



Yucaipa Recall Proponents Reject City Clerk's Settlement Offer

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
September 5, 2023

CONTACT: Joe Pradetto
(909) 769-7343

(Yucaipa, CA) – Proponents of the effort to recall three Yucaipa City Council members—and the defendants in the case challenging the validity of claims that underly their effort—rejected the City Clerk's offer to settle the lawsuit on Friday.

This action follows the expiration of the 90-day circulation period on August 16, and calls from proponents for the City Clerk to drop the lawsuit.

“As the City Clerk, I am the Elections Official for the City and it is my responsibility to ensure that voters receive true and accurate information to guide their decisions,” said Ana Sauseda, Yucaipa City Clerk. “My goal with this lawsuit was to use the law to stop the circulation of false and misleading information. With the expiration of the circulation period, I have accomplished my goal and have extended an offer to settle the lawsuit.”

In May, Sauseda commenced litigation in San Bernardino County Superior Court seeking to remove false and misleading statements from recall petitions submitted by proponents of an effort to remove three members of the Yucaipa City Council. During a status conference in July, the City and recall proponents agreed to allow a smaller group of recall proponents to represent their case in court, saving many proponents from the time and cost burdens of appearing in court. At the most recent status conference on August 24, the recall proponents asked that the City drop the lawsuit.

On Thursday morning, August 31, Sauseda proposed a settlement that would end the lawsuit and entail the parties pay their respective legal fees. Later that morning, the proponents filed a motion to dismiss the case. On Friday, September 1, the attorney representing the recall proponents informed the City Clerk that his clients rejected the settlement offer.

By filing for dismissal after the Clerk already proposed a settlement, and then rejecting that settlement, the proponents are prolonging the legal battle and incurring additional legal fees.

“As the circulation period has ended and the proponents have indicated that they do not plan to circulate those false and misleading statements that led to this suit, there is no purpose in continuing this lawsuit,” said Sauseda. “It is my hope that the proponents reconsider the settlement offer as it is the best course of action for all involved.”

###