pp. 4141-4143), which for the first time recognized the rights of state and local public employees  
19 to organize and to have their representatives meet and confer with their public agency employers  
20 over wages and working conditions." (*Coachella Valley Mosquito and Vector Control District v.*  
21 *California Public Employment Relations Board* ("Coachella") (2005) 35 Cal.4th 1072, 1083.)

22 7. "In 1968, the Legislature went a step further by enacting the MMBA (Stats. 1968,  
23 ch. 1390, pp. 2725-2729), which 'authorized labor and management representatives not only to  
24 confer but to enter into written agreements for presentation to the governing body of a municipal  
25 government or other local public agency.'" (*Coachella, supra*, 35 Cal.4th at p. 1084.)

26 8. "The MMBA imposes on local public entities a duty to meet and confer in good  
27 faith with representatives of recognized employee organizations, in order to reach binding  
28 agreements governing wages, hours, and working conditions of the agencies' employees." (*Ibid.*,

1 citing Gov't Code, § 3505.)

2 9. "To effect [its] goals the [MMBA] . . . obligates employers to bargain with  
3 employee representatives about matters that fall within the 'scope of representation.'"

4 (*Claremont Police Officers Association v. City of Claremont* (2006) 39 Cal.4th 623, 630, citing  
5 Gov't Code, §§ 3504.5, 3505.)

6 10. "The scope of representation . . . include[s] all matters relating to employment  
7 conditions and employer-employee relations, including, but not limited to, wages, hours, and  
8 other terms and conditions of employment . . . ." (Gov't Code, § 3504.)

9 11. "The duty to bargain requires the public agency to refrain from making unilateral  
10 changes in employees' wages and working conditions until the employer and employee  
11 association have bargained to impasse . . . ." (*City of Fresno v. People ex rel. Fresno*  
12 *Firefighters, IAFF Local 753* (1999) 71 Cal.App.4th 82, 99, quoting *Santa Clara County*  
13 *Counsel Attys. Assn. v. Woodside* (1994) 7 Cal.4th 525, 537.)

14 12. In 1927, the City established a defined benefit pension plan to provide retirement,  
15 disability, death, and retiree health benefits to City employees, including the police officers  
16 represented by the SDPOA and their beneficiaries ("the retirement plan").

17 13. Pursuant to the San Diego City Charter, Article IX, sections 141 through 148.1,  
18 Article X, section 1, and the San Diego Municipal Code section 24.0100, *et seq.*, each of the  
19 police officers represented by the SDPOA makes contributions to the retirement plan, and the  
20 City makes substantially equal contributions on their behalf which are considered "additional  
21 elements of compensation."

22 14. The amount of benefits paid to these police officers at retirement depends on  
23 several factors, including the officer's "Final Compensation." (San Diego Municipal Code, §§  
24 24.0403, 24.0103.)

25 15. "Final Compensation" is defined as "the Base Compensation for the highest one  
26 year period during membership in the Retirement System." (San Diego Municipal Code, §  
27 24.0103.)

28 16. "Base Compensation" as defined in San Diego Municipal Code, section 24.0103,

1 as amended effective July 1, 2000, provides: “[a] complete listing of included and excluded items  
2 of compensation or remuneration is memorialized in a document entitled ‘Earnings Codes  
3 Included in Retirement Base Compensation[’] [the Earnings Codes Document], which is  
4 prepared annually and which shall be kept on file in the Office of the City Clerk, and also  
5 maintained by the City Manager, the City Auditor and the Personnel Director.”

6 17. In exchange for particular duties performed by numerous police officers for more  
7 than the past decade, they have each been paid either “Motorcycle Care Pay” or “Canine Care  
8 Pay.”

9 18. Both Motorcycle Care Pay and Canine Care Pay were listed in the Earnings Code  
10 Document which was effective on July 1, 2000. They were also both listed in at least two  
11 Earnings Code Documents published before July 1, 2000, and at least five Earnings Code  
12 Documents since July 1, 2000. Both Motorcycle Care Pay and Canine Care Pay were listed as  
13 included in “retirement base earnings” in these Earnings Code Documents because they were  
14 “classified as ‘negotiated specialty add-ons’ and are included in retirement base earnings because  
15 all employees performing that class of work during ordinary work hours on a consistent basis  
16 earn them at the same rate of pay.”

17 19. On or about January 26, 2007, the City unilaterally changed the Earnings Code  
18 Document to exclude Motorcycle Care Pay and Canine Care Pay from Base Compensation, and  
19 therefore exclude a substantial portion of many police officers’ compensation from the  
20 calculations on which their retirement allowances will be based, thereby substantially reducing  
21 their pensions.

22 21. The City’s unilateral change to the Earnings Code Document in order to exclude  
23 Motorcycle Care Pay and Canine Care Pay was within the SDPOA’s scope of representation of  
24 the affected police officers.

25 22. The City unilaterally changed the Earnings Code Document and excluded  
26 Motorcycle Care Pay and Canine Care Pay without informing the SDPOA as required by  
27 Government Code section 3504.5.

28 23. The City unilaterally changed the Earnings Code Document and excluded

1 Motorcycle Care Pay and Canine Care Pay without meeting and conferring with the SDPOA as  
2 required by Government Code section 3505.

3 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION FOR A WRIT OF MANDATE**

4 **(Against the City and DOES 1-10)**

5 24. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and reallege paragraphs 1 through 23 as though  
6 fully set forth herein.

7 25. Pursuant to Government Code section 3504.5, the City was required to inform the  
8 SDPOA before attempting to changed the Earnings Code Document to exclude Motorcycle Care  
9 Pay and Canine Care Pay.

10 26. Pursuant to Government Code section 3505, the City was required to meet and  
11 confer with the SDPOA prior to the City's unilateral change to the Earnings Code Document in  
12 order to exclude Motorcycle Care Pay and Canine Care Pay.

13 27. There are no administrative remedies available to plaintiffs to compel the relief  
14 sought herein. Therefore, plaintiff has exhausted all available administrative remedies, including  
15 efforts by its president and attorney to resolve this matter without the necessity of litigation.

16 28. Plaintiff has no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law.

17 29. Unless the City is mandated by this Court to invalidate the January 2007 Earnings  
18 Code Document and take all necessary steps to correctly report police officers Base  
19 Compensation to the San Diego City Employees' Retirement System, the City will not do so.

20 30. The City's amendment of the Earnings Code Document without complying with  
21 the MMBA constituted an abuse of any discretion it had to change the Base Compensation of the  
22 plaintiff's members.

23 31. Therefore, this Court should issue a peremptory writ of mandate directing the City  
24 to immediately amend the 2007 Earnings Code Document to include Motorcycle Care Pay and  
25 Canine Care Pay in Base Compensation, and take all necessary steps to correctly report police  
26 officers' Base Compensation to the San Diego City Employees' Retirement System.

27 32. The action, if successful, would enforce an important right affecting the public  
28 interest, and would confer significant benefits, pecuniary and nonpecuniary, on the general

1 public and a large class of persons. Private enforcement is necessary and has placed a  
2 disproportionate financial burden on the plaintiff in relation to its stake in the matter. Plaintiff is  
3 therefore entitled to an award of attorney fees under Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and  
4 the equitable, private attorney general doctrine.

5 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF**

6 **(Against the City and DOES 11-20)**

7 33. Plaintiff incorporates by reference and reallege paragraphs 1 through 23 as though  
8 fully set forth herein.

9 34. An actual and justiciable controversy has arisen, and now exists, between the  
10 SDPOA, on the one hand, and the City, on the other hand, as to whether the City's unilateral  
11 exclusion of Motorcycle Care Pay and Canine Care Pay from Base Compensation in the January  
12 2007 Earnings Code Document—which resulted in a reduction of plaintiffs' pensions—is legally  
13 effective.

14 35. The City contends that its January 2007 reduction in police officer pensions was  
15 lawful despite its violations of Government Code section 3504.5 and 3505.

16 36. The SDPOA contends to the contrary that the City may not unilaterally reduce  
17 police officers' pensions without compliance with the MMBA.

18 37. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1060, plaintiff desires a judicial  
19 determination that the City's January 2007 change to the Earnings Code Document was unlawful.

20 38. Such a judicial determination is necessary and appropriate at this time so that the  
21 parties can ascertain their respective rights and duties.

22 39. There are no administrative remedies available to plaintiffs to compel the relief  
23 sought herein. Therefore, plaintiff has exhausted all available administrative remedies, including  
24 efforts by its president and attorney to resolve this matter without the necessity of litigation.

25 40. Plaintiff has no plain, speedy or adequate remedy at law.

26 41. The action, if successful, would enforce an important right affecting the public  
27 interest, and would confer significant benefits, pecuniary and nonpecuniary, on the general  
28 public and a large class of persons. Private enforcement is necessary and has placed a


1 disproportionate financial burden on the plaintiff in relation to its stake in the matter. Plaintiff is  
2 therefore entitled to an award of attorney fees under Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and  
3 the equitable, private attorney general doctrine.

4 **WHEREFORE, plaintiff prays that, following a duly noticed hearing, the Court:**

- 5 1. Issue a peremptory writ of mandate directing the City to immediately amend the  
6 2007 Earnings Code Document to include Motorcycle Care Pay and Canine Care Pay in Base  
7 Compensation, and take all necessary steps to correctly report police officers' Base  
8 Compensation to the San Diego City Employees' Retirement System;
- 9 2. Render a judicial determination that the City's January, 2007 change to the  
10 Earnings Code Document was unlawful;
- 11 3. Award plaintiff the costs of suit herein;
- 12 4. Award plaintiff reasonable attorney fees; and
- 13 5. Award such other and further relief as it deems necessary and proper.

14  
15 Dated: January 14, 2009

**LAW OFFICE OF MICHAEL A. CONGER**

16  
17 By:   
18 Michael A. Conger  
19 Attorney for Plaintiffs

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28