

CLAIM AGAINST THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

(Please print legibly or type. Please do not use pencil)

Claimant's Name:	Christina Corpus		
Claimant's Address:	c/o James Quadra, Quadra & Coll, 1 Embarcadero Center, Ste. 1200		
City: San Francisco	State: CA	ZIP Code: 94111	Phone: 415-426-3502

Amount of Claim:	\$ In excess of \$35,000 (See Exhibit A attached hereto.)
------------------	---

Address to which notices are to be sent (if different than above):

Date of incident:	___/___/___	Location of Incident:
See Exhibit A		See Exhibit A

How did it occur (describe damage or loss):

See Exhibit A

Name of Public Employee(s) causing injury, damage, or loss (if known):

1.	See Exhibit A
2.	

Itemization of Claim: List Item(s) that total the amount above:

1. See Exhibit A	\$
2.	\$
3.	\$
4.	\$
TOTAL	\$

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct:

Dated at San Francisco, California, on April 10, 2026

Signature of Claimant's attorney (James Quadra): _____

Return to: CLAIMS, Board of Supervisors, 500 County Center, 5th FL., Redwood City, CA 94063

EXHIBIT A TO CLAIM OF CHRISTINA CORPUS VS SAN MATEO COUNTY

DESCRIPTION OF INJURY / LOSS

Claimant Christina Corpus suffered severe reputational harm, loss of professional standing, and loss of employment opportunities as a result of false and defamatory statements made and republished by San Mateo County officials and agents, and provided to the press with knowledge that the statements were false. These statements falsely portrayed Corpus as dishonest, corrupt, engaged in misconduct, subject to conflicts of interest, and unfit to serve as Sheriff. As a direct result, Corpus was removed from elected office, forced into retirement, and lost her peace officer standards and training certification.

FACTUAL BASIS OF CLAIM – DEFAMATORY STATEMENTS AND PUBLICATIONS

Prior to being sworn in as Sheriff, Claimant Corpus served more than two decades with the San Mateo County Sheriff's Office. During her career, she held various positions including Deputy Sheriff, School Resource Officer, Internal Investigations Sergeant, Lieutenant, and Captain. Her assignments included school safety, internal affairs, personnel investigations, jail oversight, and supervisory command functions. Throughout this period, she accrued vested peace-officer retirement benefits and maintained continuous POST certification.

Claimant Corpus advanced in an agency historically dominated by white male leadership. During her rise through the ranks, she was frequently the only woman and one of the only Latinas in supervisory or command roles. Her career progression occurred against a backdrop of gender hostility and resistance to women in law-enforcement leadership.

Soon after she took over as Sheriff, Claimant Corpus engaged in protected reform activities, including reorganization of command staff, enforcement of discipline, ending unsustainable overtime practices, and implementation of structural reforms within the Sheriff's Office. In response, County employees engaged in baseless conduct undermining her authority, questioning her competence, and exploring her replacement despite no conduct that merited her removal from office. This conduct was motivated not only because of Claimant Corpus's reforms, but also by animus against Claimant Corpus' gender and ethnicity/race, and was designed to preserve the status quo of white male control over the Sheriff's Office.

Lacking any lawful basis to remove Claimant Corpus from office, County employees engaged in a sustained course of defamatory publications that led to Claimant's removal from her position as Sheriff on October 14, 2025 and continued thereafter.

As part of their campaign of defamation, County officials commissioned an allegedly unbiased report prepared by LaDoris H. Cordell (the "Cordell Report") which it then released on November 12, 2024. That report contained false allegations that Claimant Corpus engaged in an "inappropriate personal relationship" with her Chief of Staff. The report did not identify any specific conduct, dates, or corroborating evidence. It relied on inference and innuendo and expressly lacked supporting documentation or witness testimony based on personal knowledge. Despite the absence of evidence, the report was falsely framed as misconduct and publicly disseminated by County employees and the County's agent Cordell. The copy of the report provided by County employees to the public was missing 29 pages of exculpatory information. County officials and employees knowingly released the incomplete report to change the favorable perception the voters had of Claimant Corpus. As of April 9, 2026, the County of San Mateo still has the incomplete Cordell Report posted on their official website.

County agents and employees published false statements that Claimant Corpus traveled to Hawaii with her Chief of Staff as supposed evidence of misconduct or favoritism. There is no documentary evidence supporting this claim, including no travel records, receipts, or witness testimony. In fact, the evidence proves that although Claimant Corpus and her Chief of Staff were both on the same flight to Hawaii, they were not traveling together and that that trip predated Claimant Corpus taking office as Sheriff. Nonetheless, County employees and agents used these false statements to support the false claims of impropriety against Corpus.

The Cordell Report and subsequent communications by County officials also put forward false and defamatory statements that Claimant Corpus engaged in a "conflict of interest" in connection with hiring and compensation decisions. In fact, all such decisions were processed through the County's Human Resources Department, complied with standard procedures, and did not violate any rules, regulations or statutes. Claimant Corpus also consulted with County Counsel when needed relating to administrative decisions

The conflict of interest assertions were simply false statements of fact that County officials published with full knowledge of their falsity. Supervisors Noelia Corzo and Raymond "Ray" Mueller held press conferences and broadcasted on their social media pages telling the

public that Claimant Corpus was corrupt and could not be trusted. Supervisor Corzo left Claimant Corpus a threatening voice mail message urging her to resign otherwise “Subpoenas’ would start coming her way.

Following publication of the Cordell Report, members of the County’s Board of Supervisors publicly stated that Corpus was dishonest, corrupt, unstable, and had endangered public safety. These false assertions were made as statements of fact rather than allegations or opinions and were made before any adjudicative process or evidentiary hearing.

The Board then adopted a No-Confidence Resolution amplifying the false accusations. Supervisors publicly asserted there was clear evidence of corruption and that Claimant Corpus could not be trusted despite the lack of sworn testimony, corroborating evidence, or procedural safeguards in the underlying so called investigation. These untrue statements were widely disseminated and severely damaged Claimant Corpus’s reputation.

In 2025, outside counsel retained by County officials prepared a Notice of Intent to Remove that recycled the same false statements, including the alleged affair, conflict of interest, and misconduct, without requiring sworn testimony or corroboration. These false allegations were republished in official proceedings and communications.

On October 14, 2025, the Board voted to remove Corpus from office based on the false statements.

On October 15, 2025, the County and its agents communicated with the California Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) and transmitted false statements against the Corpus, which resulted in POST suspending Corpus’s POST certification without notice or hearing. The transmission of false information to POST constituted publication to a third party of the defamatory accusations and directly resulted in Claimant Corpus being barred from law enforcement employment statewide.

The defamatory statements described above constitute defamation per se because they directly impugn Claimant Corpus’ honesty, integrity, and fitness to perform her profession. County Officials knowingly published these false statements to third parties accusing Claimant Corpus of corruption and misconduct without conducting a procedurally sound investigation, without sworn evidence, and without providing Claimant Corpus an opportunity to respond before publication. The reliance on anonymous and hearsay statements, combined with the absence of corroborating evidence, demonstrates reckless disregard for the truth. In knowingly

disseminating the false statements described above about Claimant Corpus, County officials acted with actual malice.

COUNTY OFFICIALS, EMPLOYEES AND AGENTS INVOLVED

Individuals currently known whose actions contributed to the Claimant Corpus’ damages include:

David Pine	Ryan Monaghan	Valerie Barnes
Warren Slocum	Carlos Tapia	Jennifer Valdez
Noelia Corzo	James Emerson	Hector Acosta
Jackie Speier	Christopher Hsiung	Rocio Kiryczun
Raymond Mueller	John Keene	Daniel Reynolds
David Canepa	Jonathan Sebring	Joseph Fava
Lisa Guethier	Mark Myers	Jimmy Chan
Michael Callagy	Frank Dal Porto	Kenneth Binder
LaDoris H. Cordell	William Fogarty	Brandon Hensel
Kim Pearson	Richard Cheecov	David Weidner
John Nibbelin	Eamonn Allen	

DAMAGES AND AMOUNT OF CLAIM

The defamatory statements described above constitute defamation per se because they directly impugn Claimant Corpus’s honesty, integrity, and fitness to perform her profession.

The defamatory statements caused Claimant Corpus substantial harm.

- Claimant Corpus was removed from elected office, nullifying the will of the voters.
- She was coerced into retirement under threat of losing health coverage.
- Her POST certification was suspended, barring her from law enforcement employment statewide
- Her reputation for honesty, integrity, and professional competence was severely damaged.
- She suffered loss of income, loss of benefits, other employment-related compensation and future earning capacity, as well as emotional distress.

The total amount of damages exceeds \$35,000 and would constitute an unlimited civil case. The precise computation will include salary schedules, benefit valuations, retirement

calculations, and expert economic analysis. Preliminary estimates place total damages well in excess of statutory limited civil thresholds.