Filed BRANDON E 1 Matthew Chevedden, State Bar. No. 289431 LANGENKAMP, CÚRTIS & PRICE, LLP 2 1231 I Street, Suite 100 Вγ Sacramento, CA 95814 3 Telephone: (916) 648-2570 Facsimile: (916) 648-2577 4 Attorneys for Petitioner 5 Dana Demercurio 6 7 SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA 8 IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN JOAQUIN 9 DANA DEMERCURIO, Case No .: 10 Petitioner, VERIFIED PETITION FOR WRIT OF 11 **MANDATE** ٧. 12 [Code Civ. Proc. §1085] SAN JOAQUIN DELTA COMMUNITY 13 COLLEGE DISTRICT, Hearing Date: Hearing Time: 14 Respondent. Department: Judge: 15 Date Action Filed: 16 This is a Petition for a Writ of Mandate pursuant to California Code of Civil Procedure 17 section 1085, brought by Petitioner Dana Demercurio (hereinafter "Petitioner"). Petitioner is 18 a College Professor at San Joaquin Delta Community College District (hereinafter 19 "Respondent"). Petitioner brings the instant action to compel Respondent to comply with the 20 mandate of Education Code section 87482.5(a) to classify a faculty member who worked 21 more than 67 percent of the hours per week considered a full-time assignment for regular 22 employees having comparable duties as either a contract or regular employee. Petitioner 23 alleges that Respondent began misclassifying her during or before the Fall 2019 semester and 24 continues to do so. 25 Petitioner seeks immediate court intervention to compel Respondent to immediately 26 comply with these Education Code sections by: 1) paying Petitioner any difference between 27 what she was paid as a temporary faculty member and what she should have been paid as a 28

Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate

contract employee from the 2019-2020 school year to the present; and 2) reclassifying Petitioner as a third year contract employee for the 2021-2022 academic year.

## PETITION FOR A WRIT OF MANDATE

By this Verified Petition, Petitioner alleges as follows:

- 1. Petitioner was a faculty member employed by Respondent from the Spring semester 2017 through present day. (Declaration of Dana Demercurio [hereinafter "Demercurio Decl."], ¶1.)
- 2. On December 15, 2016 Respondent's Board approved the appointment of Petitioner as an hourly instructor. (Demercurio Decl., ¶2, and Exhibit A thereto).
- 3. On January 19, 2017 Respondent sent Petitioner a letter notifying her that Respondent's Board approved her appointment as an hourly instructor. (Demercurio Decl., ¶3, and Exhibit A thereto).
- 4. Petitioner is a member of the San Joaquin Delta College Teachers' Association CTA/NEA. (Demercurio Decl., ¶5).
- 5. Petitioner was a member of the Arts and Communication Division College and appointed to teach in the discipline of Communications. (Demercurio Decl., ¶2-3.)
- 6. Petitioner is qualified as a faculty member. She has a Bachelor of Arts with a Major in Comparative Literature that she completed in May 2011. (Demercurio Decl., ¶6, and Exhibit C thereto, Resume of Dana Demercurio).
- 7. Petitioner completed her Master's degree in Communications in June 2013 at California State University East Bay (Demercurio Decl., ¶7, and Exhibit C thereto).
- 8. Respondent College is located in San Joaquin County, California, and is a public community college organized pursuant to and bound by the laws of the State of California, including Education Code sections 87482.5(a), 87605, 87607, 87608, 87608.5 and 87610.
- 9. A Collectively Bargained Agreement ("CBA") between Respondent and the San Joaquin Delta College Teachers' Association CTA/NEA sets forth a full-time workload as a unit load of 15 units per semester pursuant to Articles 3.14 and 17.1. (Demercurio Decl.

¶11 and Exhibit F thereto).

- 10. A Community College must reclassify as contract or regular faculty a faculty member who works more than 67 percent of the hours considered a full-time assignment for regular employees having comparable duties. Cal. Educ. Code § 87482.5(a).
- 11. To work more than 67 percent of the hours considered a full-time assignment for regular employees having comparable duties, a faculty member at Respondent College would need to work more than 10.05 weekly contact hours per semester. (Demercurio Decl., ¶11; see also Exhibit F thereto.)
- 12. During the Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 semesters, Petitioner worked more than 67 percent of the hours per week considered a full-time assignment for regular employees having comparable duties to either a contract or regular employee.
- 13. During the Fall 2019 semester, Petitioner taught twelve (12) units of lecture courses: Three sections of Comm ST 1A, Public Speaking, and one section of COMM ST 7, Intercultural Communication. (Demercurio Decl., ¶9; see also Exhibit D thereto).
- 14. During the Spring 2020 semester, Petitioner taught twelve (15) units of courses: 5 sections of Comm ST 1A, Public Speaking, each at 3 units (Demercurio Decl., ¶10, and Exhibit E thereto).
- 15. Under Articles 3.14 and 17.1 of the CBA, a full-time workload at Respondent College is a load of 15 units per semester. (Demercurio Decl., ¶11, and Exhibit F thereto).
- 16. Pursuant to California Education Code section 87482.5, a person employed to teach classes at a community college for 67 percent or more of the hours considered a full-time assignment for "regular employees having comparable duties" will be considered full-time and may not be classified as a temporary employee. Cal. Educ. Code § 87482.5 (a).
- 17. Petitioner would need to work more than the equivalent of 10.05 units (.67 times 15) to be more than 67 percent of the hours considered a full-time assignment.
- 18. In Fall 2019, Petitioner taught a total of twelve (12) units, as described above, putting Petitioner above a 67 percent workload.

- 19. In Spring 2020, Petitioner taught a total of fifteen (15) traditional classroom units putting Petitioner above a 67 percent workload
- 20. Respondent therefore averaged more than 67% of a full time unit load for the 2019-2020 academic year.
- 21. After Petitioner taught her first semester of more than 67 percent of a full-time assignment, Respondent had a legal mandate to recognize Petitioner as contract, not temporary, faculty. Cal. Educ. Code § 87482.5(a).
  - 22. Respondent failed to comply with this mandatory duty. Ibid.
- 23. Respondent had a duty to recognize that Petitioner fulfilled her first probationary contract year at the end of the 2019-2020 school year after she worked more than 75 percent of the days of that year. Cal. Educ. Code § 87605; 87482.5.
  - 24. Respondent failed to comply with this mandatory duty.
- 25. Contract faculty, at Respondent College, have the right to be employed full-time, at the equivalent of fifteen units. (Demercurio Decl., Exhibit F, CBA, section 17.2).
- 26. Respondent continues to violate its mandatory duty under California Education Code sections 87482.5(a), 87605-87610, 87667-87682, 87732, and 87740 by not reemploying Petitioner as a full-time contract faculty member.
  - 27. The College continued to misclassify Petitioner. *Ibid*.
- 29. Petitioner has a beneficial interest in Respondent faithfully performing its legal duty to classify Petitioner properly, to continue her employment, and to provide Petitioner with due process protections prior to ceasing her employment.
- 30. Petitioner, as California Community College faculty, is the intended beneficiary of California Education Code sections 87482.5(a), 87605, 87607, 87608, 87608.5, and 87610 and Respondent's persistent violation of the mandates of those provisions deprive Petitioner of her legal rights.
- 31. Respondent has a clear, present, nondiscretionary, and mandatory duty to comply with Education Code sections 87482.5(a), 87605, 87607, 87608, 87608.5, and 87610
  - 32. There are no available administrative remedies for Petitioner to exhaust. The

California Education Code is not self-executing and Petitions for Writ of Mandate are the vehicle commonly used to vindicate Education Code rights. E.g. *Theiler v. Ventura County Community College Dist.*, (2011) 198 Cal.App.4th 852; *McGuire v. Governing Bd.*, (1984) 161 Cal.App.3d 87.

- 33. The only way to seek relief for a violation of these Education Code rights is through a Petition for a Writ of Mandate; there is no administrative hearing process for a violation of California Education Code section 87482.5 (b). E.g. Theiler v. Ventura County Community College Dist., 198 Cal.App.4th 852; McGuire v. Governing Bd., (1984) 161 Cal.App.3d 871.
- 34. The Education Code does not establish a cause of action to enforce these provisions through an ordinary action for damages. Petitioner must file this Petition for Writ of Mandate in order to obtain relief for a violation of her employment rights under the Education Code. Mandamus is the proper remedy for violations of the Education Code where no other relief is specifically provided. See E.g. Entezampour v. North Orange County Community College Dist., (2010) 190 Cal.App.4th 832.
- 35. Regardless, Petitioner has sought to resolve this matter with Respondent. On June 5, 2020, Petitioner's attorney sent letters to Respondent College placing Respondent on notice of Petitioner's misclassification. (Declaration of Matthew Chevedden in Support of Petition for Writ of Mandate, (hereinafter "Chevedden Decl."), ¶¶2, 3, and Exhibit A thereto).
- 36. Petitioner, through her attorney, also sent a letter to Respondent's Board on December 21, 2020, which constituted a claim pursuant to the California Tort Claims Act, California Government Code sections 905 et. seq. (Chevedden Decl., ¶4, and Exhibit C.)
- 37. Respondent, though counsel, sent a February 10, 2021, Rejection of Tort Claim letter, setting out six month (August 10, 2021) deadline by which Petitioner must file a claim. (Chevedden Decl. ¶ 6 and Exhibit E).
- 38. Petitioner has exhausted all available administrative remedies required to be pursued by him, and Petitioner has fulfilled any administrative prerequisites to bringing this Petition as described above.

- 39. Petitioner has not been able to resolve this matter with Respondent College. (See Chevedden Decl., ¶2, 3, 9 and Exhibits A and B.)
- 40. Petitioner has no plain, speedy, and adequate remedy at law to challenge Respondent's conduct other than the relief sought in this Petition for violation of her rights under the Education Code.
  - 41. Petitioner filed this Petition in a timely fashion.
- 42. Petitioner has not engaged in any delay that has prejudiced Respondent. Petitioner has attempted to resolve this issue through both formal and informal means multiple times without success.
- 43. As a result of Respondent's above-described actions, and in the event Respondent is not compelled by this Court to perform its legal duty, Petitioner will be irreparably damaged.

## **RELIEF**

WHEREFORE, Petitioner respectfully prays that:

- 1. This Court issue a Writ compelling Respondent to comply with the mandatory provisions of the California Education Code sections.
  - 2. This Court issue a Writ of Mandate ordering Respondent to:
    - a) Classify Respondent as a 3<sup>rd</sup> year Contract Employee;
  - b) Pay Petitioner any difference between what she was paid as an temporary faculty member and what she should have been paid as a full-time contract employee; and
- 3. This Court award Petitioner the costs of this action and/or reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1021.5 and/or California Government Code section 800 and/or any other applicable statute;
  - 4. This Court grant such other relief as may be just and proper.

Dated: August 5, 2021.

LANGENKAMP, CURTIS & PRICE, LLP

By: MATTHEW CHEVEDDEN
Attorneys for Petitioner

Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate

## **VERIFICATION**

I, Dana Demercurio, hereby declare under penalty of perjury that I read the attached Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate, I know the contents thereof to be true and correct.

Executed at Stockton\_\_\_\_\_, California on August 5\_\_\_\_, 2021.

DANA DEMERCURIO

Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate