1 2 3	21L-011PObjsSYDec211103.plm ELIZABETH J. GIBBONS, SBN 147033 THE GIBBONS FIRM, P.C. 811 Wilshire Blvd., 17 <sup>th</sup> Floor Los Angeles, CA 90017					
<ul><li>4</li><li>5</li><li>6</li></ul>	Phone: (323) 591-6000 Email: egibbons@thegibbonsfirm.com  Attorneys for Petitioner, Association of Deputy District Attorneys for Los Angeles County (ADDA)					
7 8	SUPERIOR COURT OF TH	IE STATE OF (	CALIFORNIA			
9	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES					
10						
11	ASSOCIATION OF DEPUTY DISTRICT	) Case No. 2	21STCP03412			
12	ATTORNEYS FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY (ADDA),	PETITIONER'S EVIDENTIARY				
13	Petitioner,	OF STAN	IONS TO DECLARATION LEY YEN IN SUPPORT			
14	v.		'ONDENTS' OPPOSITION RE: PRELIMINARY FION			
15	GEORGE GASCÓN, LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY; LOS	) 11.001.01 )				
16	ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE; COUNTY OF	Date: Time:	November 10, 2021 9:30 a.m.			
17	LOS ANGELES; DOES 1 through 50, inclusive,	) Place:	Dept. 86			
18	Respondents.	)				
19		)				
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
<ul><li>25</li><li>26</li></ul>						
26 27						
28						
	1					

1 Petitioner, ASSOCIATION OF DEPUTY DISTRICT ATTORNEYS FOR LOS ANGELES COUNTY (ADDA), hereby object to portions of the evidence filed by Respondents, 3 GEORGE GASCON, LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY; LOS ANGELES COUNTY DISTRICT ATTORNEY'S OFFICE; COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, in reply to 4 Respondents' Opposition to OSC Re: Preliminary Injunction. Petitioner respectfully 5 requests that the Court strike the objectionable portions of the evidence as specifically set forth 6 7 below.

2

8

28

## PETITIONER'S OBJECTIONS TO EVIDENCE PRESENTED BY DEFENDANTS

9	Material Objected to: Grounds for Objection:		Ruling:
10		1)	
11	Yen Decl. ¶ 8, lns. 4-15	1) Hearsay (California Evid. Code § 1200, <i>et</i>	Sustained:
12	Thereafter, in late December of 2020, the DA's Office consulted	seq.,)	Overruled:
	with CEO, DHR, and County	2) Lack of Personal Knowledge	Judge
13	Counsel to transfer Deputy Public Defender (DPD) III, Alisa Blair,	(California Evid. Code § 702)	
14	to serve as a special advisor to the DA in the capacity of Deputy	Reflects hearsay statements relied upon by the Declarant to assert	
15	District Attorney (DDA) III. DHR	the various acts, activities and	
16	reviewed and approved the administrative reassignment to the	conclusions of DHR	
17	DA's Office as it was appropriate under Civil Service Rules 15.03.		
	DHR determined the DPD III and		
18	DDA III classes are of the same rank, there is no increase in grade,		
19	and the employee demonstrated the possession of the skills and aptitudes		
20	required in the position to be changed. The CEO also approved		
21	the Exception to Hire for the transfer.		
22	The transfer was not based on merit (i.e. civil service exam), but rather,		
23	based on the employee's experience and the needs of the DA's Office.		
	Non-promotional inter-department		
24	transfers and change in classification such as a DPD III to DDA III does		
25	not require a County employee to take a competitive civil service		
26	examination to effect the transfer. The transfer became effective on		
27	January 4, 2021.		

1   2   3   4   5   6   7   8   9   10	Yen Decl. ¶ 9, lns. 21-25 the employee demonstrated the possession of the skills and aptitudes required in the position to be changed. The CEO also approved the Exception to Hire for the transfer. The transfer was not based on merit (i.e. civil service exam), but rather, based on the employee's experience and the needs of the DA's Office. Non-promotional interdepartment transfers and change in classification such as a DPD IV to DDA IV does not require a County employee to take a competitive civil service examination to effect the transfer.	1) Hearsay (California Evid. Code § 1200, et seq.,)  2) Lack of Personal Knowledge (California Evid. Code § 702)  ¶ 9, lns. 21-25 are predicated on hearsay statements.	Sustained: Overruled: Judge
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Yen Decl. ¶ 10, lns. 1-8  DHR reviewed and approved the administrative reassignment to the DA's Office as it was appropriate under Civil Service Rules 15.03.  DHR determined the DPD IV and DDA IV classes are of the same rank, there is no increase in grade, and the employee demonstrated the possession of the skills and aptitudes required in the position to be changed. The CEO also approved the Exception to Hire for the transfer. The transfer was not based on merit (i.e. civil service exam), but rather, based on the employee's experience and the needs of the DA's Office. Non-promotional inter-department transfers and change in classification such as a DPD IV to DDA IV does not require a County employee to take a competitive civil service examination to effect the transfer.	1) Hearsay (California Evid. Code § 1200, et seq.,)  2) Lack of Personal Knowledge (California Evid. Code § 702)  ¶ 10, lns. 1-8 are predicated on hearsay statements.	Sustained: Overruled: Judge
23   24   25   26   27   28	Dated: November 3, 2021	Respectfully submitted,  THE GIBBONS FIRM, PC  By: Lizabeth J.  Elizabeth J. Gibbons  Attorneys for Petitioner, Ass District Attorneys for Los A  (ADDA)	

1	PROOF OF SERVICE				
2	STATE OF CALIFORNIA )				
3	COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ) ss.				
4	I am a citizen of the United States; I am over the age of eighteen years and not a				
5	party to the within action; my business address is 811 Wilshire Boulevard, 17th Floor, Lo Angeles, California 90017.				
6	On the date written below, I served the within:				
7	PETITIONER'S EVIDENTIARY OBJECTIONS TO DECLARATION OF STANLEY YEN IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENTS' OPPOSITION TO				
8	OSC RE: PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION  Association of Deputy District Attorneys for Los Angeles County (ADDA) v.				
9	George Gascón, Los Angeles County District Attorney, et al. LASC Case No. 21STCP03412				
10	on the interested parties in said action as follows:				
11	Justin H. Sanders (SBN 211488)				
12	jsanders@sandersroberts.com				
13	Sabrina C. Narain (SBN 299471) snarain@sandersroberts.com				
14	Shawn P. Thomas (SBN 302593) sthomas@sandersroberts.com				
	Matthew D. Barzman (SBN 309063) mbarzman@sandersroberts.com SANDERS ROBERTS LLP 1055 West 7th Street, Suite 3200 Los Angeles, CA 90017				
15					
16 17					
	[X] BY MAIL: I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and				
18	processing correspondence by mailing. Under that practice, it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal Service on that same day with postage fully prepared at Los Angeles, California in the				
19	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.					
21	[X] BY ELECTRONIC MAIL (E-MAIL): I transmitted the document(s) via				
22	electronic mail using web mail through the electronic mail server gmail.com and no error was				
23	reported by the mail administrator. Pursuant to California Rules of Court, Rule 2006(d), I printed the confirmation of the e-mail transmission.				
24	I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.				
25	Executed on November 3, 2021 at Los Angeles, California.				
26					
27	Peggy L. Madsen Peggy Madson				
28	1 cggy ivrausyn				