CO-PRA
to me, CO-PRA

Thu, Oct 29, 4:42 PM

The Chancellor's Office received your October 19, 2026, Public Records Act request for the following records:

" …any and all complaints, formal or informal, submitted by Patricia Stock, Ricardo Orellana and Grazyne Tresoldi. Please include all relevant and disclosable investigatory files and supplemental documents."

The Chancellor's Office has conducted a reasonable search for these records under Government Code §7922.535 and has determined the request calls for documents that are not disclosable under the Public Records Act. Specifically:

1. **Personnel Records/Privacy.** Employee records that include personal information, the release of which would constitute an invasion of personal privacy. Cal. Govt. Code §§7927.700, 7928.300, 7922.000.
2. **Student Records.** Materials that reflect student education records or may violate student privacy. Cal. Govt. Code §§7927.705, 7922.000; 21 U.S.C. §1232g.
3. **General Privacy Rights**. Cal. Govt. Code §7927.705; Cal. Const. Art. 1, §1.
4. **Attorney-Client Privilege.** Records subject to the attorney-client privilege and/or attorney work product doctrine. Cal. Govt. Code §7927.705; Cal. Evid. Code §950, *et seq*., Cal. Code Civ. Pro. §2018.030(a).
5. **Deliberative Process.** Records that reflect the deliberative, decision-making process of the CSU, which often involves multiple individuals, who need to converse about issues candidly. Cal. Govt. Code §7922.000; *Times Mirror Co. v. Superior Court* (1991) 53 Cal.3d 1325; *Montrose Chemical Corporation of California v. Train* (D.DC 1982) 491 F.2d 63; *Rogers v. Superior Court* (1993) 19 Cal. App.4th 469.
6. **Balancing Test.** Records where the public interest against disclosure outweighs the public interest in disclosure. Cal. Govt. Code §7922.000. Here, the public interest served by disclosure is outweighed by the public interest served against disclosure. *Stock v. CSU* is in active litigation, and the parties have the greater interest in preserving their respective rights in the case. You are welcomed to resubmit your request for reconsideration upon the conclusion of this matter.
7. **Drafts.** Preliminary drafts, notes, or interagency or intra-agency memoranda that are not retained by the public agency in the ordinary course of business. Cal. Govt. Code §7927.500.
8. **Whistleblower Claims.** Reports of improper governmental activities are exempt from disclosure. Cal. Govt. Code §§7927.705; Cal. Govt. Code §8547, *et seq*.; Cal. Educ. Code §89570, *et seq*.

The decision that certain records are exempt and will not be disclosed was made by me.



Chris Hutton <chrishutton8833@gmail.com>
to CO-PRA

Thu, Oct 29, 8:43 PM

Hey Mayling,

I don't understand how the requested documents fall under:
1. Personal Privacy - which I argue is outweighed by the balancing test. These complaints are clearly a matter of public interest because the Chancellor's Office is undergoing a lawsuit in which substantial claims have been made about the administration not adhering to its own policies for reporting discrimination. Furthermore, text messages exchanged between College of Ag faculty and staff sharing disparaging and allegedly racist remarks about Ricardo Orellana and Patricia Stock were revealed publicly. Despite these records being published, the university and the Chancellor's Office have not taken disciplinary action against those employees—seemingly violating its own Nondiscrimination Policy. The public has a right to know the extent of these complaints so they can judge the scale of the alleged failure by university administrators and the Chancellor's Office to address them.

2.Student Records - Redactions protecting student privacy are reasonable, but that doesn't mean an entire document can be exempted because there was a student or two. It's unclear why this exemption is even being used when none of the names I provided were students.

3. General Privacy Rights - see argument in Sec. 1 or 6

4. Attorney-Client Privilege - I'm assuming these records were created prior to the lawsuit, which means they should not be protected under attorney-client privilege.
- Patricia Stock sued for being wrongfully terminated
- Ricardo Orellana signed a settlement that made it so he could not sue
- Grazyne Tresoldi quit as far as I'm aware

5. Deliberative Process - It's unclear how this applies. I'm requesting records related to complaints. While these records may relate to investigatory files, I find it strange that this exemption would still apply.

6. Balancing test - It is unrealistic to argue against the public interest in knowing the scale of discrimination that has allegedly not been addressed at the university. Ricardo Orellana signed a settlement, waiving his right to sue. He is an at-will employee. There is clearly a public interest in knowing if he made complaints about discrimination, especially since faculty and staff who currently work there called him a "fucking foreigner." He also scheduled an appointment with the diversity officer but never attended it because of the

6. Balancing test - It is unrealistic to argue against the public interest in knowing the scale of discrimination that has allegedly not been addressed at the university. Ricardo Orellana signed a settlement, waiving his right to sue. He is an at-will employee. There is clearly a public interest in knowing if he made complaints about discrimination, especially since faculty and staff who currently work there called him a "fucking foreigner." He also scheduled an appointment with the diversity officer but never attended it because of the settlement. The public interest clearly outweighs the CSU's interest in preserving these records, as the CSU is currently facing a lawsuit that alleges it failed to adhere to its own reporting policies and wrongfully terminated an employee.

Once again, the faculty and staff are still employed and have faced zero disciplinary action. Yet, Stock was fired, and Orellana signed a settlement. Students, parents, faculty and staff would have an interest in knowing the scale of these alleged issues before enrolling or continuing at Chico State University.

•••

C

CO-PRA

Fri, Nov 6, 2:47 PM (11 days ago)

to me, CO-PRA

The Chancellor's Office stands on the exemptions. As we advised previously, you are welcomed to resubmit the request for consideration upon the conclusion of the matter.

•••