

1 BRIGGS LAW CORPORATION [FILE: 1977.04]
2 Cory J. Briggs (SBN 176284)
3 99 East "C" Street, Suite 203
4 Upland, CA 91786
5 Telephone: 909-949-7115

6
7
8 Attorneys for Plaintiff and Petitioner Citizens for a
9 Friendly Airport

ELECTRONICALLY FILED
Superior Court of California,
County of San Diego

1/7/2026 1:26:45 PM

Clerk of the Superior Court
By D. Saenz , Deputy Clerk

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO – CENTRAL DIVISION

CITIZENS FOR A FRIENDLY AIRPORT,

CASE NO. 26CU002638C

Plaintiff and Petitioner,

**VERIFIED COMPLAINT FOR
DECLARATORY RELIEF AND
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
UNDER THE CALIFORNIA
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY ACT AND
OTHER LAWS**

vs.

COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO; and DOES 1 through
100,

Defendants and Respondents;

UNITED AIRLINES, INC.; and DOES 101
through 1,000,

Defendants and Real Parties in
Interest.

Plaintiff and Petitioner CITIZENS FOR A FRIENDLY AIRPORT ("Petitioner") alleges as
follows:

Parties

1. Petitioner is a non-profit organization formed and operating under the laws of the State
of California. At least one of Petitioner's members resides in or near the County of San Diego,
California, and has an interest in protecting the region's air quality, minimizing and ameliorating
airplane noise, ensuring informed and responsible growth, and promoting other environment-related
quality-of-life issues.

2. Defendant and Respondent COUNTY OF SAN DIEGO (“Respondent”) is a public agency under Section 21063 of the Public Resources Code. Respondent is authorized and required by law to hold public hearings to determine whether the California Environmental Quality Act (“CEQA”) applies to development within its jurisdiction, to determine the adequacy of and certify environmental documents prepared pursuant to CEQA, and to determine whether a project is compatible with the objectives, policies, general land uses, and programs specified in the applicable land-use plans.

3. Petitioner is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that Defendants and Real Parties in Interest UNITED AIRLINES, INC. (“RPI”), is the applicant for the proposed project (which includes the related contract to which Respondent and RPI are parties) that is the subject of this lawsuit.

4. The true names and capacities of the Defendants/Respondents identified as DOES 1 through 100 and Defendants/Real Parties in Interest identified as DOES 101 through 1,000 are unknown to Petitioner, who will seek the Court's permission to amend this pleading in order to allege the true name and capacities as soon as they are ascertained. Petitioner is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that each of the fictitiously named Defendants/Respondents 1 through 100 has jurisdiction by law over one or more aspects of the proposed project that is the subject of this lawsuit and that each of the fictitiously named Defendants/Real Parties in Interest 101 through 1,000 either claims an ownership interest in the proposed project or has some other cognizable interest in the proposed project.

Background Information

5. On or about December 10, 2025, Respondent's board of supervisors took certain action as set forth in Minute Order no. 5 (the "Project").

6. Petitioner opposes the Project (including all entitlements and other aspects thereof) and challenges certain actions taken by Respondent. In particular, Petitioner seeks to invalidate the Project's approval on the grounds, among others, that Respondent has violated CEQA, the Planning and Zoning Law ("PZL"), and/or other laws; and/or has also violated the judgment previously entered in and/or acted contrary to Respondent's representations made in San Diego County Superior Court case no. 37-2018-00057624-CU-TT-CTL.

Notice Requirements and Time Limitations

7. This lawsuit was commenced not more than 30 days after the notice authorized by Public Resources Code Section 21152(a) was filed (if such a notice was filed).

8. Petitioner has caused a Notice of Commencement of Action to be served on Respondent, as required by Public Resources Code Section 21167.5. A true and correct copy of the Notice of Commencement of Action is attached to this pleading as Exhibit "A."

9. Petitioner will have caused a copy of this pleading to be served on the Attorney General not more than 10 days after its filing, as required by Public Resources Code Section 21167.7 and Code of Civil Procedure Section 388.

Jurisdiction and Exhaustion of Administrative Remedies

10. Petitioner seeks review by and relief from this Court under Public Resources Code Section 21168 or 21168.5, as applicable; Government Code Section 65000 *et seq.*; and Code of Civil Procedure Sections 526a, 1060 *et seq.*, and 1084 *et seq.*, among other provisions of law.

11. Petitioner exhausted administrative remedies to the extent required by law; by way of example and without limitation, at least one of Petitioner's members expressed opposition to the Project. Additionally and/or alternatively, Petitioner was not required to exhaust its administrative remedies under the circumstances presented by the Project.

12. Respondent's conduct in approving the Project without complying with CEQA and other applicable laws constitutes a prejudicial abuse of discretion because, as alleged in this pleading, it failed to proceed in the manner required by law and made findings not supported by substantial evidence.

13. Petitioner has no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy in the ordinary course of law, since its members and other members of the public will suffer irreparable harm as a result of Respondent's violations of CEQA and other laws. Respondent's approval of the Project also rests on its failure to satisfy a clear, present, ministerial duty to act in accordance with those laws. Even when Respondent is permitted or required by law to exercise its discretion in approving projects under those laws, it remains under a clear, present, ministerial duty to exercise its discretion within the limits of and in a manner consistent with those laws. Respondent has had and continues to have the capacity and ability to approve the Project within the time limits of and in a manner consistent with those laws, but

1 Respondent has failed and refuses to do so and has exercised its discretion beyond the limits of and in
2 a manner that is not consistent with those laws.

3 14. Petitioner has a beneficial right and interest in Respondent's fulfillment of all its legal
4 duties, as alleged in this pleading.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION:
Illegal Approval of Project
(Against All Respondents and Real Parties in Interest)

15. Paragraphs 1 through 14 are fully incorporated into this paragraph.

8 16. Petitioner is informed and believes and on that basis alleges that the Project does not
9 comply with all applicable laws.¹ By way of example and without limitation (including alternative
10 theories of liability):

A. The Project violates CEQA. For example:

i. Whenever a project proposed to be carried out or approved by a lead agency to cause an adverse environmental impact, CEQA prohibits the agency from making a negative declaration. Instead, CEQA requires the preparation of an environmental impact statement to analyze the significant adverse environmental impacts of a proposed project, including both short-term and long-term impacts, providing decision-makers with the information needed to enable them to make an informed decision with full knowledge of the likely environmental impacts of their actions, and providing members of the public with enough information to participate fully in the project's approval and environmental-review process. CEQA also requires the preparation of an environmental impact report to identify and analyze a reasonable range of alternatives to the proposed project. CEQA further requires every environmental impact report to identify and analyze reasonable mitigation measures for a proposed project's significant adverse environmental impacts. An environmental impact report must be prepared for a proposed project if there is a fair argument, based on substantial evidence in the administrative record, that the project may have an adverse environmental impact; stated another way, a negative declaration may not be used unless the lead agency has a fair argument that the project will not have a significant adverse environmental impact.

¹ Despite Petitioner’s request for the complete contents of the administrative record under the California Public Records Act (“CPRA”), initiated, Respondent still has not produced all contents of the record. Petitioner’s allegations in this pleading, though legally sufficient, are based on the limited information available to Petitioner in light of Respondent’s failure to fulfill its obligations under the CPRA.

1 agency determines with certainty that there is no potential for the project to have an adverse
2 environmental impact.

13 B. The Project violates the PZL. For example:

14 i. Respondent did not comply with the controlling conditional use permit,
15 CUP-172, issued by the City of Carlsbad, prior to approving the Project.

6 17. There is currently a dispute between Petitioner and the other parties to this lawsuit over
7 the Project's legal force and effect. Petitioner contends that the Project's approval has no legal force
8 or effect because it violates CEQA and/or one or more other applicable laws. The other parties to this
9 lawsuit dispute Petitioner's contention. The parties therefore require a judicial determination of the
10 legal force and effect (if any) of the Project's approval.

Prayer

12 FOR ALL THESE REASONS, Petitioner respectfully prays for the following relief against all
13 Defendants/Respondents and all Defendants/Real Parties in Interest (and any all other parties who may
14 oppose Petitioner in this lawsuit):

15 A. A judgment or other appropriate order determining or declaring that
16 Defendants/Respondents failed to fully comply with CEQA, the PZL, and/or one or more other
17 applicable laws as they relate to the Project and that there must be full compliance therewith before final
18 approval and implementation of the Project may occur;

19 B. A judgment or other appropriate order determining or declaring that
20 Defendants/Respondents failed to comply with CEQA, the PZL, and/or one or more other applicable
21 laws as they relate to the Project and that its approval was illegal in at least some respect, rendering the
22 approval (including any subsequent actions or omissions based on the approval) null and void;

23 C. Injunctive relief prohibiting Defendants/Respondents and Defendants/Real Parties in
24 Interest (and any and all persons acting at the request of, in concert with, or for the benefit of one or
25 more of them) from taking any action on any aspect of, in furtherance of, or otherwise based on the
26 Project unless and until Defendants/Respondents comply with CEQA, the PZL, and all other applicable
27 laws, as determined by the Court;

D. Any and all other relief that may be authorized by CEQA, the PZL, or other applicable laws, or any combination of them, but is not explicitly or specifically requested elsewhere in this Prayer;

E. Any and all legal fees and other expenses incurred by Petitioner in connection with this lawsuit, including but not limited to reasonable attorney fees as authorized by the Code of Civil Procedure; and

F. Any and all further relief that this Court may deem appropriate.

Date: January 7, 2026. Respectfully submitted,

BRIGGS LAW CORPORATION

By: Cory J. Briggs
Cory J. Briggs

Attorneys for Plaintiff and Petitioner Citizens for a
Friendly Airport

**COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY AND INJUNCTIVE RELIEF AND PETITION
FOR WRIT OF MANDATE UNDER THE CALIFORNIA ENVIRONMENTAL
QUALITY ACT AND OTHER LAWS**

Exhibit “A”

Cory Briggs

From: Cory Briggs
Sent: Wednesday, January 7, 2026 9:29 AM
To: Potter, Andrew
Subject: Notice of Commencement of Action
Attachments: ExA_2026-01-07_NCA.pdf

Please see the attached time-sensitive correspondence. Thank you.

Cory J. Briggs
Briggs Law Corporation
99 East "C" Street, Suite 203, Upland, CA 91786
Telephone: 909-949-7115 (office); 619-736-9086 (direct)
Facsimile: 909-949-7121
E-mail: cory@briggslawcorp.com

Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail, and print double-sided whenever possible.

Important Notice: This message contains confidential information intended only for the use of the addressee(s) named above and may contain information that is legally privileged. If you are not an addressee or the person responsible for delivering this message to the addressee(s), you are hereby notified that reading, disseminating, distributing, or copying this message is strictly prohibited. If you have received this message by mistake, please immediately notify me by replying to this message and then delete the original message and your reply immediately thereafter. Thank you very much.

Internal Revenue Service Circular 230 Disclosure: Nothing in this message is intended or written by Briggs Law Corporation (including its attorneys and staff) to be used and cannot be used for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties under the Internal Revenue Code or (ii) promoting, marketing, or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed in this message.



99 East "C" Street, Suite 203
Upland, CA 91786
T: 909-949-7115
F: 909-949-7121

BLC File(s): 1977.04

7 January 2026

Andrew Potter, Board Clerk
San Diego County Board of Supervisors
1600 Pacific Highway, Room 402
San Diego, CA 92101

Via E-mail to Andrew.Potter@sdcounty.ca.gov

Re: Notice of Commencement of Action

Dear Board Clerk:

I represent Citizens for a Friendly Airport and am sending this Notice of Commencement of Action on my client's behalf.

Please be advised that an action is to be commenced by my client in San Diego County Superior Court against your agency. The action will challenge your agency's approval of the project that was the subject of Item 5 on the December 10, 2025 agenda of the Board of Supervisors (MCCLELLAN-PALOMAR AIRPORT - APPROVE LEASE WITH UNITED AIRLINES AND RELATED CEQA FINDING), on the grounds that the approval violated the California Environmental Quality Act (PUB. RES. CODE § 21000 *et seq.*). The action may also challenge your agency's approval of the project based on one or more violations of other laws.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

BRIGGS LAW CORPORATION

Cory J. Briggs



Cory Briggs

From: Microsoft Outlook
<MicrosoftExchange329e71ec88ae4615bbc36ab6ce41109e@briggslawcorp.com>
To: Potter, Andrew
Sent: Wednesday, January 7, 2026 9:29 AM
Subject: Relayed: Notice of Commencement of Action

Delivery to these recipients or groups is complete, but no delivery notification was sent by the destination server:

[Potter, Andrew \(andrew.potter@sdcounty.ca.gov\)](mailto:Potter, Andrew (andrew.potter@sdcounty.ca.gov))

Subject: Notice of Commencement of Action



Notice of
Commencemen...

VERIFICATION

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF San Diego

I have read the foregoing COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF AND PETITION FOR WRIT OF
MANDATE etc. and know its contents.

CHECK APPLICABLE PARAGRAPH

I am a party to this action. The matters stated in the foregoing document are true of my own knowledge except as to those matters which are stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true.

I am an Officer a partner a member of Citizens for a Friendly Airport

a party to this action, and am authorized to make this verification for and on its behalf, and I make this verification for that reason. I am informed and believe and on that ground allege that the matters stated in the foregoing document are true. The matters stated in the foregoing document are true of my own knowledge except as to those matters which are stated on information and belief, and as to those matters I believe them to be true.

I am one of the attorneys for a party to this action. Such party is absent from the county of aforesaid where such attorneys have their offices, and I make this verification for and on behalf of that party for that reason. I am informed and believe and on that ground allege that the matters stated in the foregoing document are true.

Executed on January 7, 20 26, at Carlsbad, California.
I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Victoria Syage

Type or Print Name

Victoria Syage
Signature

PROOF OF SERVICE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF

I am employed in the county of _____, State of California.
I am over the age of 18 and not a party to the within action; my business address is, _____

On _____, 20 ___, I served the foregoing document described as _____

on _____ in this action
 by placing the true copies thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed as stated on the attached mailing list:
 by placing the original a true copy thereof enclosed in sealed envelopes addressed as follows:

BY MAIL

* I deposited such envelope in the mail at _____, California.

The envelope was mailed with postage thereon fully prepaid.

As follows I am "readily familiar" with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with U.S. postal service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid at _____ California in the ordinary course of business. I am aware that on motion of the party served, service is presumed invalid if postal cancellation date or postage meter date is more than one day after date of deposit for mailing in affidavit.

Executed on _____, 20 ___, at _____, California.

**(BY PERSONAL SERVICE) I delivered such envelope by hand to the offices of the addressee.

Executed on _____, 20 ___, at _____, California.

(State) I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. I
 (Federal) declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of this court at whose direction the service was made.

Type or Print Name

Signature

* (By MAIL SIGNATURE MUST BE OF PERSON DEPOSITING ENVELOPE IN
MAIL SLOT, BOX, OR BAG)

**(FOR PERSONAL SERVICE SIGNATURE MUST BE THAT OF MESSENGER)