



Roseville Electric Building, 116 S. Grant Street, 1st Floor

roseville.ca.us

The City of Roseville welcomes your participation.

Meeting Schedule: Regular meetings of the Board of Appeals are held on the second Tuesday of the month at 9:00 a.m. and the fourth Thursday of the month at 3:00 p.m.

Public Comment: Speakers have three (3) minutes under Public Comment to address the Chair of the meeting on issues that are not listed on the agenda and are within the City's jurisdiction. Please submit a yellow speaker card to the Secretary before the item is heard if you wish to make a comment.

Brown Act: According to the Brown Act, the Board of Appeals is prohibited from taking any action, debating, or discussing items not listed on the agenda.

Agenda Items: Speakers have five (5) minutes to address items that are listed on the agenda.


Levine Act Provisions: If you've made a campaign contribution totaling more than \$500 (\$250 prior to January 1, 2025) to City Council Members in the last twelve (12) months, you must disclose it before addressing an item on the agenda. Please visit [Levine Act – City of Roseville](#) for updated forms and information.

Audio/Visual Presentations: If making a presentation regarding an agenda item, audio/visual materials must be submitted to the secretary for consideration at least 72 hours in advance.

Americans with Disabilities Act: If special assistance is required to participate in a meeting, including the need of auxiliary aids or services, please notify the City Clerk at least 72 hours in advance of the meeting.
City Clerk 311 Vernon Street cityclerkroseville@roseville.ca.us 916-774-5263 TDD: 916-774-5220

Security Measures: All meeting attendees must successfully pass through a security metal detector. Any person with a prohibited item will not be allowed entry. Prohibited items include but are not limited to firearms (even with valid CCW), knives, pepper spray/mace, explosives of any kind/any weapons and/or dangerous devices of any kind, illegal drugs, and alcohol.

Viewing Options: The City of Roseville provides the following option for viewing hearings:





Sharon Lawin, Board Member
Connor Milligan, Board Member
Arthur Pauly, Jr., Board Member
Howard Rudd, Board Member
Tom Rutherford, Board Member
Charles Sandoval, Board Member
Louise Santiago, Board Member
Robert Schmitt, Board Member
Andrea Seminer, Board Member
Sandeep Upamaka, Board Member
Lynda Risucci, Secretary
Travis Cochran, Liaison

AGENDA

Board of Appeals Hearing

April 14, 2026

9:00 AM

Roseville Electric Building, 116 S. Grant Street, 1st Floor

I. CALL TO ORDER

II. ROLL CALL (SILENT)

III. IDENTIFICATION OF CHAIR

IV. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

V. PUBLIC COMMENTS

VI. SWEAR IN

VII. MATTERS TO BE HEARD

1. Appeal of Report No. 2025-39016 - Rehman Alam

Summary: Appellant: Rehman Alam, 6124 63rd Street, #1, Sacramento, CA 95824

Roseville Municipal Code Section:

16.16.140(B), Prohibited Fireworks, 18 Counts (\$10,000)

CONTACT: Lynda Risucci 916-774-5363 lmrisucci@roseville.ca.us

2. Appeal of Administrative Citation No. T08438 - Mark Fedorchuk

Summary: Appellant: Mark Fedorchuk, 6804 Ranch House Way, Citrus Heights, CA 95610

Roseville Municipal Code Section:

10.58.100(a), Trespass on Parking Structure (\$100.00)

CONTACT: Lynda Risucci 916-774-5363 lmrisucci@roseville.ca.us

3. Appeal of Administrative Citation No.: 22225 - Ethan Lopez

Summary: Appellant: Ethan Lopez, 1189 Formby Way, Roseville, CA 95747
Roseville Municipal Code Section 7.16.010, Licensing, One Count (\$75)

CONTACT: Lynda Risucci 916-774-5363 lmrisucci@roseville.ca.us

VIII. STAFF/BOARD REPORTS

IX. ADJOURNMENT



Board of Appeals Communication

Meeting Date: 4/14/2026
Item #: VII.1
Item ID: 2026-207

Title: Appeal of Report No. 2025-39016 - Rehman Alam
Contact: Lynda Risucci 916-774-5363 lmriscucci@roseville.ca.us

SUMMARY

Appellant: Rehman Alam, 6124 63rd Street, #1, Sacramento, CA 95824
Roseville Municipal Code Section:
16.16.140(B), Prohibited Fireworks, 18 Counts (\$10,000)

RECOMMENDATION

The Board of Appeals will consider the appeal of Report No.: 2025-39016, submitted by Rehman Alam for the following violation:

Violation: Roseville Municipal Code Section 16.16.140(B), Prohibited Fireworks- 18 Counts:

Except as otherwise provided in this section, no person shall possess, manufacture, sell, use, display, manipulate, discharge, or explode any dangerous fireworks, or assist any other person therewith, including, but not limited to, any rocket, firecracker, roman candle, squib, torpedo, wire core sparkler, wooden core sparkler, black cartridge, aerial shell or other combustible device or explosive substance or any kind of fireworks, by whatsoever name known, or any altered safe and sane fireworks within the city. For purposes of this paragraph, "possession" of dangerous fireworks may be actual possession, constructive possession, or joint possession.

Respectfully Submitted,
Lynda Risucci, Legal Assistant

Travis Cochran, Senior Deputy City Attorney

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Fireworks Staff Report - Rehman Alam
2. Roseville PD Report 2025-39016 - Alam
3. Request for Hearing - Alam - Two Parts

REVIEWERS:

Lynda Risucci, City Attorney Department

Created -



Roseville Police Department
1051 Junction Blvd
Roseville, CA 95678

Troy Bergstrom, Chief of Police

Administrative Citation Appeal Hearing Staff Report

Date of Hearing: Tuesday, April 14, 2026, at 9:00 AM
Appellant: Rehman Alam
Case Number: A25-00912 (RPD Report No. 2025-39016)

Violation: RMC 16.16.140(B) – Prohibited Fireworks – 18 Counts

“Except as otherwise provided in this section, no person shall possess, manufacture, sell, use, display, manipulate, discharge, or explode any dangerous fireworks, or assist any other person therewith, including, but not limited to, any rocket, firecracker, roman candle, squib, torpedo, wire core sparkler, wooden core sparkler, black cartridge, aerial shell or other combustible device or explosive substance or any kind of fireworks, by whatsoever name known, or any altered safe and sane fireworks within the city. For purposes of this paragraph, "possession" of dangerous fireworks may be actual possession, constructive possession, or joint possession.”

Narrative:

On July 4, 2025, at approximately 2250 hours (10:50 p.m.), City of Roseville Police Officer Mark Nuevo was dispatched to the area of Vista Granda Blvd and Santucci Blvd for reports of illegal fireworks in the area. Upon entering the neighborhood, Officer Nuevo observed approximately 15 aerial fireworks explode in the air at the intersection of Flathead Drive and Meru Way. Officer Nuevo believed the fireworks to be illegal and went closer to investigate. When Officer Nuevo got closer to the intersection where the fireworks had been launched, a neighbor pointed at two individuals down the street about 50 yards away who were standing near the sidewalk watching the aerial fireworks. Officer Nuevo then made contact with these two individuals, one whom identified himself as Rehman Alam. When asked about the fireworks, Alam denied lighting them and said it was his friend, but Alam would not disclose who his friend was or where he went. Officer Nuevo then called the reporting party (“RP”) who had reported the aerial fireworks. The RP informed Officer Nuevo stated that RP was walking his dog and saw a male wearing dark clothing with a hoodie in his 20's ignite the fireworks. The RP said the male was associated with an older model sedan with obvious damage to it. The RP also told Officer Nuevo where such vehicle was parked. After a brief search, Officer Nuevo located that vehicle, a Honda sedan matching the RP’s description. Officer Nuevo conducted a records check of the license plate, which confirmed it was registered to Rehman Alam. While investigating, Officer Nuevo also observed a black trash bag with two more boxes of illegal aerial fireworks and a roman candle in plain view in the backseat of the vehicle registered to Alam.

Officer Nuevo then returned to speak with Alam who matched the clothing description provided by the RP and was the registered owner of the vehicle identified by the RP. Alam again denied any involvement in the use or possession of illegal fireworks, despite Officer Nuevo advising Alam that illegal fireworks could be seen in the backseat of his vehicle. Officer Nuevo then issued an administrative citation for 18 counts of violating Roseville Municipal Code Section

16.16.140(B). Officer Nuevo's investigation and contact with Alam was also recorded via bodyworn camera, relevant portions of which will be shown during the hearing.

Respectfully Submitted,
Officer Marc Nuevo, Badge #1131

NOTICE OF VIOLATION- FIREWORKS

Report#: 2025-39016

Location of Violation: 9081 FLATHEAD DR Date: 7/4/25 Time: 2300

Responsible Party Info:

Name:	<u>REHMAN ALAM</u>		
Address:	[REDACTED]	<u>SACRAMENTO CA 95824</u>	
City:	<u>SACRAMENTO</u>	State:	<u>CA</u>
(If known) Birth Date:	[REDACTED]	Sex:	<u>M</u> Driver's License # [REDACTED]

DECLARATION

I hereby declare and state:

1. This declaration pertains to a violation of Roseville Municipal Code ("RMC") § 16.16.140 related to regulation of fireworks. I personally observed a violation of:

- RMC § 16.16.140(B) "Prohibited Fireworks"- Illegal possession, manufacture, sale, use, display and/or exploding of dangerous fireworks. 18 Counts (each illegal firework may be charged as a separate violation).
- RMC § 16.16.140(F) "Host Liability"- A host that knowingly allowed a violation of RMC § 16.16.140 (including possession, manufacture, sell, use, display and/or exploding of dangerous fireworks) on their property and/or at a gathering they hosted, organized, supervised, officiated, and/or conducted. Counts (each illegal firework may be charged as a separate violation).
- RMC § 16.16.140(E) "Safe and Sane Fireworks"- Possession, use, display or discharge of "safe and sane" fireworks outside of noon on June 28 to 11:59 pm on July 4th. Counts (each illegal firework may be charged as a separate violation).
- OTHER: _____

2. On the date and time above, I was serving as an enforcement officer for the City of Roseville ("City") and, amongst other things, tasked with enforcement of RMC § 16.16.140 related to regulation of fireworks.

3. I observed the following: 15 REGULAR FIREWORKS AND A BAG FILLED WITH AT LEAST 3 MORE illegal FIREWORKS.

- Continued on back if more information is needed.
- Photo(s)/Video(s) attached and incorporated. SEE EMAIL

4. To the best of my knowledge, the information contained on this declaration is true and correct and I reasonably believe a violation has occurred. If called as a witness, I would testify thereto.

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

Executed at Roseville, California this 4 day of July 2024.

[Signature]
 Declarant Signature
M. N. UEVO OFFICER
 Name and Title

Risucci, Lynda

From: Nuevo, Marc
Sent: Saturday, July 5, 2025 1:42 AM
To: Speaker, Joseph; City Atty Admin
Cc: Kato, Darren
Subject: 2025-39016 Fireworks
Attachments: IMG_1540.MOV; thumbnail_IMG_1546.jpg; thumbnail_IMG_1541.jpg

On 7/4/25 at approximately 2250 hours, I, Officer Nuevo saw aerial fireworks at the intersection of Flathead Dr and Meru Wy in Roseville. I saw approximately 15 aerial fireworks explode in the air. When I arrived, a neighbor pointed at two individuals down the street about 50 yards away who were standing near the sidewalk watching the aerial fireworks. I spoke with Rehman Alam who denied lighting them and said it was his friend, but would not disclose who his friend was or where he went. I called a reporting party who had reported the aerial fireworks. He stated that he was walking his dog and saw a male wearing dark clothing with a hoodie in his 20's light the fireworks. He said the male was associated to an older model sedan with obvious damage to it. He told me exactly where it was parked. I located that vehicle, a Honda sedan matching that description. A records check of the license plate showed it was registered to Rehman Alam. In plain view in the backseat was a black trash bag with two more boxes of illegal aerial fireworks and a roman candle. I returned to speak with Alam who matched the clothing description provided by the RP. Alam again denied my allegations of his involvement in the illegal fireworks despite me telling him I could see them in the backseat of his car. See attached video of the aerial fireworks and photos.

Report 2025-39016

Marc Nuevo

K9 Police Officer #1131
Roseville Police Department

o: (916) 774-5000

Sign up for our public safety newsletter at roseville.ca.us/connect

1051 Junction Blvd. | Roseville, CA | 95678



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message and any accompanying documents are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged attorney-client information or work product. DO NOT FORWARD. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you





Risucci, Lynda

From: City Atty Admin
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2025 9:02 AM
To: Risucci, Lynda
Cc: Cochran, Travis
Subject: FW: 2025-39016 Fireworks
Attachments: firework.jpg; fireworks1.jpg

From: Nuevo, Marc
Sent: Friday, July 11, 2025 1:28 AM
To: Speaker, Joseph ; City Atty Admin
Cc: Kato, Darren
Subject: Re: 2025-39016 Fireworks

I meant to attach these photos as well. These are the illegal fireworks that were in the backseat of the vehicle, parked directly in front of the illegal fireworks that were being lit off. The vehicle was registered to Alam.

Marc Nuevo

K9 Police Officer #1131
Roseville Police Department

o: (916) 774-5000

Sign up for our public safety newsletter at roseville.ca.us/connect

1051 Junction Blvd. | Roseville, CA | 95678



CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email message and any accompanying documents are for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged attorney-client information or work product. DO NOT FORWARD. Any unauthorized review, use, disclosure or distribution is prohibited. If you are not the intended recipient, please contact the sender by reply email and destroy all copies of the original message. Thank you

From: Nuevo, Marc
Sent: Saturday, July 5, 2025 1:42 AM
To: Speaker, Joseph <JSpeaker@roseville.ca.us>; City Atty Admin <cityattyadmin@roseville.ca.us>
Cc: Kato, Darren <DKato@roseville.ca.us>
Subject: 2025-39016 Fireworks





Print This Page

View

[Edit](#)



[Report](#)

[Activity](#)

Administrative Citation Appeal – Request For Hearing 2025-08-16 07:22 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:** Rehman Alam
***Citation Number:** A25-00912
***Home Address:** 9191 Tuolumne Dr
***City** sacramento
***Zip** 95826
Mailing Address (if different from above):
***Phone Number:** 
***Email:** 

Reason for Appeal - Case No. A25-00912

1. No proof of 18 violations

The record does not show 18 separate fireworks. The officer's own evidence consists of (a) a personal-phone video of a single aerial cake at a distance and (b) still photos of one spent "cake" device and burned paper tubes. There is no itemization, seizure, or photo evidence of 18 separate devices. Inflating one cake's multiple bursts into 15-18 "fireworks" misrepresents facts and violates Roseville PD Report Preparation Policy §195.3.22 (accuracy/completeness) and Standards of Conduct §319 (truthfulness/integrity).

2. "Plain view" claim is not credible

The officer asserts he saw multiple boxes of fireworks in my locked, tinted vehicle at night. Yet there are no interior photographs, no body-worn-camera footage showing this observation, and no inventory or seizure of items. His narratives also conflict: one account mentions "two boxes and a roman candle," another describes "a bag with at least three." This fails Search & Seizure Policy §310.5 (document reason, scope, and results, including contraband seized) and §310.4 (explain method, act with due regard for property).

3. Failure to seize or book alleged contraband

If contraband was truly in plain view, it should have been collected and booked. Property & Evidence Policy §802 requires officers who take possession of evidence to package, barcode, and secure it (§802.3 / §802.3.1). Fireworks-specific handling is also mandated (§802.3.3). Chain-of-custody control is emphasized (§802.5 / §802.6). Yet no items from my vehicle—or even from the curb were seized, tagged, or logged.

4. Undocumented second contact

After the initial contact, the officer told me I'd be receiving a fine in the mail and left, then found my locked and parked car ran my plate, returned, and then claimed to see fireworks in my car. That entire second interaction is absent from the body-worn-camera files and in his report. Contrary to §195.3.22 (complete/accurate reporting) This omission undermines the "plain view" claim.

5. Improper evidence captured on a personal phone while driving in

The officer submitted a video recorded on his personal phone while driving in (on BWC). The BWC policy expressly prohibits use of personal cameras for enforcement or investigative evidence. Using a personal device compromises authenticity and chain of custody, violating both BWC and Property & Evidence Policy §802 (digital evidence must be routed through approved systems).

6. No direct observation or credible witness identification

At no time did the officer witness me lighting or handling fireworks. The body-worn camera shows I was a block away with a friend when the fireworks occurred. The first neighbor only pointed vaguely at "two individuals" 50 yards down the street watching. The reporting party later described "a male in a dark hoodie," but that is a generic description, not a positive identification of me. No one stated by name or on scene that I was the person who lit fireworks. Report

*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

Print This Page

View

[Edit](#)

[Report](#)

[Activity](#)

Administrative Citation Appeal – Request For Hearing 2025-08-16 07:22 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:** Rehman Alam

***Citation Number:** A25-00912

***Home Address:** 9191 Tuolumne Dr

***City** sacramento

***Zip** 95826

Mailing Address (if different from above):

***Phone Number:**

***Email:**

Report Preparation Policy §195.3.22 (accuracy/completeness) and Standards of Conduct §319 (truthfulness/integrity).

2. "Plain view" claim is not credible

The officer asserts he saw multiple boxes of fireworks in my locked, tinted vehicle at night. Yet there are no interior photographs, no body-worn-camera footage showing this observation, and no inventory or seizure of items. His narratives also conflict: one account mentions "two boxes and a roman candle," another describes "a bag with at least three." This fails Search & Seizure Policy §310.5 (document reason, scope, and results, including contraband seized) and §310.4 (explain method, act with due regard for property).

3. Failure to seize or book alleged contraband

If contraband was truly in plain view, it should have been collected and booked. Property & Evidence Policy §802 requires officers who take possession of evidence to package, barcode, and secure it (§802.3 / §802.3.1). Fireworks-specific handling is also mandated (§802.3.3). Chain-of-custody control is emphasized (§802.5 / §802.6). Yet no items from my vehicle—or even from the curb were seized, tagged, or logged.

4. Undocumented second contact

After the initial contact, the officer told me I'd be receiving a fine in the mail and left, then found my locked and parked car ran my plate, returned, and then claimed to see fireworks in my car. That entire second interaction is absent from the body-worn-camera files and in his report. Contrary to §195.3.22 (complete/accurate reporting) This omission undermines the "plain view" claim.

5. Improper evidence captured on a personal phone while driving in

The officer submitted a video recorded on his personal phone while driving in (on BWC). The BWC policy expressly prohibits use of personal cameras for enforcement or investigative evidence. Using a personal device compromises authenticity and chain of custody, violating both BWC and Property & Evidence Policy §802 (digital evidence must be routed through approved systems).

6. No direct observation or credible witness

identification

At no time did the officer witness me lighting or handling fireworks. The body-worn camera shows I was a block away with a friend when the fireworks occurred. The first neighbor only pointed vaguely at "two individuals" 50 yards down the street watching. The reporting party later described "a male in a dark hoodie," but that is a generic description, not a positive identification of me. No one stated by name or on scene that I was the person who lit fireworks. Report Preparation Policy §195.3.22 and Standards of Conduct §319 require accuracy and avoidance of assumption standards not met here.

7. Conflicting and uncorroborated narratives

The officer's account relies heavily on second-hand statements: a neighbor pointing at "two individuals" and a reporting party claiming to have seen "a male in dark clothing." These unrecorded statements are inconsistent with each other, lack detail. None rise to the level of reliable evidence under department reporting standards.

***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



Board of Appeals Communication

Meeting Date: 4/14/2026
Item #: VII.2
Item ID: 2026-280

Title: Appeal of Administrative Citation No. T08438 - Mark Fedorchuk
Contact: Lynda Risucci 916-774-5363 lmriscucci@roseville.ca.us

SUMMARY

Appellant: Mark Fedorchuk, 6804 Ranch House Way, Citrus Heights, CA 95621
Roseville Municipal Code Section:
10.58.100(a), Trespass on Parking Structure (\$100.00)

RECOMMENDATION

The Board of Appeals will consider the appeal of Administrative Citation No. T08438, submitted by Mark Fedorchuk for the following violation:

Violation: RMC 10.58.100(a) – Trespass on Parking Structure:

It is unlawful for any person to enter, be upon, or remain upon the premises of any parking garage, parking lot, parking structure, or other parking facility owned by the city, unless that person is on the premises for the purpose of parking a vehicle or retrieving a vehicle.

Respectfully Submitted,
Lynda Risucci, Legal Assistant

Travis Cochran, Senior Deputy City Attorney

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Staff Report - Fedorchuk
2. Citation
3. Request for Hearing

REVIEWERS:

Lynda Risucci, City Attorney Department

Created -



Roseville Police Department
1051 Junction Blvd
Roseville, CA 95678

Troy Bergstrom, Chief of Police

Administrative Citation Appeal Hearing Staff Report

Date of Hearing: Tuesday, April 14th, 2026, at 9:00 AM
Appellant: Mark Fedorchuk
Case Number: CE26-00343; RPD T08438

Violation: RMC 10.58.100(a) – Trespass on parking structure

“It is unlawful for any person to enter, be upon, or remain upon the premises of any parking garage, parking lot, parking structure, or other parking facility owned by the city, unless that person is on the premises for the purpose of parking a vehicle or retrieving a vehicle.”

Narrative:

On January 31, 2026, at approximately 2300 hours (11:00 p.m.), Officers of the Roseville Police Department were dispatched to 200 Oak Street, a City-owned parking structure, for reports of individuals loitering in the parking garage.

Upon arrival, Officers observed several individuals on the top floor of the parking garage that were neither coming nor going, and who appeared to be hanging out. One of these individuals was identified as Mark Fedorchuk. Officer Cabral then issued Fedorchuk a Notice to Appear for unlawful loitering with the parking structure. Upon review by the City Attorney’s Office, the Notice to Appear (an infraction) was administratively reduced to an administration citation for violation of Roseville Municipal Code Section 10.58.100(a), which specifically applies to loitering/trespassing within a City parking structure or facility. A portion of the Officers’ contact with Fedorchuk was also recorded via bodyworn camera, relevant portions of which may be shown during the hearing.

Respectfully Submitted,
Officer Hunter Cabral, Badge #1221

08 FEB 2026

ROSEVILLE POLICE DEPARTMENT Misdemeanor Nontraffic Traffic **T 08438**

NOTICE TO APPEAR

Date of Violation: 01/31/26 Time: 2300 A.M. P.M. Day of Week: S M T W T F S DR#: 26-06344

Name (First, Middle, Last): MARK, NIKOLAEVICH, FEDORCHUK

Address: 6804 RANCH HOUSE WAY Transient

City: CITRUS HEIGHTS State: CA Zip: 95621

Driver's License No. [REDACTED] State: [REDACTED] Class: [REDACTED] Date of Birth: [REDACTED]

Sex: [REDACTED] Hair: [REDACTED] Eyes: [REDACTED] Height: [REDACTED] Weight: [REDACTED] Birthdate: [REDACTED]

Booking Required (see reverse)

Code/Ordinance	Description of Violation		
<input type="checkbox"/> 8.02.200(B)(2)	Smoking in Park		I
<input type="checkbox"/> 8.02.280	Possession of Open Container in Park		I
<input type="checkbox"/> 8.02.290	Possession of Glass Container in Park		I
<input type="checkbox"/> 8.02.316(G)	Park Exclusion	M	I
<input type="checkbox"/> 9.12.190	Dumpster Diving		I
<input type="checkbox"/> 10.30.010	Possession of Open Container/Streets		I
<input type="checkbox"/> 10.30.020	Possession of Open Container/off-sale		I
<input type="checkbox"/> 10.37.040	Panhandling	M	I
<input type="checkbox"/> 10.38.010	Urinating/Defecating in Public	M	I
<input type="checkbox"/> 10.56.010	Illegal Camping on Public Property	M	I
<input type="checkbox"/> 10.56.020	Illegal Camping on Private Property	M	I
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 10.58.100 RMC	Trespass on Parking Structure		I
<input type="checkbox"/> 22435.2(b) B&P	Unlawful to Possess Shopping Cart	M	I
<input type="checkbox"/>		M	I
<input type="checkbox"/>		M	I

Location of Violation(s): 200 OAK STREET

Violations not committed in my presence, declared on information and belief. I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California the foregoing is true and correct.

Dec. Date: 01/31/26 Arresting/Citing Officer: CABRAL Badge #: 1221

WITHOUT ADMITTING GUILT, I PROMISE TO APPEAR AT THE TIME AND PLACE INDICATED BELOW

X Signature: [Signature]

When: On this date: 4/27/26 Time: 0900 A.M. P.M.

Where: Placer Superior Court Dept. 10820 Justice Center Drive, Roseville, CA 95678 (916) 408-6000 Homeless Court Dept. 10820 Justice Center Drive, Roseville, CA 95678 (916) 408-6000

Judicial Council of California Form Rev. 09-02-05 (Veh. Code §§ 40500(b), 40513(b), 40522, 40600; Pen Code, § 853.9) Approved by Placer County Presiding Judge 06-2011

SEE REVERSE TR-130

Rev 3.9.18

View

[Edit](#)

[Report](#)

[Activity](#)

Administrative Citation Appeal – Request For Hearing 2026-02-23 03:47 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:** Mark Fedorchuk

***Citation
Number:** T08438

***Home
Address:** 6804 Ranch House Way

***City** Citrus Heights

***Zip** 95621

Mailing
Address

(if
different 6804 Ranch House Way
from
above):

***Phone
Number:**

***Email:**

Me and my friend just arrived to the top of the parking garage and we weren't even there for 2 minutes, while other people were up there too out of their cars hanging out. Me and my friend were looking for the direction to the Kava bar on our phones, then the police arrive right away not even letting us tell them we just arrived. The cameras will show we were there for 2 minutes. The cops ticketed everyone up there that was actually hanging out and us when we were just going to park and leave the garage. I can't afford this ticket and that's not very fair because that was my first time ever even being there.

***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.



Board of Appeals Communication

Meeting Date: 4/14/2026
Item #: VII.3
Item ID: 2026-281

Title: Appeal of Administrative Citation No.: 22225 - Ethan Lopez
Contact: Lynda Risucci 916-774-5363 lmriscucci@roseville.ca.us

SUMMARY

Appellant: Ethan Lopez, 1189 Formby Way, Roseville, CA 95747
Roseville Municipal Code Section 7.16.010, Licensing, One Count (\$75)

RECOMMENDATION

The Board of Appeals will consider the appeal of Administrative Citation No. 22225, submitted by Ethan Lopez for the following violation:

Violation: RMC § 7.16.010 Licensing (1 count)

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

Respectfully Submitted,
Lynda Risucci, Legal Assistant

Travis Cochran, Senior Deputy City Attorney

ATTACHMENTS:

1. Staff Report
2. Citation
3. Request for Hearing

REVIEWERS:

Lynda Risucci, City Attorney Department

Created -



Roseville Police Department

1051 Junction Blvd
Roseville, CA 95678

Troy Bergstrom, Chief of Police

Administrative Citation Appeal Hearing

Staff Report

Date of Hearing: Tuesday, April 14TH, 2026 @ 09:00 AM
Appellant: Ethan Lopez @ 1189 Formby Way
Citation: 22225

Violation: RMC § 7.16.010 Licensing (1 count)

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

Narrative:

On November 8th, 2025, at 1412 hours, Roseville Police Animal Control received a complaint for two barking dogs located at 1189 Formby Way. It was determined that the dogs at the residence were also unlicensed. ACO M. Terry mailed a warning letter, license application, and ACO pamphlet.

On November 18th, Ethan spoke with ACO B. Chacon-Raoul via telephone. ACO B. Chacon-Raoul answered Ethans questions and confirmed he owned a German Shepherd and a Beagle.

On November 18th, Roseville Animal Control received an additional complaint regarding barking dogs at the residence of 1189 Formby way. One dog a 13-year-old Beagle was licensed but the German Shepherd was still unlicensed.

On January 22nd, 2026, Ethan had still not licensed his dog. ACO M. Terry issued a citation for RMC 7.16.010 Licensing x 1.

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

CITY OF ROSEVILLE

NOTICE OF CITATION 26-4346

22225

Date	Time	Day of Week
1-22-2026	1610	Thursday
Name (First, Middle, Last) Ethan, Thomas, Lopez		
Residence Address 1189 Formby way Roseville CA 95747		
Business Address _____		
Driver's Lic. No.	State	Class
_____	CA	_____
Date of Birth	Sex	Height
_____	_____	_____
Description of Animal (If Applicable)		
Breed: GSD	Color:	Age:
Vehicle Make	License #:	Sex:
Model:	_____	_____
Color:	Year:	_____
Location of Violation 1189 Formby way		
Date / Time of Violation 1-22-2026 1610		
Code / Ordinance	Description of Violation	
	RMC 7.16.010 Licensing x 1	
<input type="checkbox"/> 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: 1-22-2026 Issuing Officer: M. TERRY #3100 Badge No.		
COMPLAINING PARTY		
X Signature: M. TERRY #3100		
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		

LP

Print This Page

View

[Edit](#)

[Report](#)

[Activity](#)

Administrative Citation Appeal – Request For Hearing 2026-02-24 01:00 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:** Ethan lopez

***Citation Number:** 22225

***Home Address:** 1189 Formby Way

***City** Roseville

***Zip** 95747

Mailing Address (if different from above):

***Phone Number:** 

***Email:** 

I moved to Roseville less than a year ago from San Diego. I was unaware of the necessity of having to license my dog. This is the first notice I've received stating that I have to. Respectfully I am asking that the citation be waved, while I acquire everything needed to register my dog with the city of Roseville. Thank you.

***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