1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	CHRISTINE HAMMOND, SBN 206768 General Counsel JONATHAN KOLTZ, SBN No. 268793 Assistant General Counsel KEVIN WHEELWRIGHT, SBN No. 073138 Staff Counsel  CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION 505 Van Ness Avenue San Francisco, CA 94102-3298 Telephone: 415-703-2782 Fax: 415-703-1758 E-mail: kevin.wheelwright@cpuc.ca.gov  Attorneys for the California Public Utilities Commission		[No Fee Pursuant to Government Code §6103] ELECTRONICALLY FILED 8/4/2022 5:17 PM Superior Court of California County of Mendocino  By: John Lozano Deputy Clerk		
10	SUPERIOR	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA			
11	COUNTY OF MENDOCINO, UKIAH BRANCH				
12					
13	MENDOCINO RAILWAY		SCUK-CVED-20-74939		
14		Plaintiff,	NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION TO QUASH SUBPOENA BY WITNESSES		
15	v.		FRED HARRIS AND CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION,		
16 17	JOHN MEYER, ET AL,		MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES, AND DECLARATION OF FRED HARRIS IN SUPPORT THEREOF		
18		Defendants.	Date: August 19, 2022		
19			Time: 9:30 a.m. Dept.: E		
20			Judge: Jeanine Nadel Trial Date: August 23, 2022		
21			Action Filed: December 22, 2020		
22					
23					
24					
25 26					
27					
28					

To Plaintiff and its attorney of record:

Notice is hereby given that on August 19, 2022 at 9:30 a.m., or as soon thereafter as the matter may be heard, in Department E of the above entitled Court, witnesses Fred Harris ("Harris") and the California Public Utilities Commission ("Commission), will and hereby do bring this motion for an order to quash the subpoena dated July 22, 2022, issued by Plaintiff herein ("Subpoena") which seeks to compel the personal appearance and testimony of Harris and the production of documents by the Commission. A true and correct copy of the Subpoena that is the subject of this motion to quash is attached hereto as Exhibit "A".

The Subpoena was issued and served by Plaintiff Mendocino Railway, and seeks to compel the personal appearance and testimony of Harris for the apparent purpose of "authenticating" a single page posted by the Commission on its website:

<a href="https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/industries-and-topics/railsafety/railroad-operations-and-safety/regulated-california-railroads">https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/industries-and-topics/railsafety/railroad-operations-and-safety/regulated-california-railroads</a>.

Mendocino Railway describes the webpage as "a business record within the files of the CPUC."

This Court should issue an order to quash the Subpoena and set aside the request for Harris's personal appearance and testimony, as well as the request for the production of documents by the Commission, on the grounds that (1) the personal appearance and testimony of Harris is unnecessary and burdensome, and (2) the declaration submitted in support of the Subpoena is impermissibly vague.

## 1. The Personal Appearance and Testimony of Harris is Unnecessary.

Harris's personal appearance and testimony is unnecessary and unduly burdensome because the Commission's website is an official record of a government agency that is publicly available and is easily verifiable by the Court. Such a webpage can be admitted into evidence without calling the custodian or other witness to authenticate it. (Cal. Evid. Code, § 1280; *People v. George* (1994) 30 Cal.App.4th 262, 274.) Rather, the foundation for such a publicly available

record can be established through other means, including judicial notice. (*George*, *supra*, 30 Cal.App.4th at p. 274.)

Evidence Code section 451, subdivision (c), provides that courts may take judicial notice of "[o]fficial acts of the legislative, executive, and judicial departments of . . . any state of the United States . . ." and section 451, subdivision (h) allows notice of "[f]acts and propositions that are not reasonably subject to dispute and are capable of immediate and accurate determination by resort to sources of reasonably indisputable accuracy." Courts routinely take notice of the contents of government websites, including that of the Commission. (See, *e.g.*, *Scott v. JPMorgan Chase Bank, N.A.* (2013) 214 Cal.App.4th 743, 760-61 [taking notice of the contents of the website of an administrative agency when they were not subject to reasonable dispute]; *Overton v. Uber Techs., Inc.* (N.D. Cal. Aug. 3, 2018, No. 18-cv-02166-EMC) 2018 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 130986, at p. \*9 n.2 [taking notice of the contents of the Commission's website "as the record of a state agency not subject to reasonable dispute." (internal quotation marks omitted)].)

Here, the contents of the Commission's webpage are not reasonably subject to dispute and are capable of immediate and accurate determination. The Court should take judicial notice of the undisputed fact that the Commission's website lists Mendocino Railway as a "Class III Railway." That website does not, however, address whether Mendocino Railway should be considered a "public utility" or a "common carrier," or whether Mendocino Railway is authorized to exercise the power of eminent domain. Those are legal determinations that the website does not address, nor to which Harris could competently testify. (See, *e.g.*, *Summers v. A. L. Gilbert Co.* (1999) 69 Cal.App.4th 1155, 1178 ["There are limits to expert testimony, not the least of which is the prohibition against admission of an expert's opinion on a question of law."].)

In sum, the only thing to which Harris could competently testify—the fact that the Commission's website says what it appears to say—is also properly the subject of judicial notice, and does not require Harris's appearance.

## 2. The Subpoena is unduly burdensome to Mr. Harris and the Commission.

The Subpoena seeks to compel the personal attendance and testimony of Harris, at 9:00 a.m., on August 23, 2022, in Ukiah. As set forth in Harris's Declaration below, he is a Commission employee who resides in San Rafael, California, and he is assigned to the San Francisco office of the Commission. The Ukiah Branch of the Court is approximately 96 miles from Harris's residence, or 115 miles from San Francisco. The Subpoena would require Harris to travel to Ukiah, likely the day prior to the scheduled date for his appearance, and Harris would be forced to return to the San Francisco Bay Area, likely to arrive after the close of business on August 23, or during business hours the following day. As a result, Harris would miss one or two days of his employment and the Commission would not receive the benefit of Harris's services for the time that he would be absent.

The Subpoena is also defective because the Subpoena was not accompanied by a check for Mr. Harris in the appropriate amount as is required by Gov. Code section 68097.2

3. The Subpoena is unenforceable and should be quashed because the declaration in support of the Subpoena is impermissibly vague.

Code of Civil Procedure section 1985, subdivision (b) provides that an affidavit shall be served with a subpoena duces tecum showing good cause for the production of the matters and things described in the subpoena "specifying the exact matters or things desired to be produced, setting forth in full detail the materiality thereof to the issues involved in the case, and stating that the witness *has the desired matters or things in his or her possession or under his or her control*" (emphasis added).

As indicated above, the Subpoena refers to a specific webpage which Mendocino Railway describes as "a business record within the files of the CPUC." Paragraph 4 of the Declaration in Support of the Subpoena states that the identified webpage "pertains to plaintiff Mendocino Railway's status as a regulated common carrier railroad public utility with the power to exercise eminent domain to acquire property for public use." However, a plain reading of the webpage

reveals that it does not address or say anything about Mendocino Railway's alleged status as a "common carrier" or as a "public utility," or its alleged power to exercise eminent domain.

It is also unclear from the Subpoena and the declaration in support thereof whether Mendocino Railway is seeking to compel the testimony of Harris, or the production of additional documents by the Commission, to address the additional issues of Mendocino Railway's alleged status as a "common carrier," or a "public utility," or its ability to exercise of the power of eminent domain. It is burdensome and oppressive to force the witnesses to guess about the Subpoena's goal.

This Court should take judicial notice of the identified website and quash the Subpoena.

Dated: August 4, 2022 Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTINE HAMMOND, SBN 206768 JONATHAN KOLTZ, SBN NO. 268793 KEVIN WHEELWRIGHT, SBN NO. 073138

By: /s/ KEVIN WHEELWRIGHT

Kevin Wheelwright

Attorneys for the California Public Utilities Commission

### **EXHBIIT A**

#### **Subpoena of Fred Harris**

	30DF-00Z				
ATTORNEY OR PARTY WITHOUT ATTORNEY (Name: State Bar number, and address):	FOR COURT USE ONLY				
Glenn L. Block (SB#208017)/Christopher G. Washington (SB#307804					
Cal. Em. Dom. Law Group, 3429 Ocean View, Glendale, CA 91208					
TELEPHONE NO.: 818-957-0477 FAX NO.: 818-957-3477					
E-MAIL ADDRESS: glb@caledlaw.com					
ATTORNEY FOR (Name): Plaintiff Mendocino Railway					
NAME OF COURT: Superior Court of California, County of Mendocino					
STREET ADDRESS: 100 North Street					
MAILING ADDRESS:					
CITY AND ZIP CODE: Ukiah, CA 95482-4416					
BRANCH NAME; Ukiah					
PLAINTIFF/ PETITIONER: Mendocino Railway *	4 4 6 A				
defendant/respondent: John Meyer, et al					
CIVIL SUBPOENA (DUCES TECUM) for Personal Appearance and	CASE NUMBER:				
Production of Documents, Electronically Stored Information, and Things at Trial or Hearing and DECLARATION	SCUK-CVED-20-74939				
THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, TO (name, address, and telephone no	umber of witness. if known):				
Fred Harris, Custodian of Records (CPUC) - 505 Van Ness Avenue, San F					
1. YOU ARE ORDERED TO APPEAR AS A WITNESS in this action at the date, time, a					
UNLESS your appearance is excused as indicated in box 3b below or you make a					
item 4 below.	agreement with the person named in				
a. Date: August 23, 2022 Time: 9:00 a.m.	Div.: Room:				
b. Address: Superior Court of California, County of Mendocino, 100 Nor	<del></del>				
2. IF YOU HAVE BEEN SERVED WITH THIS SUBPOENA AS A CUSTODIAN OF CONS					
UNDER CODE OF CIVIL PROCEDURE SECTION 1985,3 OR 1985,6 AND A MOTION					
BEEN SERVED ON YOU, A COURT ORDER OR AGREEMENT OF THE PARTIES, W					
EMPLOYEE AFFECTED MUST BE OBTAINED BEFORE YOU ARE REQUIRED TO P					
RECORDS.					
3. YOU ARE (item a or b must be checked):					
a. V Ordered to appear in person and to produce the records described in the decla	ration on page two or the attached				
declaration or affidavit. The personal attendance of the custodian or other qualified witness and the production of the					
original records are required by this subpoena. The procedure authorized by E	vidence Code sections 1560(b), 1561, and				
1562 will not be deemed sufficient compliance with this subpoena.					
b. Not required to appear in person if you produce (i) the records described in the	declaration on page two or the attached				
declaration or affidavit and (ii) a completed declaration of custodian of records	in compliance with Evidence Code sections				
1560, 1561, 1562, and 1271. (1) Place a copy of the records in an envelope (o	r other wrapper). Enclose the original				
declaration of the custodian with the records. Seal the envelope, (2) Attach a c					
write on the envelope the case name and number; your name; and the date, tir					
(3) Place this first envelope in an outer envelope, seal it, and mail it to the clerk					
(4) Mail a copy of your declaration to the attorney or party listed at the top of th					
4. IF YOU HAVE ANY QUESTIONS ABOUT THE TIME OR DATE YOU ARE TO APPEAR					
THAT YOUR PRESENCE IS REQUIRED, CONTACT THE FOLLOWING PERSON BEF	ORE THE DATE ON WHICH YOU ARE				
TO APPEAR:  a. Name of subpoenaing party or attorney: Glenn Block b. Teleph	none number: 818-957-0477				
5. Witness Fees: You are entitled to witness fees and mileage actually traveled both ways					
at the time of service. You may request them before your scheduled appearance from the					
DISOBEDIENCE OF THIS SUBPOENA MAY BE PUNISHED AS CONTEMPT BY THIS					
FOR THE SUM OF FIVE HUNDRED DOLLARS AND ALL DAMAGES RESULTING					
Date issued: July 22, 2022	2 2011				
David H. Yamasaki	auxtrono-				
	ATURE OF PERSON (ESCING SUBPOENA)				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Clerk of the Court				
(Declaration in support of subpoena on reverse)	(TITLE) Page 1 of 3				
Form Adopted for Mandatory, Use CIVIL SUBPOENA (DUCES TECUM) for Personal A	ppearance and Code of Civil Procedure,				
Judicial Council of California	S 1985 et sen				

**SUBP-002** CASE NUMBER: PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Mendocino Railway SCUK-CVED-20-74939 DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: John Meyer, et al The production of the documents, electronically stored information, or other things sought by the subpoena on page one is supported by (check one): the attached affidavit or the following declaration: DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF CIVIL SUBPOENA (DUCES TECUM) FOR PERSONAL APPEARANCE AND PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS, ELECTRONICALLY STORED INFORMATION, AND THINGS AT TRIAL OR HEARING (Code Civ. Proc., §§ 1985,1987.5) 1. I, the undersigned, declare I am the plaintiff defendant petitioner attorney for (specify): Plaintiff other (specify): in the above-entitled action. 2. The witness has possession or control of the documents, electronically stored information, or other things listed below, and shall produce them at the time and place specified in the Civil Subpoena for Personal Appearance and Production of Records at Trial or Hearing on page one of this form (specify the exact documents or other things to be produce; if electronically stored information is demanded, the form or forms in which each type of information is to be produced may be specified): The CPUC webpage at: https://www.cpuc.ca.gov/industries-and-topics/rail-safety/railroad-operations-and-safety/regulated-californi a-railroads Continued on Attachment 2. 3. Good cause exists for the production of the documents, electronically stored information, or other things described in paragraph 2 for the following reasons: This document is a business record within the files of the CPUC and the CPUC is the only entity with access and ability to authenticate this document. Continued on Attachment 3. 4. The documents, electronically stored information, or other things described in paragraph 2 are material to the issues involved in this case for the following reasons: This document pertains to Plaintiff Mendocino Railway's status as a regulated common carrier railroad public utility with the power to exercise eminent domain to acquire property for public use. Continued on Attachment 4. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Date: 7/22/22 Glenn Block (TYPE OR PRINT NAME) SUBPOENAING PARTY ATTORNEY FOR SUBPOENAING PARTY)

#### Request for Accommodations

Assistive listening systems, computer-assisted real-time captioning, or sign language interpreter services are available if you ask at least five days before the date on which you are to appear. Contact the clerk's office or go to www.courts.ca.gov/forms for Request for Accommodations by Persons With Disabilities and Response (form MC-410). (Civil Code, § 54.8.)



DI ALLTER DETECTOR OF THE CONTROL OF	
_ PLAINTIFF/PETITIONER: Mendocino Railway	CASE NUMBER:
	SCUK-CVED-20-74939
DECEMBANT/DECOMMENT: Taling Marrow of al	3CUK-CVED-20-74939
DEFENDANT/RESPONDENT: John Meyer, et al	
	l .

## PROOF OF SERVICE OF CIVIL SUBPOENA (DUCES TECUM) for Personal Appearance and Production of

Documents, Electronically Stored Information,	and Things at Trial or Hearing and DECLARATION				
served this Civil Subpoena (Duces Tecum) for Personal Appearance and Production of Documents, Electronically Stored					
Information, and Things at Trial or Hearing and Declaration by					
a. Person served (name):					
b. Address where served:	• •				
c. Date of delivery:					
d. Time of delivery:					
e. Witness fees (check one):  (1) were offered or demanded and paid. Amount: \$  (2) were not demanded or paid.					
f. Fee for service:					
I received this subpoena for service on (date):					
Person serving:  a. Not a registered California process server.  b. California sheriff or marshal.  c. Registered California process server.  d. Employee or independent contractor of a registered e. Exempt from registration under Business and Profes f. Registered professional photocopier.  g. Exempt from registration under Business and Profes h. Name, address, telephone number, and, if applicable, cour	ssions Code section 22350(b).				
	-				
eclare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of lifornia that the foregoing is true and correct.	(For California sheriff or marshal use only) I certify that the foregoing is true and correct.				
te:	Date:				
	<b>X</b>				

28

1	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the					
2	foregoing is true and correct.					
3		/s/	RACHEL GALLEGOS			
4			Rachel Gallegos			
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
0						
1						
2						
13						
4						
15						
6						
17						
8						
9						
20						
21						
22						
23 24						
24 25						
25 26						
26 27						
28						
.0						