



Writer's Cell:
(415) 609-6296

Writer's direct e-mail:
jquadra@quadracoll.com

January 9, 2026

VIA EMAIL AND U.S. MAIL

ethics.commission@sfgov.org

City & County of San Francisco
San Francisco Ethics Commission
25 Van Ness Ave #220
San Francisco, CA 94102
ethics.commission@sfgov.org

Re: In the Matter of Sheryl Davis, Case No. 25-838

Dear Commissioners:

I write on behalf of Dr. Sheryl Davis. Please be advised that our office, Quadra & Coll, LLP, is joining Dr. Davis' counsel, Anthony Brass, in his representation of Dr. Davis in this matter,

We understand that the Commission proceeded with the January 9, 2026 hearing, notwithstanding the express objections by Mr. Brass, who is presently engaged in a trial and was unavailable to appear.

Proceeding while Dr. Davis's counsel of record is unavailable substantially prejudices Dr. Davis and raises serious due process concerns. Dr. Davis is constitutionally entitled to be represented by counsel of her choice at any hearing that may lead to or result in findings, sanctions, or other adverse consequences. Proceeding with the hearing over counsel's objection and unavailability deprives Dr. Davis of that right and undermines the fundamental fairness of the proceeding.

In addition, we are informed that as a result of the Commission's referral, the San Francisco District Attorney is investigating the same or substantially overlapping factual allegations at issue in this proceeding. Under these circumstances, Dr. Davis has an absolute Fifth Amendment privilege against self-incrimination. It is well established that civil or administrative proceedings must be stayed where continuation would force a respondent to choose between defending herself and preserving her constitutional rights in the face of potential criminal exposure. Thus, proceeding with the prosecution of the

Commission's claims, which Dr. Davis vehemently denies, appears designed to circumvent Dr. Davis's Fifth Amendment protections by compelling testimony or adverse inferences while a criminal investigation is pending. That result is constitutionally impermissible.

Accordingly, Dr. Davis asserts her Fifth Amendment rights, and we formally request that the Commission stay this matter pending resolution or clarification of any criminal investigation or prosecutorial decision by the District Attorney's Office.

Please confirm in writing as soon as possible that any further proceeding on this hearing will be taken off calendar or continued pending resolution of the District Attorney's investigation and prosecutorial decision. Dr. Davis expressly reserves all rights, remedies, objections, and defenses, including the right to seek judicial relief should the Commission proceed in violation of her constitutional rights.

Regards,



James A. Quadra

cc. bertha.cheung@sfgov.org
jeffrey.zumwalt@sfgov.org
bisi.matthews@sfgov.org