



MINUTES

July 14, 2026

BOARD OF APPEALS HEARING

9:00 a.m.
City Council Chambers
Roseville Electric Building
116 S. Grant Street, 1st Floor
Roseville, CA

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Sharon Lawin called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. in the City Council Chambers.

2. ROLL CALL (SILENT)

The following Hearing Panel members were present:

Sharon Lawin
Louise Santiago

The following Staff members were present:

Travis Cochran, Senior Deputy City Attorney
Melissa Lipp, Board Secretary

3. IDENTIFICATION OF CHAIR

Chairperson for the July 14, 2026 hearing was Sharon Lawin.

4. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairperson Sharon Lawin led the audience in the Pledge of Allegiance.

5. PUBLIC COMMENT

No one from the public offered any comments.

6. SWEAR IN

Chairperson Sharon Lawin administered the Oath to those in attendance who would be offering testimony at the hearing.

7. MATTERS TO BE HEARD

7.1. Administrative Citation No.: 21041

Appellant: Phillip Lee, 1005 Palos Verdes Court, Roseville, CA 95661

- Roseville Municipal Code Section 7.11.010, Leash Law, One Count
- Roseville Municipal Code Section 7.16.010, Failure to License, Three Counts

A. Staff Report:

Animal Control Officer Marissa Terry offered testimony regarding the Staff Report (Exhibit 7.1-A) and Notice of Violation (Exhibit 7.1-B).

Per RMC Section 2.50.060(D), the Staff Report was submitted to the City of Roseville Attorney's Office prior to the hearing and was provided to the Appellant and the panel members in advance of the hearing.

Complainant's Statement:

Complainant Melanie Hirsch offered testimony in support of the complaint.

B. Appellant's Response:

Request for Hearing:

Appellant's Request for Hearing form (Exhibit 7.1-C) was received by the Roseville City Attorney's Office on April 06, 2026 and was provided to the panel in advance of the hearing for review.

Appellant Phillip Lee offered testimony in support of the appeal.

C. Rebuttals and Panel Questions:

Animal Control Officer Marissa Terry offered rebuttal testimony

Complainant Melanie Hirsch offered rebuttal testimony.

Appellant Phillip Lee offered rebuttal testimony and answered panel questions.

D. Panel Discussion and Decision:

The panel discussed the evidence and testimony presented for Administrative Citation No. 21041.

In regard to the following violations of the Roseville Municipal Code Section 7.12.010, Leash Law, One Count, and Roseville Municipal Code Section 7.16.010, Failure to License, Three Counts, a motion was made by Louise Santiago and seconded by Sharon Lawin to deny the appeal and uphold the citation by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation occurred and that the appellant is the responsible party.

The motion passed with the following vote:

AYES: ALL

NOES: NONE

Chairperson Sharon Lawin signed the decision form (Exhibit 7.1-D), asked the Appellant to see staff for the paperwork, and informed the parties that they may file a petition for review with the Superior Court in Placer County within 20 days.

7.2. Administrative Citation No.: 22513

Appellant: Julie Ann Elizabeth LaHiff, 1736 Chilton Drive, Roseville, CA 95747

Roseville Municipal Code Section 7.12.010, Leash Law, Two Counts

At 9:19 a.m., the Appellant was not present. According to Section VII(A) of the rules for Administrative Hearing Procedures, if the responsible party fails to appear for the hearing within 15 minutes after the hearing commences, the responsible party's appeal will be automatically denied.

A. Panel Decision:

In regard to the violations of Roseville Municipal Code Section 7.12.010, Leash Law, Two Counts, a motion was made by Louise Santiago and seconded by Sharon Lawin to deny the appeal and uphold Administrative Citation No. 22513 because Appellant failed to appear.

The motion passed with the following vote:

AYES: ALL

NOES: NONE

Chairperson Sharon Lawin signed the decision form (Exhibit 7.2-A).

7.3. Administrative Citation No.: 21040

Appellant: Travis Little

Roseville Municipal Code Section 7.12.010, Leash Law, Two Counts, First Offense

Roseville Municipal Code Section 7.16.010, Failure to License, One Count, Third Offense

Roseville Municipal Code Section 7.16.010, Failure to License, One Count, Fourth Offense

Roseville Municipal Code Section 7.14.010, Removal of Dog Defecation, Second Offense

A. Staff Report:

Animal Control Officer Brianna Chacon-Raoul offered testimony regarding the Staff Report (Exhibit 7.3-A) and Notice of Violation (Exhibit 7.3-B).

Per RMC Section 2.50.060(D), the Staff Report was submitted to the City of Roseville Attorney's Office prior to the hearing and was provided to the Appellant and the panel members in advance of the hearing.

Complainant's Statement:

Complainant Angela McMindes offered testimony in support of the complaint.

B. Appellant's Response:

Request for Hearing:

Appellant's Request for Hearing form (Exhibit 7.3-C) was received by the Roseville City Attorney's Office on April 21, 2026 and was provided to the panel in advance of the hearing for review.

Appellant Travis Little testified in support of the appeal.

C. Rebuttals and Panel Questions:

Animal Control Officer Brianna Chacon-Raoul offered rebuttal testimony.

Complainant Angela McMIndes offered rebuttal testimony.

Appellant Travis Little offered rebuttal testimony and answered panel questions.

D. Panel Discussion and Decision:

The panel discussed the evidence and testimony presented for Administrative Citation No. 21040.

In regard to the following violation of the Roseville Municipal Code Section 7.12.010, Leash Law, Two Counts, a motion was made by Louise Santiago and seconded by Sharon Lawin to deny the appeal and uphold the citation but waive the fine in the interest of justice.

The motion passed with the following vote:

AYES: ALL

NOES: NONE

In regard to the following violations of the Roseville Municipal Code Section 7.16.010, Failure to License, One Count, Third Offense, and Roseville Municipal Code Section 7.16.010, Failure to License, One Count, Fourth Offense, a motion was made by Louise Santiago and seconded by Sharon Lawin to deny the appeal and uphold the citation but waive the fine in the interest of justice.

The motion passed with the following vote:

AYES: ALL

NOES: NONE

In regard to the following violation of the Roseville Municipal Code Section 7.14.010, Removal of Dog Defecation, Second Offense, a motion was made by Louise Santiago and seconded by Sharon Lawin to deny the appeal and uphold the citation because the City/Complainant proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation occurred and that the appellant is the responsible party.

The motion passed with the following vote:

AYES: ALL

NOES: NONE

Chairperson Sharon Lawin signed the decision form (Exhibit 7.3-D), asked the Appellant to see staff for the paperwork, and informed the parties that they may file a petition for review with the Superior Court in Placer County within 20 days.

8. ADJOURNMENT

A motion was made by Louise Santiago and seconded by Sharon Lawin to adjourn the hearing.

AYES: ALL

NOES: NONE

Chairperson Sharon Lawin adjourned the July 14, 2026 hearing at 9:40 a.m.

Melissa Lipp
Board Secretary

EXHIBIT 7.1-A



Roseville Police Department
1051 Junction Blvd
Roseville, CA 95678

Troy Bergstrom, Chief of Police

Administrative Citation Appeal Hearing

Staff Report

Date of Hearing: Tuesday, July 14th, 2026 @ 09:00 AM
Appellant: Phillip Lee @ 1005 Palos Verdes Ct.
Citation: 21041

Violation: RMC § 7.12.010 Leash law (1 count)

No person shall permit or allow any dog to run at large. This section may be cited as the "leash law."

RMC § 7.04.060 at large defined.

"At large" means the following:

1.

Off the premises of the owner or the person having care, custody, control or possession of the dog unless such dog is restrained by a leash or adequate enclosure. The leash shall not exceed six feet in length and shall be of sufficient strength to restrain the dog and must be held continuously by a responsible person capable of controlling the dog.

2.

On the premises of the owner or the person having care, custody, control or possession of the dog unless such dog is restrained by means adequate and sufficient to prevent the dog from leaving the premises or under the control and in the immediate presence of the owner or person having care, custody, control or possession of the dog.

B.

A dog shall not be considered "at large" if it is:

1.

A guide dog, signal dog, or service dog as defined in Section 54.1 of the California Civil Code, as may be amended, while performing the duties it is trained to perform;

2.

Assisting or in training to assist a peace officer who is engaged in law enforcement duties;

3.

Enrolled and actively participating in a commercial dog training or obedience class, exhibition or competition;

4.

Within the confines of a city-designated dog park and licensed pursuant to this chapter;

5.

Securely confined in a vehicle.

RMC § 7.16.010 Licensing (3 counts)

A dog or cat over the age of four months must be licensed according to the provisions of this chapter.

Narrative:

On March 30th, 2026, at 1029 hours, Roseville Police Animal Control dispatch received a telephone call from Melanie Hirsch to report an ongoing issue with her neighbor's dog located at 1005 Palos Verdes Ct.

On March 30th, 2026, at approximately 1135 hours, I spoke to Melanie via telephone. Melanie stated that at approximately 0940 hours one of the dogs from the address of 1005 Palos Verdes was loose. The dog was described as a white dog with black spots and a long tail. The dog was in the street and on the sidewalk. When Melanie walked out of her home, she stated that Phillip Lee called the dog back home. Melanie requested that a citizen citation be issued for leash law.

On March 30th, 2026, at approximately 1155 hours, I spoke to dog owner Phillip Lee on the telephone. Phillip stated that he had three dogs and the dog in question belonged to a friend and he was just the custodian of the dog. Phillip claimed that the dog was not violating the leash law and is allowed to go onto the sidewalk and into the court. I educated on leash law and advised that he would be receiving a citizen citation.

Respectfully Submitted,
M. Terry, Badge #3100
Animal Control Officer

EXHIBIT 7.1-B

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
NOTICE OF CITATION 2026-18612 21041

Date: 3-30-26 Time: 1203 Day of Week: Monday

Name (First, Middle, Last): Phillip, Randolph, Lee

Residence Address: 1003 Palas Verdes Ct
Roseville CA 95661

Business Address:

Driver's Lic. No. State Class Date of Birth

Sex Hair Eyes Height Weight Decent Age

Description of Animal (If Applicable)

Breed: Large dog Color: White/black

Sex:

Vehicle Make

License #:

Model:

Color:

Year:

Location of Violation

Palas Verdes Ct.

Date / Time of Violation

3/30/26 0940

Code / Ordinance

Description of Violation

RMC 7.12.010 Leash law x 1

RMC 7.16.010 Licensing x 3

☒ VIOLATIONS NOT COMMITTED IN MY PRESENCE, CERTIFIED ON INFORMATION AND BELIEF.

I DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Date: 3-30-26

Issuing Officer:
Badge No.

M. TERRY #3100

COMPLAINING PARTY

X Signature:

Complaint

I HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS CITATION.

X Signature:

Complaint

YOU DO NOT NEED TO DO ANYTHING AT THIS TIME.
YOU WILL RECEIVE NOTICE BY MAIL WITHIN 14 DAYS.

CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE (916) 774-5325

1 - City Attorney Copy 2 - Defendant Copy 3 - Issue Dept Copy

EXHIBIT 7.1-C



View Edit Report Activity

ADMINISTRATIVE CITATION APPEAL - REQUEST FOR HEARING 2026-04-06 12:33 PM(PST)

Completely fill out all required information prior to submitting. The City Attorney's office will contact you once a hearing date has been set.

Submissions received later than 30 days after the date of the citation notification letter will not be accepted pursuant to Roseville Municipal Code § 2.50.060.

***Name:** Phil Lee

***Citation Number:** 21041

***Home Address:** 1005 Palos Verdes Court

***City** Roseville

***Zip** 95661

Mailing Address

(if different from above): 1005 Palos Verdes Court

***Phone Number:** 9163163379

***Email:** phillee7@comcast.net



One of the dogs that is not licensed was a pet I was watching for a friend and don't know if its licensed, she is from Sacramento. I have two pets and I know they are not licensed and will take care of mine. The dog in question is my friends dog that I am no longer watching and ran out of my house when I went to check the mail and greeted my neighbor. The dog was on my property until she seen my neighbor and ran to great her. This neighbor (Melanie Hirsh) has had problems with multiple neighbors, has had several complaints for her dogs barking, abandoned cars and I also had to get a TRO against her since she moved her. This is retaliation and the claim is unfounded and I should have to pay the leash law or the third animal fine. I no longer watch the dog and havent since the day in question. I am also moving at the end of the month so I told my friend she needed to find someone else.

***Reason
for
Appeal:**

☒ By checking this box, I certify that I am the individual named on the citation and am appealing the administrative citation issued to me.

☒ I certify under penalty of perjury that the information above is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Submit Cancel



City of Roseville

311 Vernon St

Roseville, California 95678

[Contact Us](#)

[Agendas & Minutes](#)

[Open Data](#)

[Find My District](#)

[Stay Informed](#)

City of Roseville | All Rights Reserved | Privacy Policy | Powered by CivicLive | © 2026 CivicLive

EXHIBIT 7.1-D

CITATION APPEAL DECISION

Name of Appellant: Phillip Lee

Citation No.: 21041

FIRST VIOLATION

Roseville Municipal Code Section: 7.12.010, Leash Law, One Count

- ☒ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation(s) occurred and that the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence:
- ☐ That the violation(s) occurred; and/or
- ☐ That the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION but waive the fine in the interest of justice.
- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the appellant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION at the request of the City/Complainant.

Name of Appellant: Phillip Lee

Citation Number: 21041

SECOND VIOLATION

Roseville Municipal Code Section: 7.16.010, Licensing, Three Counts

- ☒ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation(s) occurred and that the appellant is the responsible party._
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence:
- ☐ That the violation(s) occurred; and/or
- ☐ That the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION but waive the fine in the interest of justice.
- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the appellant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION at the request of the City/Complainant.

Dated: July 14, 2026

By: 
Sharon Lawin
Hearing Panel Chairperson

Notice to Appellant: Under California Government Code Section 53069.4, any appeal of today's Hearing Panel decision must be filed with Placer County Superior Court within twenty (20) days of today's date.

EXHIBIT 7.2-A

CITATION APPEAL DECISION

Name of Appellant: Julie Ann Elizabeth LaHiff

Citation No.: 22513

VIOLATION

Roseville Municipal Code Section: 7.12.010, Leash Law, Two Counts

- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation(s) occurred and that the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence:
- ☐ That the violation(s) occurred; and/or
- ☐ That the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION but waive the fine in the interest of justice.
- ☒ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the appellant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION at the request of the City/Complainant.

Dated: July 14, 2026

By: Sharon Lawin
Sharon Lawin
Hearing Panel Chairperson

Notice to Appellant: Under California Government Code Section 53069.4, any appeal of today's Hearing Panel decision must be filed with Placer County Superior Court within twenty (20) days of today's date.



City Attorney
311 Vernon Street
Roseville, California 95678

CITATION APPEAL DECISION

Name of Appellant: Julie Ann Elizabeth LaHiff

Citation No.: 22513

VIOLATION

Roseville Municipal Code Section: 7.12.010, Leash Law, Two Counts

- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation(s) occurred and that the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence:
- ☐ That the violation(s) occurred; and/or
- ☐ That the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION but waive the fine in the interest of justice.
- ☒ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the appellant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION at the request of the City/Complainant.

Dated: July 14, 2026

By: 
Sharon Lawin
Hearing Panel Chairperson

Notice to Appellant: Under California Government Code Section 53069.4, any appeal of today's Hearing Panel decision must be filed with Placer County Superior Court within twenty (20) days of today's date.

EXHIBIT 7.3-A



Roseville Police Department
1051 Junction Blvd
Roseville, CA 95678

Jeff Beigh, Chief of Police

Administrative Citation Appeal Hearing

Staff Report

Date of Hearing: Tuesday, July 14th, 2026 @ 09:00 AM
Appellant: Travis Little @ 317 Pleasant St unit C
Citation: 21040

Violation: RMC 7.12.010 Leash law (2 counts)

No person shall permit or allow any dog to run at large.

Additional Information: RMC Section 7.04.060 defines "at large" as follows:

A. "At large" means the following:

1. Off the premises of the owner or the person having care, custody, control, or possession of the dog unless such dog is restrained by a leash or adequate enclosure. The leash shall not exceed six feet in length and shall be of sufficient strength to restrain the dog and must be held continuously by a responsible person capable of controlling the dog.

2. On the premises of the owner or the person having care, custody, control, or possession of the dog unless such dog is restrained by means adequate and sufficient to prevent the dog from leaving the premises or under the control and in the immediate presence of the owner or person having care, custody, control, or possession of the dog.

Violation: RMC 7.16.010 Licensing (2 counts)

A dog or cat over the age of four months must be licensed according to the provisions of this chapter.

Violation: RMC 7.14.010 Removal of Dog Defecation (1 count)

- A. It is unlawful for the owner or person having the custody of any dog to fail to immediately remove and dispose of in a sanitary manner, by placing in a closed or sealed container and depositing in a trash receptacle, any feces deposited by such dog upon public property or upon private property not exclusively owned or controlled by the owner or person having the custody of such dog.
- B. Any person who has the charge or control of any dog in a location other than on private property exclusively owned or controlled by such person, or on the property of the owner of the dog, shall have in his or her possession a suitable wrapper, bag or container for the purpose of complying with the requirements of this section. The failure of any person to carry such a wrapper, bag or container when in charge or control of any dog in a location other than on property exclusively owned or controlled by such person, or on the property of the owner of the dog, shall constitute a violation of this section.
- C. Subsections A and B of this section shall not apply to the proper use of guide dogs, service dogs, or signal dogs as defined in Section 54.1 of the California Civil Code, as may be amended.
- D. It is unlawful for the owner or person having the custody of any dog to allow its feces to accumulate or remain on the ground or other surface on his or her private property to the

extent that the accumulation creates a nuisance. A nuisance, for purposes of this subsection, includes, but is not limited to, feces accumulation that interferes with the use or enjoyment of any neighboring property as a result of odors or the attraction or breeding of vermin or vectors.

(Ord. 6268 § 1, 2020)

Narrative:

March 22nd, 2026 @ approximately 1634 hours

I contacted Angela due to her leaving me a voicemail reporting a neighbor continuing to allow his dogs off leash and not picking up his dogs feces.

Animal Control is not a witness to the reported violations. The violations of RMC Section 7.12.010, 7.14.010, and 7.16.010 are based on the statements of the complainant and appellant.

I contacted Angela who stated the following in summary; Angela stated that on March 18th, at approximately 1736 hours her neighbor allowed his two dogs off leash in Mango Aly, she advised this is an ongoing issue as well as him not picking up the dogs' feces. She requested to pursue a citizen citation due to a warning being issued to the dog owner on February 3rd and no change occurring.

I completed citizen's citation #21040 on behalf of Angela Mcmindes, regarding dog owner Travis Little, and forwarded the citation to the City Attorney's office for review.

Past History:

The following citations have been issued to Travis Little, which were not appealed and remain unpaid:

12/17/25 - Citation 22210 – Failure to License, 1 Count, First Offense

03/01/26 - Citation 22208 – Failure to License, 1 Count First Offense, 1 Count Second Offense, Removal of Dog Defecation, First Offense

03/10/26 – Citation 21039 – Failure to License, 1 Count Second Offense, 1 Count Third Offense

As of June 27th, 2026, PetData shows two current licenses for Travis' residence.

Respectfully Submitted,
B. Chacon, Badge #3090
Animal Control Officer

EXHIBIT 7.3-B

CITY OF ROSEVILLE
NOTICE OF CITATION 26-16870 21040

Date: 3/22/2026 Time: 11:27 hrs Day of Week: Sunday
Name (First, Middle, Last): JAMES, James, Little
Residence Address: 317 Pleasant St Unit C
Roseville, CA, 95678

Business Address:

Driver's Lic. No.: State: Class: Date of Birth:
Sex: Hair: Eyes: Height: Weight: Decent: Age:

Description of Animal (If Applicable): See back
Breed: Color: Age: Sex:
Vehicle Make: License #: Year:
Location of Violation: 1440 Hwy 1 Alta Ave
Date / Time of Violation: 3/18/2026 11:36 hours
Code / Ordinance: Description of Violation:

PMC 7.12.010 X2 Wash Law
PMC 7.16.010 X2 Licensing
PMC 7.14.010 Removal of dog defecation

VIOLATIONS NOT COMMITTED IN MY PRESENCE, CERTIFIED ON INFORMATION AND BELIEF.

DECLARE UNDER PENALTY OF PERJURY UNDER THE LAWS OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA, THAT THE FOREGOING IS TRUE AND CORRECT.

Date: 3/22/2026 Issuing Officer: Chalon-Raoul
Badge No: #3090

COMPLAINING PARTY
Signature: Complaint

HEREBY ACKNOWLEDGE RECEIPT OF THIS CITATION.

Signature: Complaint

YOU DO NOT NEED TO DO ANYTHING AT THIS TIME.
YOU WILL RECEIVE NOTICE BY MAIL WITHIN 14 DAYS.
CITY ATTORNEY'S OFFICE (916) 774-5325

1 - City Attorney Copy 2 - Defendant Copy 3 - Issue Dept Copy

Angela Memindes



Angela is reporting her neighbor who allows his two dogs off leash in the city and does not pick up his dogs feces. One dog is a yellow lab and the other is a golden retriever.

AO B. Chalon-Raoul #3090

NA 3085

MAR 22 2026

EXHIBIT 7.3-C

From: noreply@revize.com
To: [Finch, Sydney](#)
Subject: Contact Us
Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2026 3:56:17 PM

External: This email was sent by a person from outside your organization. Exercise caution when clicking links, opening attachments, or taking further action.

Name = Travis Little

Citation-Numbe = 21040

Home-Address = 317 pleasant st

City = Roseville

Zip = 95678

Mailing-Address-if-different-from-above = 224 capri pl , Lincoln ca 95648

Phone-Number = [REDACTED]

Email = [REDACTED]

Reason-for-Appeal = Due to issue with mailing services and a mass clearing of mail from all unit mailboxes, I was not able to receive the proper documentation in time to register my dogs. I apologize for the inconvenience, and they will be immediately registered. As for the leash law charges, I was uninformed that you could not play fetch with your dog here in Roseville. I understand now after receiving the cities letter that it is not allowed. As any normal person, this law sounds very surprising at first. As for Ms. McMIndes, me and the rest of our neighbors can agree she has been a constant harassment to the neighborhood adults, teenagers, toddlers and especially pets. After explaining to her multiple times that I pick up my dogs poop, and there's many other animals that come through this ally, she proceeds to go out of her way to verbally harass and bully me constantly. I have caught her in the act of poisoning the patch of grass my dogs go to the bathroom on, she explained to me it was to keep my dogs away and that it was bad for them. Note, this grass area would be the property belonging to residents on Pleasant street, and not Grove street. Ms. McMIndes harasses and claims that that's her property and enforces her rule as such. When informing the actual owners of the property they had no knowledge of her actions and seemed upset about hearing the news of Ms. McMIndes's actions. I have had animal poop thrown on my driveway multiple times, most of the time it is not even dog poop, it is small cat poop like pieces, or poop that would not be from my animals. She was verbally screaming and harassing at neighbor's toddler that was playing in the ally, one of many tantrum episodes from Ms. McMIndes. According to other neighbors, Ms. McMIndes is known to be this type of person who consistently behaves like this. She has been caught multiple times stalking me and other neighbors through taking pictures and videos of the property and asking where I live. I have been polite and respectful to Ms. McMIndes and offered help and chores to her. I have done absolutely everything I can to take the higher road with her and do the right thing. It has gotten so bad with Ms. McMIndes, that I have had to call the police department twice due to her behaviors and harassment. Ms. McMIndes's behaviors and harassment need to cease immediately as well as poisoning our dogs.

undefined[] = By checking this box, I certify that I am the individual named on the citation and am appealing the administrative citation issued to me.

undefined[] = I certify under penalty of perjury that the information above is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Client IP = 2601:204:c900:5770:c855:b238:7b9:6096

EXHIBIT 7.3-D

CITATION APPEAL DECISION

Name of Appellant: Travis Little

Citation No.: 21040

FIRST VIOLATION

Roseville Municipal Code Section: 7.12.010, Leash Law, Two Counts

- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation(s) occurred and that the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence:
 - ☐ That the violation(s) occurred; and/or
 - ☐ That the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☒ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION but waive the fine in the interest of justice.
- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the appellant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION at the request of the City/Complainant.

Name of Appellant: Travis Little

Citation Number: 21040

SECOND VIOLATION

Roseville Municipal Code Section: 7.16.010, Failure to License, One Count, Third Offense

- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation(s) occurred and that the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence:
 - ☐ That the violation(s) occurred; and/or
 - ☐ That the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☒ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION but waive the fine in the interest of justice.
- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the appellant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION at the request of the City/Complainant.

Name of Appellant: Travis Little

Citation Number: 21040

THIRD VIOLATION

Roseville Municipal Code Section: 7.16.010, Failure to License, One Count, Fourth Offense

- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation(s) occurred and that the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence:
 - ☐ That the violation(s) occurred; and/or
 - ☐ That the appellant is the responsible party.
- ☒ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION but waive the fine in the interest of justice.
- ☐ DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the appellant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant failed to appear.
- ☐ GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION at the request of the City/Complainant.

Name of Appellant: Travis Little

Citation Number: 21040

FOURTH VIOLATION

Roseville Municipal Code Section: 7.14.010, Removal of Dog Defecation, Second Offense



DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the violation(s) occurred and that the appellant is the responsible party.



GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant did not prove by a preponderance of the evidence:



That the violation(s) occurred; and/or



That the appellant is the responsible party.



DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION but waive the fine in the interest of justice.



DENY THE APPEAL AND UPHOLD THE VIOLATION because the appellant failed to appear.



GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION because the City/Complainant failed to appear.



GRANT THE APPEAL AND DISMISS THE VIOLATION at the request of the City/Complainant.

Dated: July 14, 2026

By:



Sharon Lawin
Hearing Panel Chairperson

Notice to Appellant: Under California Government Code Section 53069.4, any appeal of today's Hearing Panel decision must be filed with Placer County Superior Court within twenty (20) days of today's date.