1 2 3 4 5 6	PETER J. ELIASBERG (SBN 189110) peliasberg@aclusocal.org JONATHAN MARKOVITZ (SBN 3017) jmarkovitz@aclusocal.org ACLU FOUNDATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA 1313 W. 8th Street Los Angeles, CA 90017 Phone: (213) 977-9500 Fax: (213) 977-5299	767)	
7	DAVID LOY (SBN 229235)		
8	dloy@firstamendmentcoalition.org FIRST AMENDMENT COALITION		
9	534 4th St Ste B San Rafael, CA 94901		
10	Phone: (415) 460-5060		
11	Attorneys for Plaintiffs		
12			
13	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
14	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
15	EASTERN DIVISION		
16 17	UPNEET DHALIWAL AND JULIE GEARY	CASE NO. 5:23-CV-2605	
18	Plaintiffs,	JOINT STIPULATION OF	
19	vs.	SETTLEMENT AND ORDER OF APPROVAL	
20	JOSEPH KOMROSKY, in his	Hanarahla Jasua C. Damal	
21	official capacity as President of TEMECULA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD OF	Honorable Jesus G. Bernal United States District Judge	
22	TRUSTEES, and in his individual		
23	capacity, TEMECULA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT		
24	BOARD OF TRUSTEES, and TEMECULA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT		
25	Defendants.		
26			
27			
28			

WHEREAS, Plaintiffs Upneet Dhaliwal and Julie Geary (collectively "Plaintiffs") filed a First Amended Complaint against Defendants Joseph Komrosky, in his official capacity as President of Temecula Valley Unified School District Board of Trustees ("Board President"), and in his individual capacity, Temecula Valley Unified School District Board of Trustees, and Temecula Valley Unified School District ("Defendants") in the above-captioned action on January 4, 2025 (ECF No. 13), alleging violations of their constitutional and statutory rights through enforcement of certain policies, practices, regulations, and signage that authorize the expulsion of individuals from a Temecula Valley Unified School District Board of Trustees meetings ("Board Meeting") without adequate warning and when they are not engaged in conduct that actually disrupts a Board Meeting;

WHEREAS, Defendants deny the allegations made by Plaintiffs in their First Amended Complaint: and

WHEREAS, the parties wish to resolve this action without further litigation; IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED among the parties, through their respective counsel, subject to the Court's approval, that the action shall be resolved according to the terms to this Joint Stipulation of Settlement ("Stipulated Settlement") as follows:

- 1. Defendants and their officers, agents, employees, assigns or anyone acting in concert with them agree to only enforce, post, or refer the public to rules, regulations, or policies that authorize or require removal of a member of the public from a Board Meeting for conduct that actually disrupts a Board Meeting, or as otherwise permitted in Paragraph 9 herein.
- 2. Defendants and their officers, agents, employees, assigns or anyone acting in concert with them agree to only enforce, post, or refer the public to rules, regulations, or policies that define disruptive conduct or "Disruptions" as conduct that actually disrupts a Board Meeting but not merely "likely" to disrupt a Board Meeting, or as otherwise permitted in Paragraph 9 herein.
- 3. Defendants and their officers, agents, employees, assigns or anyone acting in

- concert with them shall only remove a member of the public from a Board Meeting if they are engaged in conduct that actually disrupts the Board Meeting, or as otherwise permitted in Paragraph 9 herein.
- 4. Defendants and their officers, agents, employees, assigns or anyone acting in concert with them shall not make any determination of what constitutes actual disruption of a Board Meeting on the basis of the viewpoint or content of speech or expression. However, nothing in this Stipulated Settlement shall prevent Defendant Komrosky or any subsequently elected Board President or their designee from determining that an individual is disrupting the meeting by speaking on an issue that is not within the subject matter jurisdiction of the Board during the time for non-agenda public comment. And nothing in this Stipulated Settlement shall prevent Defendant Komrosky or any subsequently elected Board President or their designee from determining that an individual is disrupting the meeting during the time for public comment on a specific agenda item by speaking on a matter that is not relevant to the agenda item under consideration at the moment of the alleged disruption.
- 5. Before the Board President (whether that be Defendant Komrosky or any successor as President) or their designee orders the removal of any member of the public from a Board Meeting, the Board President or their designee shall provide a verbal warning that the individual is disrupting the meeting and that their failure to cease their behavior may result in their removal. Subject to Paragraph 9 herein, the Board President or their designee may order the removal of the individual if that individual does not promptly cease their disruptive behavior after the warning.
- 6. If an individual does promptly cease their disruptive behavior after a warning that such conduct is disruptive, the Board President or their designee may order the individual removed from the meeting for any similar subsequent disruptive conduct. However, the Board President or their designee may not

- order the individual removed for a different type of disruptive conduct unless they provide a new verbal warning that the individual is disrupting the meeting and that their failure to cease their behavior may result in their removal. (For example, talking beyond the public comment limit is qualitatively different than yelling from the gallery.)
- 7. Nothing in this Stipulated Settlement shall prevent Defendant Komrosky or any subsequently elected Board President or their designee from employing a penalty card warning system. However, "yellow cards" or "red cards" may only be used to augment, and not to substitute for, the verbal warning requirements addressed in paragraphs 5 and 6 of this Stipulated Settlement and Government Code § 54957.95.
- 8. Nothing in this Stipulated Settlement shall preclude Defendant Komrosky, his designee, or any subsequently elected Board President or their designee from ordering the removal of any individual from a Board Meeting if they are engaged in conduct that actually disrupts the meeting and if they do not promptly cease their disruptive conduct after being administered the verbal warning provided for in paragraphs 5 and 6 of this Stipulated Settlement.
- 9. Notwithstanding any of the above provisions, nothing in this Stipulated Settlement shall require a warning before ordering the removal of an individual who is engaging in behavior that constitutes use of force or a true threat of force, as stated in California Government Code section 54957.95.
- 10. Within 45 calendar days after entry of an Order approving this Stipulated Settlement, Defendant Temecula Valley Unified School District shall pay Plaintiffs' counsel the sum of \$75,000 in full satisfaction of any claim for attorney fees or costs.
- 11.Plaintiffs stipulate and agree to accept the consideration set forth above in full settlement and satisfaction of any and all claims and demands that they or their heirs, executors, successors in interest, administrators, or assigns may have or

hereafter acquire against any Defendant on account of the events, circumstances, or incidents giving rise to this action and claims incident thereto. Plaintiffs hereby release and forever discharge all Defendants from any and all claims and liability arising directly or indirectly from the incidents or circumstances giving rise to or referred to in this action, except for any claims related to enforcement of the terms of this Stipulated Settlement.

12. Plaintiffs further stipulate and acknowledge there is a risk that now or subsequent to the execution of this Stipulation, Plaintiffs may have claims released arising from the allegations made in the First Amended Complaint ("FAC") in this action that are unknown and unanticipated at the time this Stipulation is signed, and that any claims arising from the events addressed in the FAC that are known or should be known may become more serious than they now expect or anticipate. Nevertheless, with respect to the released claims, Plaintiffs hereby expressly waive all rights they may have in such unknown and unexpected consequences or results. Plaintiffs understand California Civil Code section 1542 and, with respect to the released claims, expressly waive its provisions, which provide:

A GENERAL RELEASE DOES NOT EXTEND TO CLAIMS
THAT THE CREDITOR OR RELEASING PARTY DOES NOT
KNOW OR SUSPECT TO EXIST IN HIS OR HER FAVOR AT
THE TIME OF EXECUTING THE RELEASE AND THAT, IF
KNOWN BY HIM OR HER WOULD HAVE MATERIALLY
AFFECTED HIS OR HER SETTLEMENT WITH THE DEBTOR
OR RELEASED PARTY.

Plaintiffs separately bargained for this waiver of the provisions of section 1542 of the California Civil Code. The release in this release shall be given full force and effect in accordance with each and all of the expressed terms and provisions including those terms and provisions relating to unknown and

26

27

- unsuspected claims stemming from the events addressed in the FAC to the same extent as those terms and provisions relating to the released claims above in Paragraph 11.
- 13. Defendants deny all allegations of liability and agree to this Stipulation to resolve this dispute solely for the purpose of compromising and settling matters in dispute. The Stipulation does not constitute an admission by Defendants concerning any matters, including the truth or validity of matters in controversy, nor shall it be construed as such.
- 14. The parties consent to the continuing jurisdiction of the United States District Court Judge to which this case is assigned to enforce the terms of the Stipulated Settlement for a period of three years after dismissal of this action. During this three-year period, Plaintiffs shall not be required to file a separate lawsuit to seek such enforcement. During this three-year period, if the Plaintiffs allege their own rights under this settlement have allegedly been violated, they may additionally present arguments in this action alleging that Defendants have violated the terms of this Stipulated Settlement with respect to any member of the public. Notwithstanding the foregoing, this Stipulated Settlement does not create any rights in or grant any cause of action to any person not currently a party to this litigation, or to release or waive any claim, cause of action, demand, or defense in law or equity that any party to this litigation may have against any person(s) or entity not a party to this Stipulated Settlement. Accordingly, if Plaintiffs claim Defendants have violated the terms of this Stipulated Settlement based on a purported violation of the constitutional or statutory rights of a non-party member of the public, such claim may not be raised directly on behalf of such non-party; rather, Plaintiffs, as parties to this Stipulated Settlement, must raise such claim solely on their own behalf within the framework of an alleged breach of the Stipulated Settlement.

	2
	3
	4
	5
	6
	7
	8
	9
1	0
1	1
1	2
1	3
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2	1
2	
2	3
2	4
2	5
2	6
	7

- 15.If Plaintiffs become aware of any violation or alleged violation of this Stipulated Agreement, Plaintiffs shall promptly notify Defendant's current Superintendent or General Counsel of the violation or alleged violation in writing. The Parties agree to meet and confer no more than ten days after the written notification so that there is time for Defendants to address any violation or alleged violation before the next regularly scheduled Board meeting. If the meet and confer process does not resolve the dispute within twenty-one days of the written notification of the violation or alleged violation, Plaintiffs may seek judicial review of any claims related to alleged non-compliance with the Stipulated Agreement.
- 16. The parties understand and agree that this Stipulated Settlement contains the entire agreement between them, and that no statements, representations, promises, agreements, or negotiations, oral or otherwise, between the parties or their counsel that are not included herein have any force or effect.
- 17. Subject to the Court's approval of this Stipulated Settlement, and within ten days of the Court's order granting that approval, Plaintiffs will file a notice to dismiss this action with prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a)(1)(A)(i), with the understanding that the Court will retain ancillary jurisdiction for three years, for the sole purposes of enforcing the Stipulated Settlement, as limited by paragraph 14 of this Stipulated Settlement.

Dated: Respectfully submitted,

ACLU FOUNDATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

By: /s/ Jonathan Markovitz

JONATHAN MARKOVITZ

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

//

I		
1	Dated:	OLIVAREZ MADRUGA LAW
2		ORGANIZATION, LLP
3		By:/s/ Colin E. Barr Colin E. Barr
4		Colin E. Barr Attorneys for JOSEPH KOMROSKY
5		Attorneys for JOSEPH KOMROSKY and TEMECULA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
6	Dated:	By: Upneet Dhaliwal
7		
8	Dated:	By: Julie Geary
9	Dated:	
10		By: Gary W. Woods, Ed.D. for the TEMECULA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
11		
12	Dated:	By: Joseph Komrosky, as PRESIDENT of
13		By: Joseph Komrosky, as PRESIDENT of the TEMECULA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT BOARD
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
		8