

Appendix A

Supreme Court

Dec. 15, 2023

Jorge Navarrete Clerk

Deputy

S282433

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

ARTHUR LOPEZ, Petitioner,

v.

COURT OF APPEAL, SECOND APPELLATE

DISTRICT et al., Respondents; CHRISTOPHER

COVARRUBIAS, Real Party in Interest

The application of petitioner for leave to file a
petition for writ of mandate is hereby denied.

Guerrero (Chief Justice)

Supreme Court filed

Oct. 25, 2023

Jorge Navarrete (Clerk)

Deputy

S281348

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

En Banc

ARTHUR LOPEZ, Petitioner and Appellant,

v.

CHRISTOPHER COVARRUBIAS, Defendant and

Respondent

The petition for review is denied.

Supreme Court

Feb. 14, 2024

Jorge Navarrete Clerk Deputy

S283085

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA

ARTHUR LOPEZ, Petitioner,

v.

COURT OF APPEAL, SECOND APPELLATE

DISTRICT et al., Respondents; CHRISTOPHER

COVARRUBIAS, Real Party in Interest

The application of petitioner for leave to file a
petition for writ of mandate is hereby denied.

Guerrero (Chief Justice)

Appendix B

2nd Dist. Case # B328530 July 27, 2023 (Super. Ct.
No. 23WHRO00477) Los Angeles County

D I S M I S S A L O R D E R

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF
CALIFORNIA SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION P

ARTHUR LOPEZ,

Petitioner and Appellant,

v.

CHRISTOPHER COVARRUBIAS,

Defendant and Respondent.

THE COURT:

On March 15, 2023 and April 7, 2023, declared
vexatious petitioner Arthur Lopez filed in propria

persona notices of appeal entered on March 6, 2023, March 7, 2023, and March 28, 2023.

As a declared vexatious litigant, Lopez is subject to the prefiling order requirements of Code of Civil Procedure section 391.7, subdivision (a) and may not file new litigation in the courts of this state in propria persona without first obtaining leave of the presiding justice or presiding judge of the court where the litigation is proposed to be filed. (Code Civ. Proc., 391.7, subd. (a).) Lopez did not seek leave of this court before he filed his notices of appeal in propria persona.

On May 8, 2023, the clerk of this court sent notices to Lopez for each appeal requesting him to demonstrate in writing within 10 days of the date of the notice that the respective appeal has merit

and was not filed for purpose of harassment or delay. (Code Civ. Proc. 391.7, subds. (b)-(c).)

On May 10, 2023 and May 11, 2023, Lopez filed respective responses to the notices addressing the purported merits of each appeal. Having read and considered the responses and the available record, the court declines to issue an order allowing the appeals to proceed. (Code Civ. Proc., 391.7 subds. (b)-(c).) Consequently, the appeals initiated by the notices filed on March 15, 2023, and April 7, 2023 (“R”) are dismissed. (Code Civ. Proc., 391.7, subd. (c).)

Elwood Lui, Administrative Presiding Justice

Appendix C

Office of the Sheriff

County of Los Angeles

Robert G. Luna, Sheriff

May 26, 2023

Arthur Lopez

P.O. Box 13081

Newport Beach, CA 92658

Arthurlopez10112011@icloud.com

Dear Mr. Lopez:

PUBLIC RECORDS ACT REQUEST #23-701DI

This letter is in response to your request for records under the California Public Records Act dated and received by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's

Department, Public Records Act Until on April 6,
2023

In your request you are seeking the following:

...ALL VIDEO AND AUDIO RECORDINGS
INCLUDING 911/DISPATCH RECORDINGS
RELATED TO INCIDENT(S) @

1863 East 69th Street;

Los Angeles, CA 90061

AND INVOLVING ALTERCATION/ASSAULT
DOMINIQUE VALDEZ (AKA DOMINIQUE
JESSICA VALDEZ)

AND

CHRISTOPHER COVARRUBIAS AND FEMALE
ON 11/17/2018

In your follow up email dated May 11, 2023, you
indicated:

THE REQUEST IS ALSO SEEKING A COPY OF
THE WRITTEN REPORT.

In your follow up email dated May 13, 2023, you
stated the following:

THANK YOU FOR UPDATE AND PARTIAL
RESPONSE. HOWEVER, IT LACKS SUSPECT
DESCRIPTION. PLEASE FORWARD ASAP.

Further, you argued that:

THE PUBLIC INTEREST IS NOT SERVED BY
CONCEALING OR COVERING UP THE
CRIMINAL ACTIVITY INVOLVED HERE SUCH
AS PHYSICAL ABUSE AND BODILY HARM
AGAINST THESE VICTIM(S). ALL EXEMPTION
GOVERNMENT CODES YOU HAVE CITED ARE
INAPPLICABLE IN THIS MATTER AS THE

PUBLIC INTEREST FAR OUTWEIGHS YOUR
DESIRE TO OBSCURE THE FACTS

ACCORDINGLY, PLEASE FORWARD THE
SUSPECT(S) INFO SUCH AS PHYSICAL
DESCRIPTIONS AND NAMES AS OTHER
RESTRAINING ORDER CASES ARE INVOLVED,
AS SOON AS POSSIBLE AS THESE REQUESTS
WERE MADE OVER A MONTH AGO AND
DISCLOSURES SHOULD HAVE TAKEN PLACE
WITHIN 10 DAYS.

In your further follow up email on May 13, 2023,
you added the following:

THE NAME OF THE VICTIM IS NOT EXEMPT
FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER CA
GOVERNMENT CODE Universal Citation: CA
Govt. Code 7923.616 (2021)

(b) (1) The name of a victim of any crime defined by Section 220, 261, 261.5, 262, 264, 264.1, 265, 266, 266a, 266b, 266c, 266e, 266f, 266j, 267, 269, 273a, 273d, 273.5, 285, 286, 287, 288, 288.2, 288.3, 288.4, 288.5, 288.7, 289, 422.6, 422.7, 422.75, 646.9, or 647.6 of, or former section 288.a of, the Penal Code may be withheld at the victim's request, or at the request of the victim's parent or guardian if the victim is a minor.

HERE THERE HAS BEEN NO SUCH REQUEST BY THE VICTIM(S). MOREOVER, "LOCATION OF OCCURRENCE" MUST ALSO BE DISCLOSED ALONG WITH "FACTUAL CIRCUMSTANCES" WHICH WOULD INCLUDE SUSPECT/ASSAILANT INFO. -DESCRIPTION, etc. ESPECIALLY SINCE RESTRAINING

ORDERS CASES ARE IN COURT PROCESSES IN
THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

In your follow up email dated May 17, 2023, you
restated:

THANK YOU FOR UPDATE AND PARTIAL
RESPONSE. HOWEVER, IT LACKS SUSPECT
DESCRIPTION. PLEASE FORWARD ASAP.

ALSO, PLEASE NOTE THE PUBLIC INTEREST
IS NOT SERVED BY CONCEALING OR
COVERING UP THE CRIMINAL ACTIVITY
INVOLVED HERE SUCH AS PHYSICAL ABUSE
AND BODILY HARM AGAINST THESE
VICTIM(S). ALL EXEMPTION GOVERNMENT
CODES YOU HAVE CITED ARE INAPPLICABLE
IN THIS MATTER AS THE PUBLIC INTEREST
FAR OUTWEIGHS YOUR DESIRE TO OBSCURE
THE FACTS.

ACCORDINGLY, PLEASE FORWARD THE
SUSPECT(S) INFO SUCH AS PHYSICAL
DESCRIPTIONS AND NAEMS AS OTHER
RESTRAINING ORDER CASES ARE INVOLVED,
AS SOON AS POSSIBLE AS THESE REQUESTS
WERE MADE OVER A MONTH AGO AND
DISCLOSURES SHOULD HAVE TAKEN PLACE
WITHIN 10 DAYS.

Arthur Lopez

PRA #23-701DI

ALSO, THE NAME OF THE VICTIM IS
NOT EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER CA
GOVERNMENT CODE Universal Citation: CA
Govt. Code 7923.61 (2021)

In your additional follow up email dated May 17,
2023, you restated:

PLEASE PROVIDE ALL VIDEO AND AUDIO
RECORDINGS INCLUDING 911/DISPATCH
RECORDINGS RELATED TO INCIDENT(S) @

1863 East 69th Street;

Los Angeles, CA 90061

AND INVOLVING ALTERCATION/ASSAULT
DOMINIQUE VALDEZ (AKA DOMINIQUE
JESSICA VALDEZ)

AND

CHRISTOPHER COVARRUBIAS AND FEMALE

ON 11/17/2018

Further Response:

In our response letter dated May 12, 2023, we informed you that the requested police report was exempt from disclosure under Government Code section 7923.600. We also indicated that other information, such as the name of the victim and the location of the occurrence was exempt from disclosure under a number of authorities including, but not limited to, Government Code section 7923.615. However, in an effort to assist you, we provided you with: the date and time of the incident, the date of the report, the age of the victim, the factual circumstances surrounding the

incident and a general description of injuries or weapons involved.

In your numerous telephone calls to the Public Records Act Unit on various dates, you reiterated the information listed in the emails listed above.

On May 19, 2023, LASD emailed you stating that your request was being reassessed and that you would receive a response within three to five business days.

As a preliminary matter, please note that while the Public Records Act requires that an agency respond to a request within 10 days, it does not specify when records must be produced to a requesting party. *Motorola Common & Elecs., Inc. v. Dept. of Gen. Servs.* (1997) 55 Cal.App.4th 1340. Please be advised that LASD has been diligently searching for information responsive to your request and, as

indicated above, has corresponded with you on numerous occasions via telephone and email in order to clarify the information that you seek.

Nonetheless, we have reassessed your request and, in an effort to assist you, below, please find the suspect description relative to the incident number you have referenced as follows:

Suspect name: Christopher Covarrubias

Description: Male, White, 5'10, 220 lbs.,
Black Hair, Brown Eyes

Date of Birth: October 7, 1985

Date of Arrest: November 17, 2018

Booking#: 5475717

Charge: 273.5 PC

For information regarding the victim name and address, we stand firm on the exemptions that we previously cited. Under Government Code section 7923.615, certain information is not subject to disclosure to the extent that disclosure would endanger the safety of a person involved in an investigation. Here, disclosure of the victim's name and the location of the incident would endanger the safety of the victim. Accordingly, the information is not subject to disclosure. Further, applicable exemptions include, but are not limited to:

Government Code section 7922.000 and 7923.600;
the California Constitution article I, Section 1.

If you have any questions, please contact the Public Records Act Unit via email at

DiscoveryUnitPRArequests@lasd.org. or telephone
at (323)890-8080

Sincerely,

Robert G. Luna, SHERIFF

Shawnee N. Hinchman, Captain

Risk Management Bureau

May 12, 2023

Arthur Lopez

P.O. Box 13081

Newport Beach, CA 92658

Arthurlopez10112011@icloud.com

Dear Mr. Lopez:

PUBLIC RECORDS ACT REQUEST #23-701DI

This letter is in response to your request for records under the California Public Records Act dated and received by the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department, Public Records Act Unit on April 6, 2023.

In your request you are seeking the following:

...ALL VIDEO AND AUDIO RECORDINGS
INCLUDING 911/DISPATCH RECORDING TO
INCIDENT(S)@

1863 East 69th Street;

Los Angeles, CA 90001

AND INVOLVING ALTERCATION/ASSAULT

DOMINIQUE VALDEZ (AKA DOMINIQUE
JESSICA VALDEZ)

AND

CHRISTOPHER COVARRUBIAS AND FEMALE
ON 11/17/2018

In your follow up email dated May 11, 2023, you
seek the following:

YOU'RE NOT READING THE REQUEST
PROPERLY, THE REQUEST IS ALSO SEEKING

A COPY OF THE WRITTEN REPORT. PLEASE
FORWARD TO THIS E-MAIL AS SOON AS
POSSIBLE.

Response: LASD responded to your request dated
April 6, 2023 on May 11, 2023. In addition to our
response, we provided you with instructions
regarding the subpoena process. LASD did not
consider the image of the second page of the
subpoena as part of your request as this office does
not process subpoenas.

211 West Tripe Street, Los Angeles, California
90012

Arthur Lopez

PRA #23-701DI

We have interpreted your follow up email dated May 11, 2023 as a Public Records Act request for a police report. Police reports are exempt from disclosure under Government Code Section 7923.600 except to victims or their representatives.

In an effort to assist you, pursuant to Government Code section 7922.600 below is certain information relative to the incident number you have referenced above, which is subject to disclosure under Government Code section 7923.618(a)(2) as follows:

(A) The date, time, and location of occurrence.

November 17, 2016, at 22:53 hours. Location: The address of where the incident occurred is being withheld from disclosure based on, but not limited.

to, the following authorities: the California Constitution, article I, section 1; Government Code section 7922.000, 7923.600, 7923.615(b)(1), 7927.700, and 7927.705; and Evidence Code section 1040.

(B) The date of the report.

November 18, 2018

(C) The name and age of the victim

32 years old. The name of the victim is being withheld from disclosure based on, but not limited to, the following authorities: the California Constitution, article I, section 1; Government Code sections 7922.000, 7923.615(b)(1), 7927.700, and 7927.705; and Evidence Code section 1040.

(D) The factual circumstances surrounding the crime or incident

The victim reported there was a domestic violence dispute and the suspect and victim were in a physical altercation.

(E) A general description of any injuries, property, or weapons involved.

Injuries from the suspect to the victim with hands on victim's right side of neck and face

This concludes our response to your CRPA request

If you have any questions, please contact the Public

Records Act Unit via email at

DiscoveryUnitPRArequests@lasd.org or telephone

at (323) 890-8080

Sincerely,

Robert G. Luna, SHERIFF

Shawnee N. Hinchman, Captain

Risk Management Bureau

Appendix D

06/21/2022

Screenshots – 10 Color / Black + White

Video clip (39-seconds) (Respondent Cheryl Lopez,
3 seconds)

x.com/aviationbrk/status/1539401507031891968

Red Air #203 Crash Landing Miami International
Airport

Appendix E

Respondent Christopher Covarrubias

Declaration of 11/20/2018

I, Christopher Covarrubias, declare the following:

1. I am the Petitioner in the within matter.

I offer this Declaration in lieu of personal testimony pursuant to Sections 2009 and 2015.5 of the California Code of Civil Procedure; Rule 1225 of the California Rules of Court; and Marriage of Stevenot (1984) 154 Cal. App. 3d. 1051. The fact stated herein are personally known to me and if called as a witness I could competently testify to the truthfulness thereto excel as to those matters which are stated on information and belief and

as to those matters I believe them to be true.

2. I make this Declaration in support of my response to Respondent, Dominique Valdez's request for order for spousal support, attorney's fees and medical insurance.

3. Respondent and I married on July 26, 2008. From 2008 – 2014, I was an active duty member of the United States Air Force and during our entire marriage I supported Respondent financially as she went to university, studied abroad, traveled and worked on her fitness.

Dominique did not produce any income apart from several month of intermittent part time employment.

4. In or about October of 2014, we moved back to Los Angeles after my honorable discharge from the Air Force. Upon our return to Los Angeles, I begged Respondent to become gainfully employed, since at the time I came out of the military without employment or any money. Thankfully my grandmother agreed to let us live with her rent free for a year so that I could save money and get us on our feet again. I also immediately used my GI Bill to apply for college and I enlisted into the Air Force Reserve, which provided us with healthcare and professional development for me while acting as a safety net while I transitioned from 6 ½ years of active duty. My father

offered me his spare car to get to and from school. I eventually saved up enough money to purchase my own vehicle and use it to drive Uber to supplement our income. During this time, Respondent said she would consider getting a job after she finished her Bachelor's degree in December 2014. Respondent obtained two degrees in Sociology and General Education in December 2014.

5. In or about May 2015, since Respondent still had not obtained gainful employment, I was forced to quit my studies at Rio Hondo College and seek full-time employment. In or about May 2015 with my military experience and government clearances, I was able to find

employment as a defense coordinator to support us. The monthly stipend from my GI Bill no longer was enough to cover our growing expenses, majority of which was due to Respondent's unemployment.

Respondent was unwilling to accept that I no longer had the type of benefits (e.g. housing allowance, free healthcare, food allowance, and other military resources) I did when I was in the Air Force; she continued to shop without limitations and give her family money. I sat down with Respondent several times to explain our financial situation and the importance of her finding work so we could survive living here in Los Angeles. She had access to all the books. Showed her all the debt

all the mutual funds, all the insurance policies, etc. We did this multiple times throughout our marriage, but she was not interested. She was only interested in seeing how much I could earn and how much I worked.

6. On or about October 22, 2018, with the mutual agreement of Respondent, I hired a paralegal to assist us with the completion of the dissolution paperwork. Respondent accompanied me to the first appointment with the paralegal. During the meeting we agreed that we were going to do the dissolution by way of default, and we agreed to settlement terms, which were reduced to a Marital Settlement Agreement, a copy of which is

attached hereto as Exhibit 2. With respect to spousal support, we mutually agreed that I would pay Respondent a total of \$1,500.00 in monthly spousal support until December 30, 2025. Prior to our agreement, from March 2018 to October 2018 I paid Respondent \$1,200 per month to her Downey Federal Credit Union #...3752; from November 2018 to the present I have been paying Respondent a monthly total of \$1,500 in spousal support to the same Downey Federal Credit Union bank account. See, Exhibit 3 attached hereto – bank transfer document. Thus, Respondent is being less than honest about the support I have

provided her. In other words, I did not cut her off financially.

7. On or about November 17, 2018, Respondent appeared at my home on 69th Street unannounced and entered my home without my permission. She became unhinged when she saw that a female guest was at my home. She tried to attack me and my house guest. After Respondent left my home, she called the police and made a false claim against me. Thereafter, Respondent refused to sign the Marital Settlement and Agreement. Instead, she filed her response stating false claims about me, including the financial support I have provided her and continue to do so to this date.

8. Regarding health insurance, I pay for Respondent's healthcare; it has never been cancelled nor has it lapsed. The healthcare coverage is through the Air Force Reserve. See, Exhibit 4 attached hereto. I pay Tricare Reserve a total of \$228 per month for Respondent's health insurance. Again, Respondent has misrepresented that I terminated her medical insurance.
9. Recently, I had to take a medical leave of absence from my employment due to the injuries I sustained while in the service, which in part have been exasperated by Respondent's physical and mental abuse that she has subjected me to. I will require five different surgeries with long

recoveries to have any chance at a life of less pain. I am currently receiving VA Disability.

10. Further, Respondent should be obligated to pay her own attorneys' fees in connection with this dissolution. She has income and there is no reason that she is not gainful employed, except for her own desire not to be. Moreover, we agreed that this dissolution was going to be done by way of default and the attached Marital Settlement Agreement. Respondent's decision to file a response was merely a means to further hurt me and her attempt to cause me further financial harm.

I declare under the penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.