

85. In addition, during the Board's February 13, 2023 meeting, the Board also voted to appoint a new alderman to a vacant seat. The Board took a vote on a motion to appoint James Mitchell to the vacant seat, and the motion passed.

86. Neither the publicly-posted notice nor the publicly-posted agenda for the February 13, 2023 meeting indicate that a new Board member would be under consideration for appointment or that a vote would take place.

87. The City knew or reasonably should have known in advance of the meeting that the Board would have considered the appointment of a new alderperson at the February 13, 2023 meeting.

88. The City, Mayor White, and the Board have known that public meeting agendas must be reasonably calculated to advise the public of the matters considered at a public meeting.

89. The City exhibited a conscious design, intent, or plan to violate the Open Meetings Law.

90. The City was aware that consequences exist for violating the Open Meetings Law.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that this Court enter judgment in favor of Plaintiff: (a) declaring Defendant violated the Open Meetings Law by failing to comply with notice requirements of § 610.020 in each instance described above; (b) order appropriate injunctive relief under § 610.030 to ensure the City complies with the Open Meetings Law's meeting notice requirements; (c) award \$1,000 in monetary penalties for each knowing violation the Court finds under