

SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA, COUNTY OF ORANGE

North Justice Center
1275 N. Berkeley Ave
Fullerton , CA 92838

SHORT TITLE: Baldwin & Sons, Inc. vs. California Regional Water Quality Control Board San Diego Region

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/ELECTRONIC SERVICE

CASE NUMBER:
30-2022-01291447-CU-WM-NJC

I certify that I am not a party to this cause. I certify that that the following document(s), Judgment dated 12/22/25, was transmitted electronically by an Orange County Superior Court email server on December 23, 2025, at 8:57:36 AM PST. The business mailing address is Orange County Superior Court, 700 Civic Center Dr. W, Santa Ana, California 92701. Pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 1013b, I electronically served the document(s) on the persons identified at the email addresses listed below:

GATZKE DILLON & BALLANCE LLP
KTEAL@GDANDB.COM

GATZKE DILLON & BALLANCE LLP
STEE@GDANDB.COM

ROB BONTA
JOSH.CAPLAN@DOJ.CA.GOV

Clerk of the Court, by:



, Deputy

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING/ELECTRONIC SERVICE

FILED
SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE

DEC 22 2025 *W*

DAVID H. YAMASAKI, Clerk of the Court

BY: R. CASTRO, DEPUTY

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

**SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ORANGE, NORTH JUSTICE CENTER**

BALDWIN & SONS, INC.; SUNRANCH)
CAPITAL PARTNERS, LLC; SUNRISE)
PACIFIC CONSTRUCTION, INC., SRC-PH)
INVESTMENTS, LLC; BALDWIN & SONS,)
LLC, SHAWN M. BALDWIN; RANDALL G.)
BONE; and JOSE CAPATI,)

Petitioners,

v.

CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER)
QUALITY CONTROL BOARD SAN DIEGO)
REGION; and DOES 1 through)
10, inclusive,)

Respondents.

Case No.: 30-2022-01291447-CU-WM-NJC

Judge: Nathan Nhan Vu
Department: N15

~~PROPOSED~~ JUDGMENT GRANTING
PEREMPTORY WRIT OF
ADMINISTRATIVE MANDAMUS

Petition Filed: November 4, 2022

1 Petitioners, Baldwin & Sons, Inc.; Sunranch Capital Partners, LLC; Sunrise Pacific
2 Construction, Inc.; SRC-PH Investments, LLC; Baldwin & Sons, LLC; Shawn M. Baldwin; Randall
3 G. Bone; and Jose Capati (collectively, Petitioners) filed the Petition in the captioned-action
4 challenging the Administrative Civil Liability Order No. R9-2022-0094 (Order No. R9-2022-0094)
5 adopted by Respondent California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region
6 (Respondent) on June 8, 2022.

7 The hearing on the merits was held before the Honorable Nathan Nhan Vu, presiding, in
8 Department N15 of the Orange County Superior Court on the following dates: February 20, 2025;
9 February 21, 2025; March 20, 2025; March 21, 2025; and April 17, 2025. Stephen F. Tee of Gatzke
10 Dillon & Ballance LLP and Geri Bone of InnovaCounsel appeared on behalf of Petitioners. Joshua
11 Caplan and Natalie Collins of the Office of the Attorney General appeared on behalf of Respondent.

12 The court reviewed the administrative record, which was lodged with the court and
13 admitted into evidence; the briefs and papers submitted by Petitioners and Respondent; and the
14 arguments of counsel, and the matter was submitted for decision. The court entered its Ruling on
15 Submitted Matter on September 4, 2025 (ROA #159), which represented the court's final
16 decision on the merits of this proceeding.

17 **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED, THAT:**

- 18 1. For the reasons set forth in this Court's Ruling on Submitted Matter, dated September 4,
19 2025, Judgment is hereby entered granting in part and denying in part Petitioner's
20 Verified Petition for Writ of Mandate.
- 21 2. A peremptory writ of administrative mandate shall issue under seal of this Court,
22 commanding Respondent to set aside Order No. R9-2022-0094.
- 23 3. The peremptory writ of administrative mandate shall further remand the matter to
24 Respondent, commanding Respondent to vacate Order No. R9-2022-0094, and to issue a
25 new order consistent with the court's Ruling on Submitted Matter, the peremptory writ of
26 administrative mandate, and applicable law and regulations.
- 27 4. The Court reserves jurisdiction over any timely claim for an award of costs and
28 attorneys' fees.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

5. The court retains jurisdiction over this matter to ensure compliance with the peremptory writ of administrative mandate issued pursuant to this Judgment.

Dated: DEC 22 2025


HON. NATHAN NHAN VU
JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT