

1 MATTHEW J. MURRAY (SBN 271461)  
mmurray@altber.com  
2 BRONWEN B. O'HERIN (SBN 336967)  
boherin@altber.com  
3 ALTSHULER BERZON LLP  
177 Post Street, Suite 300  
4 San Francisco, CA 94108  
Telephone: (415) 421-7151  
5 Facsimile: (415) 362-8064

6 *Attorneys for Petitioners/Plaintiffs Inland*  
7 *Empire United, Evelyn Arana, Elizabeth Ayala,*  
*Edgar Castelan, and Robert Garcia*

8 MOE KESHAVARZI (SBN 223759)  
mkeshavarzi@sheppardmullin.com  
9 SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER &  
HAMPTON LLP  
10 A Limited Liability Partnership  
Including Professional Corporations  
11 333 South Hope Street, 43rd Floor  
Los Angeles, CA  
12 Telephone: (213) 620-1780  
Facsimile: (213) 620-1398

13 *Attorneys for Petitioners/Plaintiffs Araceli*  
14 *Caldera and Daisy Lopez*

JULIA A. GOMEZ (SBN 316270)  
jgomez@aclusocal.org  
PETER BIBRING (SBN 223981)  
pbibring@aclusocal.org  
MELISSA GOODMAN (SBN 289464)  
mgoodman@aclusocal.org  
ACLU FOUNDATION OF SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA  
1313 West 8th Street  
Los Angeles, CA 90017  
Telephone: (213) 977-9500  
Facsimile: (213) 977-5297

15 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
16 COUNTY OF RIVERSIDE  
RIVERSIDE HISTORIC COURTHOUSE

17 INLAND EMPIRE UNITED, EVELYN )  
ARANA, ELIZABETH AYALA, ARACELI )  
18 CALDERA, EDGAR CASTELAN, ROBERT )  
GARCIA, and DAISY LOPEZ, )

19 )  
20 )  
21 )  
22 )  
23 )  
24 )  
25 )  
26 )  
27 )  
28 )

v.

RIVERSIDE COUNTY, RIVERSIDE COUNTY )  
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS, and KEVIN )  
JEFFRIES, KAREN SPIEGEL, CHUCK )  
WASHINGTON, V. MANUEL PEREZ, and )  
JEFF HEWITT, in their official capacities as )  
members of the Riverside County Board of )  
Supervisors, and REBECCA SPENCER, in her )  
official capacity as the Riverside County Registrar )  
of Voters, )

Respondents/Defendants.

Case No.

**VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF  
MANDATE AND COMPLAINT FOR  
DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE  
RELIEF**

Unlimited Civil Case



1 set of mandatory ranked map-drawing criteria that counties have a non-discretionary obligation to  
2 follow and that prioritizes communities over incumbents, political parties, and candidates.

3 4. Riverside County failed to comply with either the spirit or the letter of the FAIR  
4 MAPS Act during the 2021 redistricting cycle. The County did not initially attach required  
5 demographic information to its draft redistricting maps and did not consistently provide requested  
6 Spanish interpretation services throughout the redistricting process. The County also disregarded  
7 extensive and robust public input about historically underrepresented Latino communities.

8 5. Indeed, the Board of Supervisors explicitly rejected Community Map 1.4, a  
9 community-drafted plan that received wide public support and that showed it was possible to  
10 create two Latino-majority CVAP districts that kept communities of interest whole. Instead, the  
11 Board adopted an incumbency-protection plan that splits up Latino communities of interest and  
12 includes only one Latino-majority district. The County rejected Community Map 1.4 because it  
13 threatened to disrupt the electoral status quo for incumbents, as expressly noted by supervisors  
14 during multiple redistricting hearings. The Board also attempted to justify its decision by  
15 asserting that Community Map 1.4's district lines split certain municipalities, but this rationale is  
16 inconsistent with the ranked criteria mandated by the FAIR MAPS Act.

17 6. Petitioners/Plaintiffs bring this action to redress Respondents'/Defendants'  
18 infringement of the voting rights of Riverside County's Latino residents and to require Riverside  
19 County to adopt a redistricting plan that complies with the FAIR MAPS Act and California  
20 Constitution and provides the County's Latino voters with the opportunity to elect candidates of  
21 their choice.

22 7. Petitioners/Plaintiffs seek a peremptory writ of mandate compelling  
23 Respondents/Defendants to adopt a supervisorial plan that comports with the FAIR MAPS Act.  
24 Petitioners/Plaintiffs also seek a declaration that the 2021 Redistricting Plan violates the voting  
25 rights of Latino residents as secured by Article I, Section 2 and Article I, Section 7 of the  
26 California Constitution, and an injunction requiring the adoption of a constitutional plan.

27 **PARTIES**

28 8. Petitioner/Plaintiff Inland Empire United ("IE United") is a community-

1 organizing and coalition-building non-profit that was established in 2017. IE United's mission is  
2 to transform Inland Empire leadership and culture so that it is accountable to and better represents  
3 the identities and values of the region's residents, particularly residents who are members of  
4 historically disenfranchised and underrepresented communities, including Riverside County's  
5 Latino community. To effect intersectional and inclusive change, IE United partners with  
6 community leaders and organizations in Riverside and San Bernardino Counties and focuses on a  
7 set of policy platforms that put racial, gender, and LGBTQ+ equity at center.

8 9. IE United's member organizations include Alianza Coachella Valley,  
9 Communities for a New California, Congregations Organized for Prophetic Engagement, Inland  
10 Empire Coalition for Immigrant Justice, Inland Congregations United for Change, Inland Region  
11 Equality Network, Starting Over, Inc., TODEC Legal Center, and Warehouse Worker Resource  
12 Center. All these organizations represent or have members who are Latino voters in Riverside  
13 County, including Latino voters who reside in Districts 1, 2, and 5 of the 2021 Redistricting Plan.  
14 The 2021 Redistricting Plan harms these members by breaking up their communities of interest  
15 and denying them the opportunity to elect candidates of their choice.

16 10. IE United devotes time, energy, and resources to ensure accountable leadership in  
17 Riverside County. IE United does this by providing voting and redistricting training to  
18 community partners; collecting, organizing, and synthesizing community members' electoral  
19 preferences; and advocating for electoral districts and representatives that reflect the needs of  
20 partner organizations' constituents and members, many of whom are Latino electors who reside  
21 in Districts 1, 2, and 5 of the 2021 Redistricting Plan.

22 11. IE United diverted resources from other efforts to engage community members in  
23 Riverside County's 2021 supervisorial redistricting process and to advocate for the adoption of a  
24 fair and lawful district plan. IE United trained and surveyed constituents of member and partner  
25 organizations about redistricting, purchased and used mapping software, worked with community  
26 members to develop and support Community Map 1.4, and worked with community members to  
27 oppose the adoption of redistricting maps that would dilute Latino voting power, including the  
28 final adopted map.

1           12.     The County’s adoption of the 2021 Redistricting Plan, which dilutes the Latino  
2 vote and breaks up Latino communities of interest, frustrates IE United’s mission and IE United’s  
3 efforts to promote legislative representation that is responsive to the County’s residents.  
4 The 2021 Redistricting Plan will continue to cause IE United to divert resources from other  
5 projects to develop and support the political power of Latino voters whose voting power is diluted  
6 by the redistricting plan.

7           13.     Petitioner/Plaintiff Evelyn Arana is a Latina resident and registered voter of  
8 Riverside County. She lives in the City of Corona, part of supervisorial District 2. Ms. Arana is  
9 part of a politically cohesive community of interest that includes Latino residents of Jurupa  
10 Valley and the northwest part of the City of Riverside, and the 2021 Redistricting Plan splits her  
11 community of interest between Districts 1 and 2. She lives in an area where Latino voters are  
12 sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute the majority of eligible voters in a  
13 district and where, as a result, Latino voters would have the opportunity to elect their preferred  
14 candidates. Under the 2021 Redistricting Plan, however, Ms. Arana’s supervisorial candidates of  
15 choice will typically be outvoted by the majority of the electorate in District 2. She is harmed by  
16 the 2021 Redistricting Plan because the map splits her community of interest and denies her the  
17 opportunity to elect candidates of her choice. She has paid taxes to Riverside County within the  
18 past year.

19           14.     Petitioner/Plaintiff Elizabeth Ayala is a Latina resident and registered voter of  
20 Riverside County. She lives in the northwest portion of the City of Riverside, which is part of  
21 supervisorial District 1. Ms. Ayala is part of a politically cohesive community of interest that  
22 includes Latino residents of Jurupa Valley and the northwest part of the City of Riverside, and the  
23 2021 Redistricting Plan splits her community of interest between Districts 1 and 2. She is harmed  
24 by the 2021 Redistricting Plan because the map fractures her community of interest. She has paid  
25 taxes to Riverside County within the past year.

26           15.     Petitioner/Plaintiff Araceli Caldera is a Latina resident and registered voter of  
27 Riverside County. Ms. Caldera is civically engaged and organizes on behalf of immigrant rights.  
28 She lives in the City of Moreno Valley, part of supervisorial District 5. She is part of a politically

1 cohesive community of interest that includes Latino residents of Perris and Moreno Valley, and  
2 the 2021 Redistricting Plan splits her community of interest between Districts 1 and 5. Ms.  
3 Caldera lives in an area where Latino voters are sufficiently large and geographically compact to  
4 constitute the majority of eligible voters in a district and where, as a result, Latino voters would  
5 have the opportunity to elect their preferred candidates. Under the 2021 Redistricting Plan,  
6 however, Ms. Caldera's supervisory candidates of choice will typically be outvoted by the  
7 majority of the electorate in District 5. She is harmed by the 2021 Redistricting Plan because the  
8 map splits her community of interest and denies her the opportunity to elect candidates of her  
9 choice. She has paid taxes to Riverside County within the past year.

10 16. Petitioner/Plaintiff Edgar Castelan is a Latino resident and registered voter of  
11 Riverside County. Mr. Castelan is civically engaged and serves as an elected official for the  
12 Jurupa Area Recreation and Parks District. He lives in the City of Jurupa Valley, part of  
13 supervisory District 2. He is part of a politically cohesive community of interest that includes  
14 Latino residents of Jurupa Valley and the northwest part of the City of Riverside, and the 2021  
15 Redistricting Plan splits his community of interest between Districts 1 and 2. Mr. Castelan lives  
16 in an area where Latino voters are sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute the  
17 majority of eligible voters in a district and where, as a result, Latino voters would have the  
18 opportunity to elect their preferred candidates. Under the 2021 Redistricting Plan, however, Mr.  
19 Castelan's supervisory candidates of choice will typically be outvoted by the majority of the  
20 electorate in District 2. He is harmed by the 2021 Redistricting Plan because the map splits his  
21 community of interest and denies him the opportunity to elect candidates of his choice. He has  
22 paid taxes to Riverside County within the past year.

23 17. Petitioner/Plaintiff Robert Garcia is a Latino resident and registered voter of  
24 Riverside County. Mr. Garcia is civically engaged and serves as a local school board member and  
25 volunteer with his local Lions Club. He lives in the City of Jurupa Valley, part of supervisory  
26 District 2. He is part of a politically cohesive community of interest that includes Latino residents  
27 of Jurupa Valley and the northwest part of the City of Riverside, and the 2021 Redistricting Plan  
28 splits his community of interest between Districts 1 and 2. Mr. Garcia lives in an area where

1 Latino voters are sufficiently large and geographically compact to constitute the majority of  
2 eligible voters in a district and where, as a result, Latino voters would have the opportunity to  
3 elect their preferred candidates. Under the 2021 Redistricting Plan, however, Mr. Garcia's  
4 supervisorial candidates of choice will typically be outvoted by the majority of the electorate in  
5 District 2. He is harmed by the 2021 Redistricting Plan because the map splits his community of  
6 interest and denies him the opportunity to elect candidates of his choice. He has paid taxes to  
7 Riverside County within the past year.

8 18. Petitioner/Plaintiff Daisy Lopez is a Latina resident and registered voter of  
9 Riverside County. Ms. Lopez is civically engaged and organizes on behalf of local warehouse  
10 workers. Ms. Lopez lives in the City of Eastvale, part of supervisorial District 2. She is part of a  
11 politically cohesive community of interest that includes Latino residents of Jurupa Valley and the  
12 northwest part of the City of Riverside, and the 2021 Redistricting Plan splits her community of  
13 interest between Districts 1 and 2. Ms. Lopez lives in an area where Latino voters are sufficiently  
14 large and geographically compact to constitute the majority of eligible voters in a district and  
15 where, as a result, Latino voters would have the opportunity to elect their preferred candidates.  
16 Under the 2021 Redistricting Plan, however, Ms. Lopez's supervisorial candidates of choice will  
17 typically be outvoted by the majority of the electorate in District 2. She is harmed by the 2021  
18 map because the map splits her community of interest and denies her the opportunity to elect  
19 candidates of her choice. She has paid taxes to Riverside County within the past year.

20 19. Respondent/Defendant Riverside County is a political and geographic subdivision  
21 of the State of California established and operating under the laws of the State of California and  
22 created for the provision of government services.

23 20. Respondent/Defendant Riverside County Board of Supervisors is the County's  
24 legislative body and is responsible for establishing County policies and administering Riverside  
25 County government.

26 21. Respondents/Defendants Kevin Jeffries, Karen Spiegel, Jeff Hewitt, Chuck  
27 Washington, and V. Manuel Perez are members of the Board of Supervisors of Defendant  
28 Riverside County. Each supervisor is sued in his or her official capacity only. Each supervisor

1 resides in the County of Riverside.

2 22. Respondent/Defendant Rebecca Spencer is the Riverside County Registrar of  
3 Voters. She is responsible for conducting county elections in Riverside County and is sued in her  
4 official capacity only. She resides in the County of Riverside.

### 5 JURISDICTION AND VENUE

6 23. This Court has jurisdiction over this action pursuant to the California Constitution,  
7 Article VI, § 10, because this case is a cause not given by statute to other trial courts, and under  
8 Code of Civil Procedure § 1085(a), because this is a petition for writ of mandate. This action is  
9 within the unlimited civil jurisdiction of this Court. Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 88.

10 24. Venue is proper in this Court because respondent/defendant Riverside County,  
11 respondent/defendant Riverside County Board of Supervisors, and respondent/defendant  
12 Riverside County Registrar of Voters are counties or local agencies situated in the County of  
13 Riverside. Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 394(a). Venue is also proper in this Court because all  
14 respondents/defendants are situated in the County of Riverside and the injuries suffered by  
15 petitioners/plaintiffs have occurred and, unless enjoined, will continue to occur, in the County of  
16 Riverside. Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 395(a).

### 17 FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

#### 18 **Riverside County's Latino Population and Communities of Interest**

19 25. Riverside is the fastest growing county in Southern California, and that growth has  
20 been driven entirely by Latino and other residents of color. According to the 2020 United States  
21 Census, Riverside County has a total population of 2,418,185 residents, of whom 49.7% are  
22 Latino. The Latino share of the County's total population grew in the decade prior to the 2021  
23 redistricting process, from 45.5% in 2010 to 49.7% in 2020. During the same period, the  
24 County's non-Latino white ("white") share of the population decreased from 39.8% to 32.6%.

25 26. The growth of Riverside County's Latino population is also reflected in its share of  
26 the eligible voting population. The Census Bureau's 2019 5-year American Community Survey  
27 ("ACS"), the most recently available CVAP data during the 2021 redistricting process, shows that  
28 the County had a Latino CVAP of 39.3%. This is a significant increase from the County's Latino



1 CVAP share of 28.9% reflected in the 2009 5-year ACS.

2 27. Riverside’s Latino population is sufficiently large and geographically compact to  
3 constitute over half of the voters in two districts on the west side of the County, a region where  
4 Latino voters, despite voting cohesively, have previously been unable to elect their preferred  
5 candidates. Cohesive Latino communities in this region are concentrated around two areas: (1)  
6 Jurupa Valley, northwest Riverside, Corona, Eastvale, and surrounding areas; and (2) Moreno  
7 Valley, Perris, and other surrounding areas. On the east side of the County, a cohesive Latino  
8 community is concentrated around the eastern Coachella Valley cities of Indio, Coachella,  
9 Thermal, Oasis, Mecca, and Northshore.

10 28. Latino residents in each of these three areas not only share racial identity and  
11 geography, but also form communities of interest that are joined by common social and economic  
12 interests. For example, Latino residents of Jurupa Valley, northwest Riverside, Corona, Eastvale,  
13 and surrounding areas (“Jurupa Valley/northwest Riverside community of interest”) include many  
14 Spanish-speaking immigrant households of similar socioeconomic status who have organized  
15 around issues of environmental racism in their region, most recently resisting the construction of  
16 a \$1.3 million warehouse facility next to a residential neighborhood in northeastern Jurupa  
17 Valley.

18 29. The large Spanish-speaking immigrant population in Moreno Valley, Perris, and  
19 surrounding areas (“Moreno Valley/Perris community of interest”) is similarly united by a set of  
20 socioeconomic needs, including a desire for greater investment in the residential infrastructure of  
21 their rural-turned-suburban region, which lacks the resources of the adjacent City of Riverside.

22 30. In the eastern Coachella Valley, an exceptionally strong community of Spanish-  
23 speaking Latino residents share common goals for investment in affordable housing and  
24 residential infrastructure, such as roads and sidewalks, street lighting, and community parks.

### 25 **Decennial Redistricting Requirements**

26 31. Riverside County is geographically divided into five supervisorial districts. Each  
27 district elects one member to the County Board of Supervisors by a vote of eligible voters  
28 residing within the district. The resulting five-member Riverside County Board of Supervisors

1 acts as the governing and legislative body for Riverside County. County supervisors are elected to  
2 four-year terms, and the elections for supervisor within each district are staggered.

3 32. Following each federal decennial census, the Riverside County Board of  
4 Supervisors must adopt a new supervisorial district map so that, based on the most recent census  
5 data, the map complies with applicable state and federal law. Cal. Elec. Code § 21500.

6 33. The FAIR MAPS Act outlines detailed substantive and procedural requirements  
7 for decennial redistricting. The procedural requirements are meant to ensure transparency and  
8 encourage members of underrepresented communities and non-English speaking communities to  
9 participate in the redistricting process. *See* Cal. Elec. Code § 21508(a). To that end, the Act  
10 requires counties to, among other things, host a minimum number of public hearings, provide  
11 interpretation services upon request, and make draft maps with demographic data, including  
12 CVAP data, available to the public. Cal. Elec. Code. §§ 21507.1(a), 21508(b) & (d)(2).

13 34. The FAIR MAPS Act also expressly requires county redistricting plans to comply  
14 with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act (“VRA”) and the United States and California  
15 Constitutions. Cal. Elec. Code. § 21500(b).

16 35. In addition, the FAIR MAPS Act established a set of non-discretionary ranked  
17 criteria that the County Board of Supervisors must apply when choosing a new supervisorial  
18 district map. In descending order of priority, these criteria are: 1) geographic contiguity of  
19 districts; 2) preserving the geographic integrity of communities of interest; 3) preserving the  
20 geographic integrity of cities and census designated places; 4) easily identifiable and  
21 understandable district boundaries; and 5) geographic compactness of districts. Cal. Elec. Code §  
22 21500(c). Importantly, the Act does not include incumbency as a ranked criterion and is instead  
23 clear that communities of interest do not include relationships with political parties, incumbents,  
24 or political candidates. Elec. Code § 21500(c)(2).

25 36. During the 2021 redistricting cycle, the Riverside County Planning Commission  
26 served as an advisory redistricting commission for the Board and the Executive Office Technical  
27 Committee (“ETOC”) was charged with developing draft redistricting maps. The public was also  
28 invited to submit draft redistricting maps. The Planning Commission and the Board held a series

1 of redistricting public hearings throughout the late summer and fall of 2021. The Board, however,  
2 retained sole authority to select the final redistricting plan.

3 37. Throughout the redistricting process, the County disregarded its legal obligations.  
4 Supervisors openly commented on how the draft maps would affect their candidacy and the  
5 Board prioritized incumbency over the FAIR MAPS Act's mandatory ranked redistricting  
6 criteria. The County also prioritized the geographic integrity of cities and census-designated  
7 places over the geographic integrity of communities of interest, at times erroneously identifying  
8 cities as communities of interest. And the County did not make any efforts to assess its  
9 obligations under the VRA until members of the public, community organizations, and legal  
10 organizations raised the issue. The County consistently disregarded the issue of Latino vote  
11 dilution and ultimately voted for a map that violates the FAIR MAPS Act and the California  
12 Constitution.

13 38. The County also failed to take steps to encourage non-English speaking  
14 community members to engage in the redistricting process, as required under the FAIR MAPS  
15 Act. For example, call-in instructions for public comment on draft maps were provided only in  
16 English, and none of the redistricting meeting agendas or agenda attachments were provided in  
17 Spanish. Although members of the public requested Spanish language interpretation throughout  
18 the redistricting process, the County did not consistently make a Spanish interpreter available.

### 19 **The County's 2021 Supervisorial Redistricting Process**

20 39. The Planning Commission held its first and second redistricting hearing on August  
21 18, 2021, and September 22, 2021, and the Board held its first redistricting hearing on September  
22 28, 2021. During the Board's first hearing, EOTC staff and members of the Board made  
23 comments indicating that they did not understand the County's obligations under the FAIR  
24 MAPS Act and VRA.

25 40. Following the release of state-adjusted decennial census data on September 20,  
26 2021, the EOTC published a series of draft supervisorial district maps, EOTC draft maps A  
27 through D. The published maps did not include CVAP data necessary to assess compliance with  
28 the FAIR MAPS Act and Section 2 of the VRA, and none of the draft maps included Latino-

1 majority CVAP districts as required by the FAIR MAPS Act and Section 2 of the VRA.

2 41. In connection with the Planning Commission’s October 6, 2021 hearing, members  
3 of the public and organizations submitted public comment raising concerns with the County’s  
4 failure to include CVAP data with draft maps and the fact that the County had not released any  
5 draft maps that included Latino-majority CVAP districts. The County also received comments  
6 urging the Board to assess the County’s obligations under the VRA, including by commissioning  
7 an analysis of racially polarized voting (“RPV”) in the County.

8 42. During the October 6 hearing, EOTC staff represented that maps EOTC A-D had  
9 been drawn with the understanding that cities were, by definition, communities of interest. When  
10 EOTC staff was asked by the Planning Commission about the relative levels of importance of the  
11 various redistricting criteria under the FAIR MAPS Act, a staff member responded that “all of  
12 them are equally important.” But the Act specifies that preserving the geographic integrity of  
13 communities of interest must be prioritized over preserving cities within a district.

14 43. Following the October 6 hearing, and after numerous public comments, the County  
15 re-released maps EOTC A-D with CVAP data attached. The data confirmed for the public that  
16 none of the initial set of draft supervisorial district maps included one, much less two, Latino-  
17 majority CVAP districts. The County also released a new set of draft maps labeled EOTC E  
18 through J and commissioned a study of racially polarized voting in the County.

19 44. The public was invited to submit draft maps by November 1, 2021. The Inland  
20 Empire Redistricting Hub (“the Hub”), a coalition of nearly two dozen community-based  
21 organizations brought together by IE United, submitted a draft map that was subsequently revised  
22 and labeled Community Map 1.4. In accordance with state and federal law, the Hub’s redistricting  
23 plan prioritized preserving the geographic integrity of communities of interest, including the  
24 largely Latino Jurupa Valley/northwest Riverside, Moreno Valley/Perris, and eastern Coachella  
25 Valley communities of interest. Map 1.4 included two geographically compact districts where  
26 Latino residents constituted the majority of the citizen age voting population. One of these  
27 districts, draft district 2, captured the Jurupa Valley/northwest Riverside community of interest.  
28 The other district, draft district 5, captured the Moreno Valley/Perris community of interest.

1           45.     The County released a summary of its RPV analysis on November 4, 2021. The  
2 County’s consultants found racially polarized voting countywide and in each district based on a  
3 review of all contested primary and general supervisorial elections from 2014 to 2020 and based  
4 on eight statewide races involving a Latino candidate. The County’s RPV analysis further found  
5 that Latino candidates of choice in Riverside County have been unsuccessful due to white bloc  
6 voting for the white candidate of choice. Thus, by November 4, the County knew that it was  
7 possible to adopt a map with two Latino-majority CVAP districts, as demonstrated by  
8 Community Map 1.4, and that a failure to adopt such a map would dilute the vote of Latino  
9 communities on the west side, as confirmed by the County’s RPV analysis.

10           46.     The Board ultimately advanced versions of EOTC F, EOTC H, and Community  
11 Map 1.4 as final maps for consideration. Unlike Community Map 1.4, EOTC F and H included  
12 only one district that was barely over 50% Latino CVAP, draft district 1, centered around the City  
13 of Riverside. EOTC F and H each created this bare-majority Latino district by excluding parts of  
14 cohesive Latino communities on both ends of district 1. This included cutting off all or part of  
15 Jurupa Valley and all or part of Moreno Valley.

16           47.     In connection with the December 1, 2021 Board redistricting hearing, the County  
17 released a table with a side-by-side comparison of the three final maps. The table showed that  
18 EOTC F, the map that the Board would eventually adopt, split more communities of interest than  
19 Community Map 1.4. The table also showed that Community Map 1.4 was the only map that  
20 created two Latino-majority CVAP districts and that kept both the Jurupa Valley/northwest  
21 Riverside and the Moreno Valley/Perris communities of interest whole. Nonetheless, the table  
22 erroneously listed EOTC F and EOTC H as complying with the VRA because these maps  
23 purportedly contained two “Latino opportunity-to-elect” districts, draft districts 1 and 4. District 4  
24 in all configurations, however, had a Latino citizen voting age population of no more than 38.7%  
25 and would do nothing to redress the vote dilution injuries of Latino voters on the west side of the  
26 County.

27           48.     During the final redistricting hearing on December 7, 2021, Board members once  
28 again made statements that confirmed that they were adopting EOTC F and rejecting Community

1 Map 1.4 in violation of the FAIR MAPS Act. For example, Supervisor Hewitt commented that he  
2 could not support Community Map 1.4 because it split up more cities than EOTC F, ignoring the  
3 fact that EOTC F split more communities of interest. Supervisor Hewitt stated: “I can’t see Map  
4 1.4, which divides up so many cities to try to check off one box, and I will argue with anyone  
5 whether someone with a little bit darker skin can represent any group of people any better than I  
6 can.” Supervisor Hewitt also stated that he could not support Community Map 1.4 because it  
7 would make Chuck Washington his supervisor, and Supervisor Spiegel complained that Map 1.4  
8 would place her in a different supervisorial district. The Supervisors’ statements indicate they  
9 were rejecting the creation of two Latino-majority CVAP districts because Community Map 1.4  
10 upset the supervisorial representation status quo and had the potential to affect incumbents’  
11 reelection.

12 49. The County did not attempt to draw a map that would preserve the Jurupa  
13 Valley/northwest Riverside and Moreno Valley/Perris communities of interest and address the  
14 County’s asserted concerns about other aspects of Community Map 1.4. Instead, the Board  
15 selected EOTC F, ignoring its affirmative obligation under the FAIR MAPS Act and the  
16 California Constitution to adopt a redistricting plan that avoided discriminatory results. In doing  
17 so, the County also ignored overwhelming community testimony and other evidence that the 2021  
18 Redistricting Plan would dilute Latino voting strength and disparately impact the voting rights of  
19 Latino residents.

#### 20 **The 2021 Redistricting Plan**

21 50. The County Board of Supervisors adopted the 2021 Redistricting Plan on  
22 December 14, 2021. The plan took effect for the June 2022 primaries for Districts 2, 4, and 5, and  
23 will take effect in 2024 for elections in Districts 1 and 3.

24 51. The 2021 Redistricting Plan cracks the Latino communities of interest in Jurupa  
25 Valley/northwest Riverside and Moreno Valley/Perris so that these communities of interest are  
26 prevented from electing their candidates of choice. The Plan thereby dilutes the voting power of  
27 those Latino communities.

28 52. The 2021 Redistricting Plan disparately impacts Latino voters in Riverside County

1 by making it harder for them to elect their candidate of choice than it is for similarly situated  
2 white electors to do so.

3 53. Rather than preserving the historically underrepresented Jurupa Valley/northwest  
4 Riverside and Moreno Valley/Perris Latino communities of interest within single supervisorial  
5 districts in a manner that would ensure fair and effective representation of those communities, the  
6 2021 Redistricting Plan divides these communities to serve pro-incumbent goals and to prioritize  
7 the geographic integrity of cities and census designated places over the geographic integrity of  
8 these communities of interest. The division of these communities across supervisorial districts is  
9 not justified by any statutorily approved criteria the Board of Supervisors may consider, and must  
10 prioritize in a particular order, when adopting a redistricting plan.

11 54. Respondents/Defendants are engaging in, and will continue to engage in, the  
12 illegal expenditure and waste of County funds by conducting elections and operating the Board of  
13 Supervisors pursuant to a redistricting plan that does not comply with the FAIR MAPS Act or the  
14 California Constitution.

### 15 **Racially Polarized Voting**

16 55. There is a clear and persistent pattern of racially polarized voting between Latino  
17 and white voters in Riverside County elections. Latino voters in the County are politically  
18 cohesive and tend to prefer the same candidates, and white voters usually vote as a bloc to defeat  
19 Latino voters' preferred candidates. Racially polarized voting exists throughout the County,  
20 including on the west side of the County where an additional Latino-majority district can and  
21 should be drawn.

22 56. Examples of Riverside County elections exhibiting racially polarized voting  
23 between Latino and white voters include, but are not limited to, the 2018 District 5 Board of  
24 Supervisors primary, the 2014 District 4 Board of Supervisors primary, and numerous statewide  
25 elections.

26 57. The 2018 District 5 Board of Supervisors primary involved five candidates. The  
27 two Latino candidates received a majority of the Latino vote and lost to the top two candidates  
28 preferred by white voters, Russ Bogh and Jeff Hewitt.

1           58.     In the 2014 District 4 Board of Supervisors primary, Latino candidate V. Manuel  
2 Perez received 72.3% of the Latino vote and only 28.7% of the white vote, while the non-Latino  
3 candidate who prevailed, John Benoit, received 71% of the white vote.

4           59.     Numerous statewide elections have also exhibited racially polarized voting,  
5 including six general elections involving Latino candidates since 2010 and nine of the primary  
6 elections involving Latino candidates since 2010. In each of these statewide races, Latino voters  
7 consistently voted differently than white voters. Moreover, for each of these statewide electoral  
8 contests, racially polarized voting occurred in every supervisorial district in Riverside County.

9     **Latino Residents Do Not Have Equal Opportunities to Participate in County Politics**

10          60.     Although Riverside County has a large and growing Latino population, that  
11 population does not have equal opportunities to participate in the County’s political sphere.  
12 Racially polarized voting and a historic pattern continuing into the present day of Latino  
13 discrimination by County government have prevented Latino-preferred candidates from being  
14 elected to the County Board of Supervisors.

15          61.     In addition to having their political preferences blocked by racially polarized  
16 voting, Riverside County’s Latino residents’ political participation has also been limited by  
17 numerous instances of government-sanctioned discrimination, both historic and present day, that  
18 have excluded them from equal opportunity to participate in the County’s political sphere.

19          62.     Historically, Latinos in Riverside County and in California generally have been  
20 subject to official discrimination. A de facto system of racial exclusion of Mexican-Americans  
21 was present in California from the 1920s into the 1960s in the form of racially restricted  
22 covenants, segregation in education, and “whites only” public facilities and businesses. For  
23 example, during the first half of the 20th Century, City of Riverside facilities such as municipal  
24 pools were racially segregated, and restrictive covenants prevented Latinos from buying homes in  
25 many city neighborhoods. Many schools in the city remained segregated until 1965.

26          63.     More recently, in 2010, the U.S. Department of Justice (“DOJ”) sued the County  
27 for failing to provide services to Spanish-speaking voters as required under Section 203 of the  
28 VRA. DOJ election officials monitored Riverside County’s November 2008 election, and federal



1 observers monitored its 2010 general election for VRA compliance, including provision of  
2 language assistance.

3 64. The County's voting practices and procedures have also worked to exclude Latino  
4 voters from political participation. In 2011, when the County redrew supervisorial district  
5 boundary lines, Latino residents made up 45.5% of the County's total population and 28.9% of its  
6 CVAP. Yet the Board of Supervisors adopted a supervisorial boundary map that did not include *a*  
7 *single* Latino-majority district. Given racially polarized voting in the County, it was almost  
8 impossible for Latino voters to elect their preferred candidates.

9 65. California's majority vote and runoff requirements for Board of Supervisors  
10 elections pose another obstacle to Latino political participation in the County by increasing the  
11 expense and burden to Latino candidates for whom electoral victory is already an uphill battle.

12 66. Riverside County's Board of Supervisors elections have also featured subtle racial  
13 appeals. In the 2018 District 4 supervisorial race, Jan Harnik's campaign released a television  
14 commercial that showed Supervisor Perez in front of a bloodied wall. The commercial stated that  
15 "Manuel Perez's policies let murderers, rapists, and child molesters go free" and showed a picture  
16 of a Latino man in an orange jumpsuit and Supervisor Perez accented with blinking police siren  
17 lights. Harnik also distributed mailers featuring images of men of color in police lineups and the  
18 language "Manuel Perez – Wrong on Crime" in large font.

19 67. Given that Latino residents have been subjugated to official discrimination,  
20 including voting practices or procedures that enhance the opportunity for discrimination against  
21 Latino voters and subjugate their voting preferences, it is not surprising that Latino candidates  
22 have had almost no success in supervisorial district races. Despite Riverside County's large  
23 Latino population, in the County's 129-year history there has only ever been one Latino member  
24 of the Riverside County Board of Supervisors.

25 68. That Latino supervisor, V. Manuel Perez, did not join the Board until 2017, and he  
26 did so only by virtue of an appointment by the governor of California to fill an out-of-cycle  
27 vacancy in District 4. Supervisor Perez had previously been defeated in a 2014 District 4  
28 supervisorial race infected with racially polarized voting. Supervisor Perez was elected to the

1 Board in 2018, and his incumbency played an unusually important role in his election.

2 69. From 2014 to 2020, other Latino candidates ran for Riverside County’s Board of  
3 Supervisors, but none were successful.

4 70. Because Riverside County’s Latino residents do not have equitable opportunities  
5 to participate in the political process, the Riverside County Board of Supervisors is unresponsive  
6 to the needs of Riverside County’s Latino community. Rather than serving these constituents, the  
7 Board of Supervisors has pursued projects demonstrating disregard for the distinct needs and  
8 policy preferences of its Latino constituents and has been sued multiple times for discriminatory  
9 and inhumane programs impacting Latino residents.

10 71. For example, the County was sued in 1992 when it chose to erect the “Mecca  
11 Migrant Farmworker Campground,” a complex of tent-like structures widely regarded as  
12 inhumane and demeaning, rather than seeking federal funds to construct affordable housing for  
13 largely Latino seasonal migrant farmworkers in the Coachella Valley. A decade after the  
14 discrimination lawsuit was filed, the County finally funded a public restroom facility for seasonal  
15 farmworkers in Mecca. The County, however, has done little else to address the housing needs  
16 that remain for Latino workers in the Coachella Valley. The County’s failure to provide needed  
17 housing resources directly impacts the County’s Latino seasonal workers who reside in County  
18 cities outside the Coachella Valley, such as Perris, and is perceived as anti-Latino by many of the  
19 County’s Latino residents.

20 72. In 2011, a Jurupa Valley based environmental group sued the County after it  
21 approved a 65-acre industrial complex in a primarily Latino residential area of Mira Loma.  
22 Residents there, already subject to some of the highest pollution in the country, had organized for  
23 nearly ten years to keep the project out of their neighborhood. Yet, despite contentious public  
24 testimony opposing the development, the Board of Supervisors ultimately approved the full  
25 project. The lawsuit highlighted the County’s failure to analyze and mitigate the project’s air  
26 quality and noise impacts on Mira Loma’s Latino residents; such failure follows a pattern since  
27 the 1990s of County approval for warehouse projects in the Jurupa Valley region without regard  
28 for their harmful health impacts to the region’s primarily Latino community.

1           73.     More recently, in 2019, the County settled a lawsuit over the County’s “Youth  
2 Accountability Teams” program, an onerous juvenile diversion effort that disproportionately  
3 referred Latino youth to the criminal system. Riverside County had funded this program since  
4 2001.

5           74.     The Board of Supervisors also consistently allocates funding in manners contrary  
6 to the needs of its Latino residents. As one example, the Board recently increased law  
7 enforcement funding in the face of high-profile public reports highlighting its district attorney and  
8 sheriff’s anti-Latino policing practices, such as prosecuting Latino youth as adults at rates nearly  
9 ten times as high as their white counterparts. Meanwhile, the County Housing Authority has a  
10 policy of denying or terminating rental assistance for individuals with criminal records, a policy  
11 that disproportionately affects Latino residents. In 2019, the County settled another lawsuit over  
12 its public assistance program, which had been unlawfully denying aid to unemployed and  
13 differently abled residents for years before the lawsuit. The County had illegally been denying aid  
14 to those with criminal records, another policy disproportionately affecting Latino residents. These  
15 examples are not exhaustive.

16           75.     Riverside County’s Latino residents predictably bear the present effects of this  
17 longstanding societal, economic, and educational discrimination in numerous respects, and white  
18 residents of Riverside County fare better than Riverside County’s Latino residents on several  
19 measures of socioeconomic status as shown by 2020 5-year ACS data.

20           76.     Riverside County’s Latino residents are more likely to live in poverty than white  
21 residents. Moreover, the median household income for white residents in the County was  
22 \$78,847, while the median household income for Latinos in the County was \$61,637.

23           77.     Riverside County’s Latino residents are also less likely to have health insurance  
24 coverage. Nearly 12% of Latino residents in Riverside County have no health insurance,  
25 compared to 7% of white residents.

26           78.     There is a significant gap in educational achievement between Riverside County’s  
27 Latino and white residents. Approximately one third of Riverside County’s Latino residents have  
28 not received a high school diploma, compared to only 12.7% of the County’s white residents.

1 Only 11.5% of the County’s Latino residents have received a bachelor’s degree or higher,  
2 compared to 24% of the County’s white residents.

3 79. Riverside County’s Latino residents are far less likely to live in a healthy built  
4 environment than the County’s white residents. They are more likely to live in proximity to  
5 hazardous sites, such as federal superfund or military evaluation sites, and to have their  
6 residences exposed to toxic releases from emitting facilities. They also are less likely to have  
7 access to greenspace.

8 **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**  
9 **WRIT OF MANDATE (Cal. Code Civ. Proc. § 1085)**  
10 **FOR VIOLATIONS OF FAIR MAPS ACT (Cal. Elec. Code §§ 21500-21509)**  
11 **(All Petitioners/Plaintiffs Against All Respondents/Defendants)**

12 80. Petitioners/Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations set forth in the  
13 previous paragraphs.

14 81. Petitioners/Plaintiffs have public interest standing to seek writ relief in that the  
15 claims raised by this Petition/Complaint are based on public rights and the object of this action is  
16 to enforce a public duty.

17 82. Petitioners/Plaintiffs also have a beneficial interest in the issuance of relief sought  
18 by the Petition/Complaint, in that the individual Petitioners/Plaintiffs’ and IE United’s member-  
19 organizations’ members’ voting power and rights are directly affected by the 2021 Redistricting  
20 Plan, and IE United’s mission and resources are impacted by the Plan.

21 83. Respondents/Defendants have, and at all relevant times have had, clear, present,  
22 and ministerial duties to comply with California’s FAIR MAPS Act and to adopt and implement a  
23 redistricting plan that complies with the Act.

24 84. Despite their ability to perform these ministerial duties, Respondents/Defendants  
25 have adopted a redistricting plan, and will continue to implement that plan if not promptly  
26 corrected, that violates the FAIR MAPS Act.

27 85. California’s FAIR MAPS Act requires counties that elect members of the county  
28 board of supervisors by district to draw new supervisorial district boundaries after each federal  
decennial census, and to do so pursuant to a set of mandatory criteria. First, the FAIR MAPS Act

1 requires that supervisorial districts be substantially equal in population and otherwise comply  
2 with the United States Constitution, the California Constitution, and the federal Voting Rights  
3 Act of 1965, as amended, 52 U.S.C. § 10301, *et seq.* Second, the Act requires counties to follow a  
4 set of priority-ordered criteria when adopting their supervisorial district boundaries. Preserving  
5 the geographic integrity of communities of interest must be the second-most important of these  
6 criteria, superseded only by geographic contiguity. The Act specifies that communities of interest  
7 do not include relationships with incumbents, and the Act does not list incumbency as a  
8 mandatory criterion for redistricting decisions.

9 86. Riverside County is a county that elects members of the county's board of  
10 supervisors by district. The 2021 Redistricting Plan violates the FAIR MAPS Act in four ways.  
11 Each of these four violations alleged below provides an alternative and independently sufficient  
12 theory establishing a violation of the FAIR MAPS Act. None of these theories is itself a necessary  
13 element of Plaintiffs/Petitioners' FAIR MAPS Act claim.

14 **FAIR MAPS Act Violation 1: Failure to Comply with California Constitution**

15 87. First, the 2021 Redistricting Plan violates the FAIR MAPS Act because it does not  
16 comply with the California Constitution's equal protection guarantees. Under those provisions of  
17 the California Constitution, government actions with a disparate impact on the fundamental rights  
18 of a suspect class, such as Latinos, are subject to strict constitutional scrutiny.

19 88. The 2021 Redistricting Plan disparately impacts Latino voters' ability to elect  
20 candidates of their choice to the County Board of Supervisors without any compelling  
21 government purpose.

22 89. The 2021 Redistricting Plan splits the primarily Latino Jurupa Valley/northwest  
23 Riverside and Moreno Valley/Perris communities of interest. Latino voters in these communities  
24 are sufficiently numerous and geographically compact to constitute the majority of the CVAP in  
25 two properly apportioned districts.

26 90. Racially polarized voting persists in elections of members to the Riverside County  
27 Board of Supervisors. A white majority of voters typically vote as a bloc such that the Latino  
28 voters' candidates of choice are defeated.

1           91.     The 2021 Redistricting Plan results in the denial or abridgment, on account of race,  
2 color, or ethnicity, of the voting rights of Riverside County’s eligible Latino voters residing in the  
3 Jurupa Valley-Riverside and Perris-Moreno Valley communities of interest, by diluting their  
4 voting strength. As compared to the voting power of white voters, the 2021 Redistricting Plan  
5 impairs the ability of Latino voters in these communities of interest to elect candidates of their  
6 choice. The 2021 Redistricting Plan gives Latino voters in Riverside County less opportunity to  
7 participate in the political process than similarly situated non-Latino members of the electorate.

8           92.     The division of the Jurupa Valley/northeast Riverside and Moreno Valley/Perris  
9 Latino communities of interest in Riverside County’s 2021 Redistricting Plan does not serve a  
10 compelling government purpose. The division of these communities of interest is not necessary to  
11 ensure substantial population equality between districts, nor to ensure districts’ geographic  
12 contiguity, nor to align with the ranked priorities the California legislature has required boards of  
13 supervisors to follow when redistricting. In fact, the division of these communities of interest was  
14 driven by a purpose—protecting incumbents—that the California legislature excluded from its list  
15 of mandatory ranked redistricting criteria. Moreover, the division of these communities of interest  
16 directly contradicts the California legislature’s directive that counties prioritize preserving  
17 communities of interest within a single district.

18 **FAIR MAPS Act Violation 2: Failure to Comply with the Federal Voting Rights Act**

19           93.     Second, the 2021 Redistricting Plan violates the FAIR MAPS Act because it does  
20 not comply with Section 2 of the federal Voting Rights Act. The 2021 Redistricting Plan splits  
21 the primarily Latino Jurupa Valley/northwest Riverside and Moreno Valley/Perris communities  
22 of interest. Latino voters in these communities are sufficiently numerous and geographically  
23 compact to constitute the majority of the CVAP in two properly apportioned districts.

24           94.     Racially polarized voting, in which a white majority of voters typically vote as a  
25 bloc such that the Latino voters’ candidates of choice are defeated, persists in elections of  
26 members to the Riverside County Board of Supervisors.

27           95.     Consequently, Riverside County’s 2021 Redistricting Plan dilutes Latino voting  
28 strength and denies or abridges the rights of Latino voters in Riverside County on account of their

1 race, color, or membership in a language minority group. By diluting and abridging Latino voting  
2 rights, the County's failure to adopt a redistricting plan with a second majority Latino CVAP  
3 district impairs the ability of Latino voters to elect candidates of their choice and gives them less  
4 opportunity than other members of the electorate to participate in the political process.

5 **FAIR MAPS Act Violation 3: Failure to Use Mandatory Ranked Criteria**

6 96. Third, Riverside County's 2021 redistricting plan violates the FAIR MAPS Act  
7 because Respondents/Defendants did not apply the Act's mandatory ranked criteria in the order of  
8 priority required by the Act. Instead, the County prioritized lower-ranked criteria, such as  
9 preserving the geographic integrity of cities, above maintaining within a single district  
10 communities of interest whose fair and effective representation requires such preservation. By its  
11 own admission, the County adopted a redistricting plan that splits more communities of interest  
12 than Community Map 1.4, and the County offered no reasoned analysis as to why such divisions  
13 were necessary or superior to those proposed in Community Map 1.4 other than that Community  
14 Map 1.4 split more cities across district lines. The FAIR MAPS Act, however, imposed a  
15 mandatory duty on the County to prioritize communities of interest *over* such municipal  
16 boundaries.

17 **FAIR MAPS Act Violation 4: Improper Consideration of Incumbency**

18 97. Fourth, Riverside County's 2021 redistricting plan violates the FAIR MAPS Act  
19 because Respondents/Defendants prioritized incumbency protection over complying with the  
20 FAIR MAPS Act's mandatory ranked criteria. Protecting incumbents is not one of the mandatory  
21 and ranked criteria the Act requires county boards of supervisors to follow when redistricting, and  
22 the Act explicitly states that communities of interest do *not* include incumbency. Yet supervisors  
23 repeatedly voiced concerns about how draft districts would impact their constituencies,  
24 announced opposition to Community Map 1.4 specifically because of its potential impacts on  
25 incumbents, and failed to provide a reasoned analysis for rejecting Community Map 1.4, whose  
26 two majority Latino CVAP districts had the potential to disrupt the status quo and prevent  
27 incumbent reelection.

28 98. Respondents/Defendants, collectively and individually, are responsible for

1 imposing, applying, maintaining, and/or failing to prevent the use of Riverside County’s 2021  
2 Redistricting Plan for electing members of the Board of Supervisors.

3 99. Petitioners/Plaintiffs have no plain, speedy, or adequate remedy in the ordinary  
4 course of law to compel Respondents/Defendants to perform their mandatory duty to comply with  
5 the FAIR MAPS Act.

6 100. There are no administrative remedies available to Petitioners/Plaintiffs to obtain  
7 the requested relief.

8 101. Respondents/Defendants’ wrongful conduct has caused, is causing, and unless  
9 enjoined will continue to cause irreparable injury to Petitioners/Plaintiffs. Petitioners/Plaintiffs  
10 have no adequate remedy at law for the injury they have suffered, are suffering, and will continue  
11 to suffer unless Defendants’ wrongful conduct is enjoined.

12 **SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**  
13 **CALIFORNIA CONSTITUTION (Article I, §§ 2 & 7)**

14 **(All Petitioners/Plaintiffs Against All Respondents/Defendants)**

15 102. Petitioners/Plaintiffs incorporate by reference the allegations of fact set forth in the  
16 previous paragraphs.

17 103. Under the California Constitution’s equal protection provisions, government action  
18 with a disparate impact on the fundamental rights of a suspect class, such as Latinos, is subject to  
19 strict scrutiny. Here, Riverside County’s 2021 Redistricting Plan disparately impacts Latino  
20 voters’ ability to elect candidates of their choice to the County Board of Supervisors without any  
21 compelling government purpose.

22 104. The 2021 Redistricting Plan splits the primarily Latino Jurupa Valley/northwest  
23 Riverside and Moreno Valley/Perris communities of interest. Latino voters in these communities  
24 are sufficiently numerous and geographically compact to constitute the majority of the CVAP in  
25 two properly apportioned districts.

26 105. Racially polarized voting persists in elections of members to the Riverside County  
27 Board of Supervisors. A white majority of voters typically vote as a bloc such that the Latino  
28 voters’ candidates of choice are defeated.



1           106.   Riverside County’s 2021 Redistricting Plan results in the denial or abridgment, on  
2 account of race or color, of the voting rights of Riverside County’s eligible Latino voters residing  
3 in the Jurupa Valley/Riverside and Moreno Valley/Perris communities of interest, by diluting  
4 their voting strength. As compared to the voting power of white voters, the 2021 Redistricting  
5 Plan impairs the ability of Latino voters in these communities of interest to elect candidates of  
6 their choice. The 2021 Redistricting Plan gives Latino voters in Riverside County less  
7 opportunity to participate in the political process than similarly situated non-Latino members of  
8 the electorate.

9           107.   The division of the Jurupa Valley/northwest Riverside and Perris/Moreno Valley  
10 Latino communities of interest in Riverside County’s 2021 Redistricting Plan does not serve a  
11 compelling government purpose. The division of these communities of interest is not necessary to  
12 ensure substantial population equality between districts, nor to ensure districts’ geographic  
13 contiguity, nor to align with the ranked priorities the California legislature has required boards of  
14 supervisors to follow when redistricting. In fact, the division of these communities of interest was  
15 driven by a purpose—protecting incumbents— that the California legislature excluded from its  
16 list of mandatory ranked redistricting criteria. Moreover, the division of these communities of  
17 interest directly contradicts the California legislature’s directive that counties prioritize preserving  
18 communities of interest within a single district.

19           108.   Respondents/Defendants, collectively and individually, are responsible for  
20 imposing, applying, maintaining, and/or failing to prevent the use of Riverside County’s 2021  
21 Redistricting Plan for electing members of the Board of Supervisors.

22           109.   An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between the parties relating to the  
23 legal rights and duties of all Petitioners/Plaintiffs and Respondents/Defendants for which all  
24 Petitioners/Plaintiffs desire a declaration of rights.

25           110.   Respondents/Defendants’ wrongful conduct has caused, is causing, and unless  
26 enjoined will continue to cause irreparable injury to Petitioners/Plaintiffs. Petitioners/Plaintiffs  
27 have no adequate remedy at law for the injury they have suffered, are suffering, and will continue  
28 to suffer unless Respondents/Defendants’ wrongful conduct is enjoined.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

**PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

Wherefore, as remedies for the causes of action asserted above, Petitioners/Plaintiffs request judgment for Petitioners/Plaintiffs for:

(1) A peremptory writ of mandate compelling Respondents/Defendants to adopt a supervisorial district map that comports with the FAIR MAPS Act, including by ensuring that neither the Latino community of interest centered around northwest Riverside and Jurupa Valley nor the Latino community of interest centered around Perris and Moreno Valley is split across different supervisorial districts;

(2) A declaratory judgment that Riverside County’s 2021 redistricting plan violates the FAIR MAPS Act;

(3) Preliminary and permanent injunctive relief requiring the adoption of a supervisorial district map that comports with Article I, Section 2 and Article I, Section 7 of the California Constitution, including by ensuring that neither the Latino community of interest centered around northwest Riverside and Jurupa Valley nor the Latino community of interest centered around Perris and Moreno Valley is split across different supervisorial districts;

(4) A declaratory judgment that Riverside County’s 2021 redistricting plan violates the voting rights of Petitioners/Plaintiffs as secured by Article I, Section 2 and Article I, Section 7 of the California Constitution;

(5) Attorneys’ fees and costs of this action pursuant to Cal. Code of Civil Procedure §1021.5 and other applicable law;

(6) Such other and further relief as the nature of Petitioners/Plaintiffs’ cause may warrant.

Dated: June 14, 2022

MATTHEW J. MURRAY  
BRONWEN B. O’HERIN  
ALTSHULER BERZON LLP

By: /s/ Bronwen B. O’Herin

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs Petitioners/Plaintiffs Inland*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

*Empire United, Evelyn Arana, Elizabeth Ayala,  
Edgar Castelan, and Robert Garcia*

JULIA A. GOMEZ  
PETER BIBRING  
MELISSA GOODMAN  
ACLU FOUNDATION OF SOUTHERN  
CALIFORNIA

MOE KESHAVARZI  
SHEPPARD, MULLIN, RICHTER &  
HAMPTON LLP

*Attorneys for Petitioners/Plaintiffs Araceli Caldera  
and Daisy Lopez.*

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

VERIFICATION

I am the Executive Director of Inland Empire United, a party to this action, and am authorized to make this verification on its behalf. I have read the foregoing Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate and Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief and know its contents. The allegations in the Petition are true to my own knowledge, except where they are made on information and belief, in which case I am informed and believe them to be true. I declare under penalty of perjury of the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on June 14, 2022, in \_\_\_\_\_ Corona, California \_\_\_\_\_.

DocuSigned by:  
*Michael Gomez Daly*

508D607141D1405...

Michael Gomez Daly, Executive Director  
Inland Empire United