



Amy Parker <apark0006@student.cerritos.edu>

CPRA Response

4 messages

Lopez, Felipe <flopez@cerritos.edu>

Mon, Mar 6, 2023 at 5:11 PM

To: Amy Parker <apark0006@student.cerritos.edu>

Cc: "Lopez, Felipe" <flopez@cerritos.edu>

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello Ms. Parker,

Please find the attached response to your public record request received February 24, 2023.

Thank-you

Felipe R. Lopez

Vice President of Business Services/

Assistant Superintendent

Cerritos College

[11110 Alondra Blvd.](#)

[Norwalk, CA 90650](#)

(562) 860-2451 ext. 2242



Amy Parker PRA_03_06_2023.pdf

252K

Amy Parker <apark0006@student.cerritos.edu>

Mon, Mar 6, 2023 at 8:27 PM

To: "Lopez, Felipe" <flopez@cerritos.edu>

Hello,

I have the following responses to your claims:

With regards to your four provided exemptions:

1. Does not apply because the GOV Code section mentioned only applies when under the aforementioned EVID 952 and 954 sections, which state "The word "persons" as used in this subdivision includes partnerships, corporations, limited liability companies, associations and other groups and entities."; this does not apply to government institutions, such as the District. BPC 6068 is not applicable as it is not the lawyers themselves directly disclosing the decisions.
2. Does not apply. See my explanation for #4 for GOV 7927.500, as it also applies here. GOV 7927.705 does not apply as previously shown. EVID 915 is completely irrelevant to this as it only refers to courts ruling on claims of privilege and has no relevance here. BPC 6068 has already been covered, and CCP 2018.030 does not refer to public records requests, only discovery requests made in a legal proceeding.
3. Does not apply due to lack of evidence. The records requested are not "security record"s that would reveal

vulnerabilities; a security opinion and legal opinion, as requested for this case, should not show active vulnerabilities in the system (as even if it did - for no valid reason - they should be already patched).

4. Does not apply as the standards have not been met in your response letter. The burden of proof falls on the denying agency to show how "not disclosing the record clearly outweighs the public interest served by disclosure of the record." In fact, quite the opposite is true; it is in the public interest to know why these are being denied, as it is of issue to the public why they are unable to properly use the educational and informational resources of the District (as should be protected under AP 3050, and are not currently due to active internal policy).

I will further note that these are all clearly the intent of the legislature, as shown in the sections provided to you previously, which clearly state that there is only an exemption when there is pending litigation, and that the documents are available after the litigation. If AWP and ACP applied, as you claim, then all legal opinions would be exempt, clearly contradicting the statutes on the matter. Further, as the CPRA is engrained directly into the state Constitution, it overrides any other applicable statutes if a contradiction occurs.

As for your 7922.540 response, I will note that it does not answer my request. The text of the statute reads:

"(b) The notification of denial shall set forth the names and titles or positions of each person responsible for the denial."

This has not been satisfied. You are not the only person responsible for the denial. The statute demands the names and titles/positions of ALL responsible; this includes, for instance, anyone who had written a legal opinion which caused the request to be denied. This remains unsatisfied, and the District thus still in violation of the relevant statutes, as this information has not yet (as of March 6 at 8:27 PM PST) been provided.

Please follow up and provide the documents or a sufficient explanation against mine. Thank you.

Amy Parker
she/her/hers
[Quoted text hidden]

Amy Parker <apark0006@student.cerritos.edu>
To: "Lopez, Felipe" <flopez@cerritos.edu>
Cc: "Kaufman, Linda" <lkaufman@cerritos.edu>, zarquietasma@gmail.com

Wed, Mar 15, 2023 at 7:55 AM

Hello,

Following up on this followup, as it has now been 9 days.

[Quoted text hidden]

Lopez, Felipe <flopez@cerritos.edu>
To: Amy Parker <apark0006@student.cerritos.edu>
Cc: "Kaufman, Linda" <lkaufman@cerritos.edu>, "zarquietasma@gmail.com" <zarquietasma@gmail.com>

Wed, Mar 15, 2023 at 10:19 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Please refer to the previous response that was provided. No other information will be provided.

Felipe R. Lopez
Vice President of Business Services
Cerritos College

From: Amy Parker <apark0006@student.cerritos.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, March 15, 2023 2:55:31 PM
To: Lopez, Felipe <flopez@cerritos.edu>
Cc: Kaufman, Linda <lkaufman@cerritos.edu>; zarquietasma@gmail.com <zarquietasma@gmail.com>
Subject: Re: CPRA Response

[Quoted text hidden]

***** NOTICE ***** This message was sent from an external sender and did **not** originate from Cerritos College. If you are unsure of the authenticity of the sender, **DO NOT** click any links or download any attachments. If you suspect this

message is a phishing attempt, please FORWARD the Email to HelpDesk@cerritos.edu