

**COSTA MESA  
LITIGATION STATUS REPORT  
Second Quarter 2018**

**AmeriCare MedServices, Inc. v. City of Costa Mesa and CARE Ambulance Services**

<b>Case Name</b>	AmeriCare MedServices, Inc. v. City of Costa Mesa and CARE Ambulance Services	<b>Case Number</b>	<b>District Court:</b> 8:16-cv-01804  <b>Court of Appeals:</b> 17-55565																						
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. Josephine L. Staton Magistrate: Hon. Alexander F. MacKinnon	<b>Venue</b>	<b>District Court:</b> United States District Court for Central District of California <b>Court of Appeals:</b> Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals																						
<b>Attorney(s) for City</b>	James R. Touchstone Melissa M. Ballard Bruce A. Lindsay Kendall H. MacVey – Best, Best & Krieger	<b>Opposing Attorney(s)</b>	Jarod Michael Bona Bona Law PC																						
<b>Date of Loss</b>	Not applicable.	<b>Complaint Filed</b>	09/28/2016																						
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred through 06/30/18</b>	\$31,449.02																								
<b>Causes of Action</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Monopolization – 15 U.S.C. § 2</li> <li>2. Attempted Monopolization – 15 U.S.C. § 2</li> <li>3. Conspiracy to Monopolize – 15 U.S.C. § 2</li> <li>4. Conspiracy to Restrain Trade – 15 U.S.C. § 1</li> <li>5. Declaration of Rights – Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 1060</li> <li>6. Declaratory Judgment – 28 U.S.C. § 2201; 15 U.S.C. § 26</li> </ol>																								
<b>Summary</b>	Antitrust claim by AmeriCare MedServices that City created unlawful monopoly with CARE Ambulance Services.																								
<b>Status</b>	The case is on appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals following the district court's granting of defendants' motions to dismiss.																								
<b>Next Hearing Date</b>	August 7, 2018 – Oral Argument																								
<b>Court of Appeals Docket</b>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>05/09/17</td> <td>Plaintiff's Motion to Expedite Briefing and Hearing on Appeal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>05/15/17</td> <td>Opposition to Motion to Expedite Briefing and Hearing on Appeal Filed by Cities of Anaheim, Laguna Beach, and Newport Beach</td> </tr> <tr> <td>05/17/17</td> <td>City's Joinder to Opposition to Motion to Expedite Briefing and Hearing on Appeal Filed by Cities of Anaheim, Laguna Beach, and Newport Beach</td> </tr> <tr> <td>05/23/17</td> <td>Plaintiff's Response to Oppositions to Motion to Expedite Briefing and Hearing on Appeal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>05/23/17</td> <td>Plaintiff's Motion for Order Requiring Cities to File a Joint Brief on Appeal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>05/26/17</td> <td>City's Response to Plaintiff's Motion for Order Requiring Cities to File a Joint Brief on Appeal</td> </tr> <tr> <td>06/02/17</td> <td>Court's Order Denying Motion to Expedite and Motion for Order Requiring Cities to File a Joint Brief</td> </tr> <tr> <td>09/11/17</td> <td>Plaintiff's Requested for Extension of Time to File Opening Brief Filed</td> </tr> <tr> <td>09/11/17</td> <td>Court's Order Approving Plaintiff's Request for Extension of Time to File Opening Brief</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11/01/17</td> <td>Appellant's Opening Brief Filed</td> </tr> <tr> <td>11/07/17</td> <td>Amicus Brief for Review and Motion to Become Amicus Curiae Filed by California Emergency Medical Services Authority</td> </tr> </table>			05/09/17	Plaintiff's Motion to Expedite Briefing and Hearing on Appeal	05/15/17	Opposition to Motion to Expedite Briefing and Hearing on Appeal Filed by Cities of Anaheim, Laguna Beach, and Newport Beach	05/17/17	City's Joinder to Opposition to Motion to Expedite Briefing and Hearing on Appeal Filed by Cities of Anaheim, Laguna Beach, and Newport Beach	05/23/17	Plaintiff's Response to Oppositions to Motion to Expedite Briefing and Hearing on Appeal	05/23/17	Plaintiff's Motion for Order Requiring Cities to File a Joint Brief on Appeal	05/26/17	City's Response to Plaintiff's Motion for Order Requiring Cities to File a Joint Brief on Appeal	06/02/17	Court's Order Denying Motion to Expedite and Motion for Order Requiring Cities to File a Joint Brief	09/11/17	Plaintiff's Requested for Extension of Time to File Opening Brief Filed	09/11/17	Court's Order Approving Plaintiff's Request for Extension of Time to File Opening Brief	11/01/17	Appellant's Opening Brief Filed	11/07/17	Amicus Brief for Review and Motion to Become Amicus Curiae Filed by California Emergency Medical Services Authority
05/09/17	Plaintiff's Motion to Expedite Briefing and Hearing on Appeal																								
05/15/17	Opposition to Motion to Expedite Briefing and Hearing on Appeal Filed by Cities of Anaheim, Laguna Beach, and Newport Beach																								
05/17/17	City's Joinder to Opposition to Motion to Expedite Briefing and Hearing on Appeal Filed by Cities of Anaheim, Laguna Beach, and Newport Beach																								
05/23/17	Plaintiff's Response to Oppositions to Motion to Expedite Briefing and Hearing on Appeal																								
05/23/17	Plaintiff's Motion for Order Requiring Cities to File a Joint Brief on Appeal																								
05/26/17	City's Response to Plaintiff's Motion for Order Requiring Cities to File a Joint Brief on Appeal																								
06/02/17	Court's Order Denying Motion to Expedite and Motion for Order Requiring Cities to File a Joint Brief																								
09/11/17	Plaintiff's Requested for Extension of Time to File Opening Brief Filed																								
09/11/17	Court's Order Approving Plaintiff's Request for Extension of Time to File Opening Brief																								
11/01/17	Appellant's Opening Brief Filed																								
11/07/17	Amicus Brief for Review and Motion to Become Amicus Curiae Filed by California Emergency Medical Services Authority																								

11/08/17	Amicus Brief for Review and Motion to Become Amicus Curiae Filed by Emergency Medical Services Administrators Association of California
12/05/17	City Appellees' Joint Request for Extension of Time to File Answering Briefs Filed
12/05/17	Care Ambulance's Motion for Extension of Time to File Answering Brief Filed
12/07/17	Court's Order Granting Extension of Time to File Answering Briefs
01/22/18	City Appellees' Joint Answering Brief Filed
01/22/18	Appellee Care's Answering Brief Filed
01/23/18	AmeriCare's Request for Extension of Time to File Reply Brief Filed
01/24/18	Court's Order Granting Extension of Time to File Reply Brief
01/29/18	Amicus Curiae Brief for Review Filed by California Fire Chiefs Association
01/29/18	Amicus Curiae Brief for Review Filed by International Association of Fire Fighters
01/29/18	Amicus Curiae Brief for Review Filed by League of California Cities and International Municipal Lawyers Association
02/01/18	AmeriCare's Response to Care's Motion for Judicial Notice
02/08/18	Care's Reply to Response re Motion for Judicial Notice
02/16/18	Notice from Court re Consideration of Placement of Matter on June 2018 Oral Argument Calendar in Pasadena
02/20/18	Letter from Counsel for Care re Unavoidable Conflict
03/14/18	AmeriCare's Reply Brief Filed
04/20/18	Notice from Court re Consideration of Placement of Matter on August 2018 Oral Argument Calendar in Pasadena
05/30/18	Notice of Oral Argument Date
06/08/18	Motion by California Emergency Medical Services Authority to Participate in Oral Argument
06/11/18	Order Granting Motion of Amicus Curiae to Participate in Oral Argument

**Casa Capri Recovery, Inc. v. City of Costa Mesa**

<b>Case Name</b>	Casa Capri Recovery, Inc. v. City of Costa Mesa	<b>Case Number</b>	8:18-cv-00329
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. Judge James Selna Magistrate: Hon. Judge Patrick Walsh	<b>Venue</b>	United States District Court for the Central District of California
<b>Attorney(s) for City</b>	Bruce A. Lindsay	<b>Opposing Attorney(s)</b>	Isaac R. Zfaty Garrett M. Prybylo  Zfaty Burns Steven Polin Law Offices of Steven G. Polin
<b>Date of Loss</b>	Not applicable.	<b>Complaint Filed</b>	02/26/2018
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred through 06/30/18</b>	\$9,117.80		
<b>Causes of Action</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Violation of the Federal Housing Act</li> <li>2. Violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act</li> <li>3. Violation of the Rehabilitation Act</li> <li>4. Violation of the Civil Rights Act of 1871</li> <li>5. Violation of California Fair Employment and Housing Act</li> <li>6. Violation of State Zoning Powers</li> </ol>		
<b>Summary</b>	Plaintiff, a sober living home operator, alleges the City engages in a pattern or practice of discrimination against it on the basis of disability in violation of various federal and state laws.		
<b>Status</b>	The case is in the pleading stage.		
<b>Next Hearing Date</b>	November 18, 2019 – Pre-Trial Conference		
<b>Trial Date</b>	December 3, 2019		
<b>Docket</b>	02/26/18	Complaint Filed	
	02/27/18	Summons Filed	
	04/16/18	Court’s Initial Order Following Filing of Complaint	
	04/17/18	Court’s Order Setting Rule 26(f) Conference	
	04/24/18	Plaintiff’s First Amended Complaint Filed	
	05/10/18	Court’s Order Advancing Scheduling Conference	
	05/29/18	City’s Answer to Amended Complaint Filed	
	05/29/18	City’s Notice of Interested Parties Filed	
	06/13/18	Stipulation to Continue Scheduling Conference Filed	
	06/14/18	Court’s Order Continuing Scheduling Conference	
	06/19/18	Joint Rule 26(f) Report Filed	
<b>Written Discovery</b>		Not yet exchanged.	

**Timothy Dadey v. City of Costa Mesa**

<b>Case Name</b>	Timothy Dadey v. City of Costa Mesa	<b>Case Number</b>	30-2014-00757962
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. Sheila Fell	<b>Venue</b>	Superior Court of California, County of Orange
<b>Attorney(s) for City</b>	Monica Choi Arredondo Bruce A. Lindsay	<b>Opposing Attorney(s)</b>	Mark Erickson Matthew Costello Christopher Maciel Haynes and Boone  Kenneth Babcock Lili Graham Richard Walker Public Law Center  Navneet Grewal Stephanie Haffner S. Lynn Martinez Richard Rothschild Western Center on Law and Poverty
<b>Date of Loss</b>	Not applicable.	<b>Complaint Filed</b>	11/24/2014
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred through 06/30/18</b>	\$1,053,109.20		
<b>Causes of Action</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Land Use Discrimination – Cal. Gov’t Code § 65008</li> <li>2. Disability Discrimination in Violation of the Fair Housing Act (FHA) – 42 U.S.C. § 3604</li> <li>3. Disability Discrimination in Violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) – 42 U.S.C. § 12132</li> <li>4. Disability Discrimination in Violation of the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) – Cal. Gov’t Code §§ 12920, 12927, 12955</li> <li>5. Familial Status Discrimination in Housing in Violation of the FHA – 42 U.S.C. § 3604</li> <li>6. Familial Status Discrimination in Housing in Violation of FEHA – Cal. Gov’t Code §§ 12920, 12927, 12955</li> <li>7. Source of Income Discrimination in Violation of FEHA – Cal. Gov’t Code §§ 12920, 12927, 12955</li> <li>8. Violation of Duty to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing – 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 3608(e)(5)</li> <li>9. Violation of Constitutional Right to Travel</li> <li>10. Violation of Constitutional Right to Privacy</li> <li>11. Violation of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 – 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 5301 <i>et seq.</i>, 24 C.F.R. §§ 570.600 <i>et seq.</i>, 24 C.F.R. §§ 42 <i>et seq.</i></li> <li>12. Violation of the California Relocation Assistance Act – Cal. Gov’t Code §§ 7260 <i>et seq.</i>, 25 C.C.R. § 6010</li> </ol>		

<b>Summary</b>	Plaintiffs challenge the City's adoption of Ordinance No. 14-11. Plaintiffs allege discrimination based on mental/physical disability, income level, source of income, and/or familial status under state and federal housing discrimination statutes, as well as related state and federal civil rights violations.
<b>Status</b>	The parties recently settled the matter.

**James Davis v. South Coast Plaza; City of Costa Mesa**

<b>Case Name</b>	James Davis v. South Coast Plaza; City of Costa Mesa	<b>Case Number</b>	30-2018-00978892
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. James Crandall	<b>Venue</b>	Superior Court of California, County of Orange
<b>Attorney(s) for City</b>	Carmen Vasquez	<b>Opposing Attorney(s)</b>	Steven L. Mazza Carpenter, Zuckerman & Rowley
<b>Date of Loss</b>	02/26/2017	<b>Complaint Filed</b>	03/12/2018
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred through 06/30/18</b>	\$4,255.50		
<b>Causes of Action</b>	1. General Negligence 2. Premises Liability		
<b>Summary</b>	Plaintiff alleges he slipped and fell in a common area of South Coast Plaza, which Plaintiff alleges was a result of a dangerous condition on Defendants' property, repaired, inspected and/or maintained by Defendants' agents in a negligent fashion.		
<b>Status</b>	Plaintiff agreed to dismiss the City from the lawsuit, since the City does not own, maintain, or control the area where Plaintiff fell.		

**William Tyler Davis v. Angie de Loudes Alvaz Alvarez; Sandra Sepulveda; County of Orange; City of Costa Mesa**

<b>Case Name</b>	William Tyler Davis v. Angie de Loudes Alvaz Alvarez; Sandra Sepulveda; County of Orange; City of Costa Mesa	<b>Case Number</b>	30-2018-00984318
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. Gregory Lewis	<b>Venue</b>	Superior Court of California, County of Orange
<b>Attorney(s) for City</b>	Gary S. Kranker	<b>Opposing Attorney(s)</b>	Joel W. Baruch Corey A. Hall Law Offices of Joel W. Baruch
<b>Date of Loss</b>	08/20/2017	<b>Complaint Filed</b>	04/05/2018*  *City served on 06/25/2018
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred through 06/30/18</b>	None to date.		
<b>Causes of Action</b>	1. Negligence – Against Defendants Alvarez and Sepulveda 2. Negligence – Against Defendants County of Orange and City of Costa Mesa		
<b>Summary</b>	Plaintiff, while riding a motorcycle, was involved in an automobile accident with an individual exiting a parking lot at the Orange County Fairgrounds and alleges the City’s negligence caused the driver to collide with Plaintiff and cause injuries to Plaintiff.		
<b>Status</b>	The case is in the pleading stage.		
<b>Next Hearing Date</b>	September 10, 2018 – Case Management Conference		
<b>Trial Date</b>	Not yet set.		
<b>Docket</b>	04/05/18	Complaint Filed	
	04/06/18	Summons Issued and Filed	
<b>Written Discovery</b>		Not yet exchanged.	



**James Faulkner v. City of Costa Mesa; County of Orange; State of California**

<b>Case Name</b>	James Faulkner v. City of Costa Mesa; County of Orange; State of California	<b>Case Number</b>	30-2017-00926083
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. Martha K. Gooding	<b>Venue</b>	Superior Court of California, County of Orange
<b>Attorney(s) for City</b>	Melissa M. Ballard	<b>Opposing Attorney(s)</b>	Steven L. Mazza Paul S. Zuckerman Carpenter, Zuckerman & Rowley, LLP
<b>Date of Loss</b>	05/22/2016	<b>Complaint Filed</b>	06/15/2017
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred through 06/30/18</b>	\$34,857.50		
<b>Causes of Action</b>	1. Premises Liability 2. General Negligence		
<b>Summary</b>	Plaintiff alleges he tripped and fell in an empty tree well that is owned and maintained by the City. Plaintiff sued the City, the County of Orange, and the State of California.		
<b>Status</b>	The parties recently settled the matter.		

**Cheryl Giacomino v. City of Costa Mesa; Jean Sola**

<b>Case Name</b>	Cheryl Giacomino v. City of Costa Mesa; Jean Sola	<b>Case Number</b>	30-2017-00963795
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. Gregory Lewis	<b>Venue</b>	Superior Court of California, County of Orange
<b>Attorney(s) for City</b>	Melissa M. Ballard	<b>Opposing Attorney(s)</b>	W. Douglas Easton Matthew D. Easton Travis R. Easton Easton & Easton, LLP
<b>Date of Loss</b>	03/11/2016	<b>Complaint Filed</b>	12/27/2017*  *City served on 01/31/2018
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred through 06/30/18</b>	\$14,412.20		
<b>Causes of Action</b>	1. Dangerous Condition of Public Property 2. Negligence		
<b>Summary</b>	Plaintiff alleges that she tripped and fell on a City-owned sidewalk.		
<b>Status</b>	Discovery is ongoing.		
<b>Next Hearing Date</b>	July 30, 2018 – Case Management Conference		
<b>Trial Date</b>	Not yet set.		
<b>Docket</b>	12/27/17	Summons and Complaint	
	02/16/18	Sola's Answer to Complaint Filed	
	03/05/18	City's Answer to Complaint Filed	
	05/15/18	Sola's Case Management Statement Filed	
	05/18/18	City's Case Management Statement Filed	
	05/18/18	Plaintiff's Case Management Statement Filed	
	05/18/18	Plaintiff's Amendment to Complaint Filed	
	06/04/18	Case Management Conference (Continued to July 9, 2018)	
<b>Written Discovery</b>	03/20/18	Plaintiff's Special Interrogatories (ROGS) to Sola, Set One	
	03/20/18	Plaintiff's Form ROGS to Sola, Set One	
	03/20/18	Plaintiff's Requests for Production (RFPS) to Sola, Set One	
	03/20/18	Plaintiff's Special ROGS to City, Set One	
	03/20/18	Plaintiff's Form ROGS to City, Set One	
	03/20/18	Plaintiff's RFPS to City, Set One	
	04/05/18	Plaintiff's Responses to Sola's RFPS, Set One	
	04/05/18	Plaintiff's Responses to Sola's Form ROGS, Set One	
	04/13/18	City's Form ROGS to Plaintiff, Set One	
	04/13/18	City's Special ROGS to Plaintiff, Set One	
	04/13/18	City's RFPS to Plaintiff, Set One	
	05/08/18	Sola's Responses to Plaintiff's Form ROGS, Set One	
	05/08/18	Sola's Responses to Plaintiff's Special ROGS, Set One	
	05/08/18	Sola's Responses to Plaintiff's RFPS, Set One	
	05/24/18	City's Responses to Plaintiff's Form ROGS, Set One	
	05/24/18	City's Responses to Plaintiff's Special ROGS, Set One	

	05/24/18	City's Responses to Plaintiff's RFPS, Set One
	06/22/18	Plaintiff's Responses to City's Form ROGS, Set One
	06/22/18	Plaintiff's Responses to City's Special ROGS, Set One
	06/22/18	Plaintiff's Responses to City's RFPS, Set One

**Gayle Hickey; Ed Burke v. City of Costa Mesa**

<b>Case Name</b>	Gayle Hickey; Ed Burke v. City of Costa Mesa	<b>Case Number</b>	30-2017-00951064
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. Craig Griffin	<b>Venue</b>	Superior Court of California, County of Orange
<b>Attorney(s) for City</b>	Melissa M. Ballard	<b>Opposing Attorney(s)</b>	Orlando J. Castaño, Jr.  Law Offices of Orlando J. Castaño, Jr. Inc.
<b>Date of Loss</b>	10/20/2016	<b>Complaint Filed</b>	10/20/2017*  *City served on 05/02/2018
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred through 06/30/18</b>	\$5,174.10		
<b>Causes of Action</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Negligence</li> <li>2. Willful Failure to Warn</li> <li>3. Dangerous Condition of Public Property</li> </ol>		
<b>Summary</b>	This lawsuit arises out of a trip and fall on a City sidewalk. Plaintiff Hickey sued the City for a dangerous condition of public property, and Plaintiff Burke sued the City for loss of consortium.		
<b>Status</b>	The case is in the pleading stage. Plaintiff Burke has dismissed his claims against the City.		
<b>Next Hearing Date</b>	August 17, 2018 – Continued Case Management Conference		
<b>Trial Date</b>	Not yet set.		
<b>Docket</b>	10/20/17	Complaint Filed	
	05/16/18	Proof of Services of Summons and Complaint Filed	
	06/08/18	Joint Stipulation and Proposed Order Filed	
	06/08/18	Case Management Conference (Continued to August 17, 2018)	
	06/19/18	Stipulation and Order to Dismiss Plaintiff and Strike Allegation from Complaint Filed by City	
	06/21/18	City's Answer to Complaint Filed	
<b>Written Discovery</b>		Not yet exchanged.	

**Paula Jameson v. Segerstrom Center for the Arts; City of Costa Mesa**

<b>Case Name</b>	Paula Jameson v. Segerstrom Center for the Arts; City of Costa Mesa	<b>Case Number</b>	30-2016-00886449
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. Craig Griffin	<b>Venue</b>	Superior Court of California, County of Orange
<b>Attorney(s) for City</b>	Carmen Vasquez	<b>Opposing Attorney(s)</b>	Christopher E. Russell Russell & Lazarus
<b>Date of Loss</b>	03/22/2016	<b>Complaint Filed</b>	11/14/2016*  *City served on 03/21/2017
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred through 06/30/18</b>	\$48,433.18		
<b>Causes of Action</b>	1. Premises Liability 2. Negligence		
<b>Summary</b>	Plaintiff alleges she tripped and fell on an uneven sidewalk/walkway.		
<b>Status</b>	Discovery is ongoing.		
<b>Next Hearing Date</b>	August 17, 2018 – Mandatory Settlement Conference		
<b>Trial Date</b>	September 17, 2018		
<b>Docket</b>	11/14/16 Summons and Complaint 03/21/17 City Served with Complaint 03/28/17 Plaintiff's Case Management Statement Filed 04/04/17 County of Orange's Cross-Complaint Against City and Segerstrom Center for the Arts 04/10/17 City's Case Management Statement Filed 04/10/17 City's Cross-Complaint Against Segerstrom Center for the Arts 04/14/17 Case Management Conference 05/24/17 City's Answer to County of Orange's Cross-Complaint 06/16/17 City's Amendment to Cross-Complaint 06/23/17 Cross-Complainant Center Tower Associates, LLC's Answer Filed 06/23/17 Cross-Complainant Center Tower Associates, LLC's Case Management Statement Filed 06/28/17 County of Orange's Case Management Statement Filed 07/10/17 City's Request for Dismissal of Cross-Complaint Against Segerstrom Center for the Arts 07/14/17 Case Management Conference 08/18/17 Plaintiff's Case Management Statement Filed 08/21/17 City's Case Management Statement Filed 08/22/17 County of Orange's Case Management Statement Filed 09/01/17 Case Management Conference 09/14/17 Plaintiff's Amended Complaint Filed 10/18/17 County of Orange's Case Management Statement Filed 10/26/17 City's Case Management Statement Filed 10/31/17 Cross-Complainant Center Tower Associates, LLC's Answer Filed 11/01/17 Plaintiff's Request for Dismissal as to State of California		

	11/08/17	County of Orange's Notice of Motion and Motion for Summary Judgment, or, in the Alternative, Summary Adjudication
	01/11/18	Plaintiff's Notice of Non-Opposition Filed
	01/29/18	Hearing on County's Motion for Summary Judgment
	01/29/18	Court's Minute Order Denying County's Motion for Summary Judgment
	01/30/18	County of Orange's Motion for Summary Judgment/Summary Adjudication Filed
	04/06/18	Plaintiff's Notice of Non-Opposition Filed
	04/23/18	Hearing on Motion for Summary Judgment/Adjudication
	04/23/18	Notice of Ruling Filed by County of Orange
	05/15/18	Judgment Entered as to County of Orange
	05/31/18	Notice of Entry of Judgment Filed by County of Orange
<b>Written Discovery</b>	04/13/17	City's Form Interrogatories (ROGS) to Plaintiff, Set One
	04/13/17	City's Special ROGS to Plaintiff, Set One
	04/13/17	City's Requests for Admission (RFAS) to Plaintiff, Set One
	04/13/17	City's Requests for Production (RFPS) to Plaintiff, Set One
	05/09/17	Plaintiff's RFAS to City, Set One
	05/09/17	Plaintiff's Form ROGS to City, Set One
	05/09/17	Plaintiff's RFAS to Segerstrom, Set One
	05/09/17	Plaintiff's Form ROGS to Segerstrom, Set One
	05/09/17	Plaintiff's RFAS to County of Orange, Set One
	05/09/17	Plaintiff's Form ROGS to County of Orange, Set One
	06/06/17	Plaintiff's Responses to County of Orange's Form ROGS, Set One
	06/06/17	Plaintiff's Responses to County of Orange's Special ROGS, Set One
	06/06/17	Plaintiff's Responses to County of Orange's RFPS, Set One
	06/16/17	County of Orange's Response to Plaintiff's Form ROGS, Set One
	06/16/17	County of Orange's Response to Plaintiff's RFAS, Set One
	06/22/17	Plaintiff's Responses to City's Form ROGS, Set One
	06/22/17	Plaintiff's Responses to City's Special ROGS, Set One
	06/22/17	Plaintiff's Responses to City's RFAS, Set One
	06/22/17	Plaintiff's Responses to City's RFPS, Set One
	06/22/17	Plaintiff's Objection to Declaration of Carmen Vasquez
	06/29/17	City's Responses to Plaintiff's Form ROGS, Set One
	06/29/17	City's Responses to Plaintiff's RFAS, Set One
	07/06/17	Center Tower Associates' RFPS to City, Set One
	07/06/17	Center Tower Associates' Special ROGS to City, Set One
	08/23/17	City's Responses to Center Tower Associates' RFPS, Set One
	08/23/17	City's Responses to Center Tower Associates' Special ROGS, Set One
	09/19/17	City's Supplemental Responses to Center Tower Associates' Special ROGS, Set One
	11/01/17	Plaintiff's Responses to Center Tower Associates' Form ROGS, Set One
	04/23/18	Plaintiff's Form ROGS to City, Set Two
	04/23/18	Plaintiff's RFAS to City, Set Two
	05/02/18	Plaintiff's RFPS to City, Set One
	06/05/18	City's Responses to Plaintiff's Form ROGS, Set Two
	06/05/18	City's Responses to Plaintiff's RFAS, Set Two
	06/05/18	City's Responses to Plaintiff's RFPS, Set One

**City of Costa Mesa, Cross-Complainant in Interpleader, v. Indtech Group, LLC;**  
**Lilley Planning Group; Jennifer Lilley**

<b>Case Name</b>	City of Costa Mesa, Cross-Complainant in Interpleader, v. Indtech Group, LLC; Lilley Planning Group; Jennifer Lilley		<b>Case Number</b>	30-2017-00935893
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. Frederick Horn		<b>Venue</b>	Superior Court of California, County of Orange
<b>Attorney(s) for City</b>	Gary S. Kranker		<b>Opposing Attorney(s)</b>	Jayson M. Lorenzo Law Offices of Jayson M. Lorenzo Counsel for Jennifer Lilley
<b>Date of Loss</b>	Not applicable		<b>Cross-Complaint Filed</b>	03/01/2018
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred through 06/30/18</b>	\$3,901.56			
<b>Causes of Action</b>	Not applicable.			
<b>Summary</b>	Underlying lawsuit is between former and current owners of Lilley Planning Group, which previously provided services to the City. Both parties allege to be entitled to amounts owed by the City for services rendered by Lilley Planning Group. The City filed a cross-complaint in interpleader seeking to deposit the funds with the Court and be discharged from liability to either party.			
<b>Status</b>	The City is working with counsel for both parties to determine where to deposit the funds while the dispute is resolved.			
<b>Next Hearing Date</b>	June 14, 2019 – Mandatory Settlement Conference			
<b>Trial Date</b>	July 15, 2019			
<b>Docket</b>	03/01/18	City's Cross-Complaint Filed		
	05/10/18	Status Conference		
	06/14/18	Case Management Conference		
<b>Written Discovery</b>	None exchanged.			

**Arthur Lopez v. Costa Mesa Police Department; City of Costa Mesa; Christopher Walk; Isidro Gallardo**

<b>Case Name</b>	Arthur Lopez v. Costa Mesa Police Department; City of Costa Mesa; Christopher Walk; Isidro Gallardo	<b>Case Number</b>	<b>District Court:</b> 8:17-cv-00297  <b>Court of Appeals:</b> 18-55520
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. Valerie Baker Fairbank Magistrate: Hon. Michael R. Wilner	<b>Venue</b>	<b>District Court:</b> United States District Court for Central District of California  <b>Court of Appeals:</b> Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals
<b>Attorney(s) for City</b>	Carmen Vasquez James R. Touchstone	<b>Opposing Attorney(s)</b>	Pro per
<b>Date of Loss</b>	02/19/2015	<b>Complaint Filed</b>	02/17/17*  *City served on 04/10/2017
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred through 06/30/18</b>	\$83,356.93		
<b>Causes of Action</b>	1. 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Fourth Amendment, Fifth Amendment, and Fourteenth Amendment		
<b>Summary</b>	Plaintiff alleges his constitutional rights were violated during a traffic stop that occurred on February 19, 2015.		
<b>Status</b>	The case is on appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals following the district court's granting of the City's Motion for Summary Judgment.		
<b>Next Hearing Date</b>	No hearings are scheduled at this time.		
<b>Trial Date</b>	Not yet set.		
<b>Court of Appeals Docket</b>	04/20/18 06/18/18 06/19/18	Court Docketed Cause and Set Briefing Schedule Appellant's Motion for Extension of Time to File Opening Brief Order Granting Appellant's Late Motion to Extend Time to File Opening Brief	



**Ivin Mood v. City of Costa Mesa; City of Newport Beach**

<b>Case Name</b>	Ivin Mood v. City of Costa Mesa; City of Newport Beach	<b>Case Number</b>	<b>District Court:</b> 8:15-cv-01154  <b>Court of Appeals:</b> 18-55184
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. Stephen V. Wilson Magistrate: Hon. Kenly Kiya Kato	<b>Venue</b>	<b>District Court:</b> United States District Court for the Central District of California  <b>Court of Appeals:</b> Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals
<b>Attorney(s) for City</b>	James R. Touchstone Carmen Vasquez	<b>Opposing Attorney(s)</b>	Pro per
<b>Date of Loss</b>	04/05/2014	<b>Complaint Filed</b>	07/22/2015
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred through 06/30/18</b>	\$79,166.12		
<b>Causes of Action</b>	1. 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Fourth Amendment, Fourteenth Amendment		
<b>Summary</b>	Plaintiff alleges various incidents of false arrest and use of excessive force.		
<b>Status</b>	The case is on appeal to the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals following the district court's granting of the City's Motion for Summary Judgment.		
<b>Next Hearing Date</b>	No hearings are scheduled at this time.		
<b>Court of Appeals Docket</b>	02/12/18 Notice of Appeal Filed 02/14/18 Court's Time Schedule Order Issued 02/15/18 Appellant's Informal Opening Brief Filed 02/15/18 Appellant's Notice of Motion and Motion to Vacate Judgment 02/27/18 Court's Order Granting Motion for Leave to Appeal in Forma Pauperis 03/29/18 Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time Filed 04/17/18 Plaintiff's Motion for Extension of Time Entered by Court 04/17/18 Plaintiff's Opening Brief Received 04/20/18 Copy of Order on Plaintiff's Motion for Leave to Appeal in Forma Pauperis Filed 05/01/18 Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration Requesting Permission to File Substitute or Supplemental Brief Filed 05/03/18 Appellate Commissioner's Order Denying Motion to Vacate District Court's Judgment, Denying Motion for Extension of Time to File Opening Brief as Moot, and Granting Motion to File a Substitute or Supplemental Brief		

**OneSource Distributors, LLC v. Old Republic Surety Company; City of Costa Mesa;  
City of Buena Park**

<b>Case Name</b>	OneSource Distributors, LLC v. Old Republic Surety Company; City of Costa Mesa; City of Buena Park	<b>Case Number</b>	30-2016-00884879
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. Nathan Scott	<b>Venue</b>	Superior Court of California, County of Orange
<b>Attorney(s) for City</b>	Gary S. Kranker	<b>Opposing Attorney(s)</b>	Pamela Scholefield Scholefield P.C.
<b>Date of Loss</b>	Not applicable.	<b>Complaint Filed</b>	11/03/2016
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred through 06/30/18</b>	\$6,012.30		
<b>Causes of Action</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Recovery on Stop Payment Notices</li> <li>2. Recovery on Payment Bond</li> </ol>		
<b>Summary</b>	OneSource alleges Smart Tech, the former contractor for the City's Placentia Avenue Bicycle Signal Improvement Project, purchased electrical materials, equipment and services for the project and failed to pay OneSource for the materials.		
<b>Status</b>	The parties are attempting to settle the matter.		
<b>Next Hearing Date</b>	February 2, 2019 – Mandatory Settlement Conference		
<b>Trial Date</b>	March 18, 2019		
<b>Docket</b>	11/03/16 04/12/17 05/01/17 05/04/17 05/05/17 07/11/17 07/14/17 07/31/17 11/06/17 12/13/17 02/05/18 04/02/18	Summons and Complaint Case Management Statement Filed by OneSource Case Management Conference Answer to Complaint Filed by Old Republic Notice of Continued Case Management Conference Case Management Statement Filed by Old Republic Case Status Statement Filed by OneSource Distributors Case Management Conference Case Management Conference Request for Dismissal of Buena Park Filed by OneSource Distributors Case Management Conference Case Management Conference	
<b>Written Discovery</b>		Not yet exchanged.	

**Orange County Catholic Worker et al. v. Orange County, City of Anaheim, City of Costa Mesa, and City of Orange**

<b>Case Name</b>	Orange County Catholic Worker et al. v. Orange County, City of Anaheim, City of Costa Mesa, and City of Orange	<b>Case Number</b>	8:18-cv-00155
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. David O. Carter Magistrate: Karen E. Scott	<b>Venue</b>	United States District Court for the Central District of California
<b>Attorney(s) for City</b>	James R. Touchstone Krista MacNevin Jee Gary Kranker Denise Rocawich	<b>Opposing Attorney(s)</b>	Brooke Weitzman William Wise Elder Law and Disability Rights Center  Carol A. Sobel Monique Alarcon Avneet Chattha Law Office of Carol A. Sobel  Paul L. Hoffman Catherine Sweetser Colleen M. Mullen Schonbrun, Seplow, Harris & Hoffman
<b>Date of Loss</b>	Not applicable.	<b>Complaint Filed</b>	01/29/2018
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred through 06/30/18</b>	\$78,706.70		
<b>Causes of Action</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Eighth Amendment, Fourteenth Amendment; Art. 7 § 17 California Constitution</li> <li>2. 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – First Amendment, Fourteenth Amendment</li> <li>3. 42 U.S.C. § 1983 – Right to Due Process of Law – Fourteenth Amendment</li> <li>4. California Civil Code § 52.1</li> </ol>		
<b>Summary</b>	Plaintiffs seek to enjoin and restrain Orange County from closing the Santa Ana Riverbed bike path area from habitation as to the 800-1200 homeless people that are currently living there. Plaintiffs further seek to enjoin and restrain Orange County, and the cities of Costa Mesa, Anaheim, and Orange from enforcing various anti-camping, trespassing, and loitering laws.		
<b>Status</b>	The parties are attempting to settle the matter.		
<b>Next Hearing Date</b>	No hearings are scheduled at this time.		
<b>Trial Date</b>	Not yet set.		
<b>Docket</b>	01/29/18	Complaint Filed	
	01/29/18	Plaintiffs' Notice of Related Case Filed	
	02/01/18	Plaintiffs' Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order re Enforcement of Various Anti-Camping, Trespass, and Loitering Laws Filed	

02/01/18	Court's Initial Standing Order
02/02/18	City's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Ex Parte Application Filed
02/02/18	Orange County's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Ex Parte Application Filed
02/02/18	Anaheim's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Ex Parte Application Filed
02/02/18	Orange's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Ex Parte Application Filed
02/04/18	Court's Minute Order Setting Hearing re Plaintiffs' Ex Parte Application
02/06/18	Plaintiffs' Emergency Stay Request Filed
02/06/18	Court's Order Granting Temporary Restraining Order re Temporary Stay Request
02/07/18	County's Motion for Modification and/or Clarification of Terms of Temporary Restraining Order
02/07/18	Plaintiffs' Response to County's Motion for Clarification
02/08/18	City of Orange's Supplemental Memorandum of Points and Authorities in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order
02/08/18	City of Anaheim's Supplemental Briefing in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Application for Temporary Restraining Order
02/08/18	City's Supplemental Opposition to Plaintiffs' Ex Parte Application for a Temporary Restraining Order
02/09/18	Amicus Curiae Brief of Public Law Center and The Kennedy Commission in Support of Plaintiffs' Application Filed
02/09/18	Court's Minute Order Denying County's Motion for Clarification or Modification
02/09/18	Amicus Letter of Legal Aid Society of Orange County in Support of Preliminary Injunction Filed
02/09/18	Amicus Curiae Brief of ACLU of Southern California in Support of Plaintiffs' Application for Preliminary Injunction Filed
02/11/18	Amicus Curiae Brief of Colette's Children's Home in Support of Plaintiffs' Application for Preliminary Injunction Filed
02/12/18	Plaintiffs' Response in Support of OSC re Preliminary Injunction Filed
02/12/18	City of Santa Ana's Amicus Letter re Preliminary Injunction
02/12/18	Amicus Curiae Letter of National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty in Support of Emergency Stay Request Filed
02/12/18	Amicus Curiae Brief of Orange County Poverty Alleviation Coalition in Support of Plaintiffs' Application for a Temporary Restraining Order Filed
02/12/18	City's Joinder to Defendants' Opposition and Other Supporting Documents to Plaintiffs' Ex Parte Application for a Temporary Restraining Order
02/13/18	Hearing on Temporary Restraining Order
02/13/18	Court's Minute Order re Extension of Temporary Restraining Order through February 14, 2018
02/14/18	Continued Hearing on Temporary Restraining Order
02/14/18	Court's Minute Order re Extension of Temporary Restraining Order through February 15, 2018
02/14/18	Parties' Stipulation re Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order
02/15/18	Court's Minute Order re Extension of Temporary Restraining Order through February 20, 2018
02/16/18	Hearing re Logistics of Riverbed Cleanup Scheduled for February 20, 2018
02/17/18	Court's Minute Order re Parties Request for Case Management Conference re Stipulation
02/17/18	County's Notice of Issues Filed
02/17/18	Notice to Court re Issues Relating to Implementation of Stipulation in Related

	Case Filed
02/17/18	Court's Minute Order re Request for Case Management Conference
02/18/18	County's Update re Stipulation Between Parties
02/20/18	Court's Minute Order Lifting Temporary Restraining Order
02/20/18	Plaintiffs' Notice to Court re Reimposition of Temporary Restraining Order in Related <i>Orange County Catholic Worker, et al. v. County of Orange, et al.</i> , Due to Ongoing Issues re Implementation of Stipulation
03/11/18	Minute Order Setting Status Conference for April 3, 2018
03/11/18	Plaintiffs' Request to Advance Status Conference Filed
03/12/18	Minute Order Denying Request to Advance Status Conference and Requiring Parties to Meet and Confer on March 14, 2018
03/14/18	Joint Status Report re Request to Advance Hearing Filed
03/14/18	Minute Order Advancing Status Conference to March 17, 2018
03/14/18	Plaintiffs' Supplement to Request to Continue Advance Status Conference
03/15/18	Plaintiffs' Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order to Stay Motel Evictions Pending Status Conference Filed
03/15/18	Ex Parte Application to Intervene Filed by City of Santa Ana
03/15/18	County's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order to Stay Motel Evictions Filed
03/15/18	Court's Minute Order Denying Ex Parte Application for Temporary Restraining Order to Stay Motel Evictions
03/16/18	Plaintiffs' Status Report re First Day of Motel Evictions Filed
03/16/18	Minute Order Setting Mandatory Settlement Conference and Hearing on Santa Ana's Ex Parte Application to Intervene for March 17, 2018
03/17/18	Status/Settlement Conference
03/19/18	Status Conference
03/22/18	Status Conference
03/22/18	Minute Order Setting Status Conference for April 3, 2018
03/23/18	Letter from Public Law Center and The Kennedy Commission in Support of Efforts in Lawsuit
03/24/18	Amicus Brief Filed by Amicus Irvine Residents Against Tent City
03/25/18	Minute Order Directing City of Anaheim to Appear for a Conference with the Special Master, the County, and Plaintiffs
03/29/18	Minute Order Setting Mandatory Settlement Conference for April 3, 2018
03/29/18	Court's Scheduling Notice Setting Status Conference for March 30, 2018 to Discuss Civic Center Area with County, Plaintiffs, and Santa Ana, and Ordering that Various County and Santa Officials, and Plaintiffs' Counsel, Be Present (Orange, Anaheim, and Costa Mesa not required to attend)
03/30/18	Letter from City of Orange City Manager to Judge Carter
04/03/18	Mandatory Settlement Conference and Status Conference
04/05/18	Court's Scheduling Notice re Status Conference with Plaintiffs and County of Orange
04/26/18	Santa Ana's Cross-Complaint Filed Against All Orange County Cities
05/17/18	Stipulation for Extension of Time to Respond to Cross-Complaint
05/17/18	Court's Order Granting Extension of Time and Ordering Responses to Cross-Complaint to be Filed by July 23, 2018
05/25/18	Status Conference
06/13/18	Status Conference
<b>Written Discovery</b>	Not yet exchanged.

**Cecil Patterson v. Michael Beltran; City of Costa Mesa**

<b>Case Name</b>	Cecil Patterson v. Michael Beltran; City of Costa Mesa	<b>Case Number</b>	30-2017-00954620
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. Craig Griffin	<b>Venue</b>	Superior Court of California, County of Orange
<b>Attorney(s) for City</b>	Melissa M. Ballard	<b>Opposing Attorney(s)</b>	Pro per
<b>Date of Loss</b>	09/24/2016	<b>Complaint Filed</b>	11/08/2017
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred through 06/30/18</b>	\$7,243.09		
<b>Causes of Action</b>	1. General Negligence 2. Motor Vehicle Negligence		
<b>Summary</b>	Plaintiff alleges he was involved in an automobile collision with a former City employee.		
<b>Status</b>	The case is in the pleading stage.		
<b>Next Hearing Date</b>	October 12, 2018 – Case Management Conference		
<b>Trial Date</b>	Not yet set.		
<b>Docket</b>	11/08/17	Complaint Filed	
	03/28/18	Summons Issued	
	04/06/18	Case Management Conference	
	04/27/18	City's Answer to Complaint Filed	
	06/28/18	City's Case Management Statement Filed	
<b>Written Discovery</b>		Not yet exchanged.	

**Juan Villeda v. Erick Fricke; Costa Mesa Police Department**

<b>Case Name</b>	Juan Villeda v. Erick Fricke; Costa Mesa Police Department	<b>Case Number</b>	30-2018-00980935
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. James Di Cesare	<b>Venue</b>	Superior Court of California, County of Orange
<b>Attorney(s) for City</b>	Melissa M. Ballard	<b>Opposing Attorney(s)</b>	Pro per
<b>Date of Loss</b>	Not identified.	<b>Complaint Filed</b>	03/21/2018
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred through 06/30/18</b>	\$5,975.13		
<b>Causes of Action</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Wrongful Arrest</li> <li>2. Violation of Civil Rights</li> </ol>		
<b>Summary</b>	Plaintiff filed a state court action alleging wrongful arrest and violation of his civil rights.		
<b>Status</b>	The City filed a motion to quash service of the summons.		
<b>Next Hearing Date</b>	July 27, 2018 – Hearing on City’s Motion to Quash		
<b>Trial Date</b>	Not yet set.		
<b>Docket</b>	03/21/18	Complaint Filed	
	04/20/18	City’s Motion to Quash Service of Summons Filed	
<b>Written Discovery</b>		Not yet exchanged.	

## Yellowstone v. City of Costa Mesa

<b>Case Name</b>	Yellowstone v. City of Costa Mesa	<b>Case Number</b>	8:14-cv-01852
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. James Selna Magistrate: Hon. Jay Gandhi	<b>Venue</b>	United States District Court for the Central District of California
<b>Attorney(s) for City</b>	James R. Touchstone Bruce A. Lindsay Monica Choi Arredondo Jones & Mayer  David Palmer Stradling Yocca Carlson & Rauth  Jennifer L. Keller Jesse Asher Gessin Chase Scolnick Keller Anderle	<b>Opposing Attorney(s)</b>	Steven Polin Law Offices of Steven G. Polin  Christopher Brancart Elizabeth Brancart Brancart & Brancart  Isaac Raymond Zfaty Garrett M. Prybylo Zfaty Burns
<b>Date of Loss</b>	Not applicable.	<b>Complaint Filed</b>	11/20/2014
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred through 06/30/18</b>	<b>Jones &amp; Mayer:</b> \$1,264,752.24 <b>Keller Anderle:</b> \$170,482.00		
<b>Causes of Action</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Violation of Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 3601 <i>et seq.</i></li> <li>2. Violation of Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 12131 <i>et seq.</i></li> <li>3. Violation of Rehabilitation Act, 29 U.S.C. § 794</li> <li>4. Violation of Civil Rights Act of 1871, 42 U.S.C. §§ 1983, 1985(3) and 1986</li> <li>5. Violation of California Fair Employment and Housing Act, Cal. Gov. Code §§ 12626, 12627, and 12955, <i>et seq.</i></li> <li>6. Violation of Cal. Gov. Code §§ 11135 and 65008</li> </ol>		
<b>Summary</b>	Plaintiffs challenge the City's adoption of Ordinance No. 14-13, alleging that the ordinance violates state and federal law and the state and federal constitutions.		
<b>Status</b>	Discovery is ongoing.		
<b>Next Hearing Date</b>	July 30, 2018 – Hearing on Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment		
<b>Trial Date</b>	November 6, 2018		
<b>Docket</b>	11/20/14	Summons and Complaint	
	01/16/15	Application to Appear Pro Hac Vice	
	01/22/15	Order Granting Leave for Christopher Brancart to Act as Local Counsel	
	03/13/15	Initial Order Following Filing of Complaint	
	03/16/15	Request for Order for Extending Time to Serve Complaint	
	03/17/15	Order Granting Request for Order Extending Time for Service of Complaint	
	05/04/15	Stipulation Extending Time to Answer Complaint	
	05/15/15	Second Stipulation Extending Time to Answer Complaint	
	05/29/15	Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Case Filed by City; Request for Judicial Notice	
	06/15/15	First Application for Extension of Time to File Response to City's Motion to	



		Dismiss
06/16/15		Order Granting Application Extending Time to Respond to City's Motion to Dismiss
06/29/15		Joint Application to Continue Scheduling Conference
06/29/15		Notice of Motion and Motion to Amend Complaint
06/29/15		Memorandum in Opposition to Motion to Dismiss
06/30/15		Order Continuing Scheduling Conference Pursuant to Joint Application of the Parties
07/07/15		Order Granting Plaintiffs' Motion to Amend Complaint and Denying as Moot Defendant's Motion to Dismiss
07/07/15		First Amended Complaint Filed
07/08/15		Joint Stipulation for Extension of Time to File Response to First Amended Complaint and to Continue Scheduling Conference
07/09/15		Order re Joint Application and Stipulation for Extension of Time to File Response/Reply
07/17/15		Joint Stipulation to Continue Scheduling Conference
07/20/15		Order Continuing Scheduling Conference
08/03/15		Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Plaintiff's First Amended Complaint; Request for Judicial Notice
08/07/15		Stipulation for Extension of time to File Response as to Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint
08/07/15		Order Extending Time to Response to City's Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint
08/12/15		Ex Parte Application to Expedite Rule 26(f) Conference or Discovery
08/13/15		Opposition to Plaintiff's Ex Parte Application
08/18/15		Joint Application for Leave to File Second Amended Complaint and First Supplemental Complaint
08/18/15		Order Filing Second Amended and First Supplemental Complaint and Setting Date for Response
08/19/15		Order Denying Application to Compel Rule 26(f) Conference and Commencement of Discovery
08/19/15		Second Amended Complaint and First Supplemental Amended Complaint
08/24/15		Plaintiffs' Request for Judicial Notice
08/24/15		Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Second Amended and First Supplemental Complaint; Request for Judicial Notice
08/31/15		Objection Opposition re: Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Second Amended and First Supplemental Complaint
08/31/15		Opposition to Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Second Amended and First Supplemental Complaint
09/04/15		Reply in Support of Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Second Amended and First Supplemental Complaint
09/04/15		City's Response to Plaintiffs' Objection to City's Request for Judicial Notice re Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Second Amended and First Supplemental Complaint
09/21/15		Hearing on Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint and Motion to Dismiss Second Amended Complaint and First Supplemental Complaint
10/08/15		Order Granting Motion to Dismiss Second Amended Complaint and Denying as Moot Motion to Dismiss First Amended Complaint
10/22/15		First Application for Extension of Time to Amend

10/29/15	Order Extending Time to File Third Amended Complaint
11/13/15	Third Amended Complaint
11/30/15	Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Third Amended Complaint; Request for Judicial Notice
12/07/15	Plaintiffs' Request for Judicial Notice re Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint
12/07/15	Objection to Defendant's Request for Judicial Notice re: Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint
12/07/15	Opposition to Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint
12/10/15	Order to Show Cause Why Case Should Not Be Stayed
12/17/15	City's Brief in Support of Stay
12/17/15	Plaintiffs' Response to Order to Show Cause
12/18/15	Order Directing City to File a Response
12/23/15	City's Response to Order to Show Cause
01/05/16	Order Staying Action Pending Solid Landings Appeal
01/22/16	Order Removing Action from Active Caseload and Directing Parties to File Status Report
05/03/16	Joint Status Report
06/14/16	Joint Status Report
07/15/16	Joint Status Report
08/15/16	Status Report
09/02/16	Order Lifting Stay of Action and Setting Scheduling Conference
09/13/16	Status Report/Joint Scheduling Report
09/26/16	Opposition to Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint
10/03/16	Reply to Plaintiffs' Amended Opposition
10/03/16	City's Objection to Plaintiffs' Second Request for Judicial Notice in Opposition to City's Motion to Dismiss
10/03/16	Request for Judicial Notice and Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint
10/05/16	Plaintiffs' Response to City's Second Request for Judicial Notice
10/05/16	Plaintiffs' Request for Judicial Notice
10/10/16	Objection to Plaintiffs' Second Request for Judicial Notice and Confession of Error Filed in Opposition to City's re: Notice of Motion and Motion to Dismiss Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint
10/17/16	Hearing on Motion to Dismiss Third Amended Complaint
10/20/16	Stipulation for Protective Order
10/25/16	Order Granting Stipulated Confidentiality Order
11/07/16	Fourth Amended Complaint
11/21/16	Answer to Amended Complaint/Petition
03/09/17	Stipulation to Continue Status Conference
03/10/17	Order Continuing Interim Status Conference
04/10/17	Plaintiffs' Status Report and Request to Continue Status Conference
04/11/17	Order Continuing Status Conference
05/10/17	Plaintiffs' Status Report and Request to Continue Status Conference
05/10/17	Order Continuing Status Conference
05/30/17	Stipulation to Continue Deadline for Completion of Settlement Discussions
06/01/17	Order Continuing Deadline to Complete Settlement Discussions

06/09/17	Joint Stipulation to Continue Trial, Pre-Trial Conference and Related Cut-Off Dates
06/09/17	Order Modifying Court's Scheduling Order to Continue Trial, Pre-Trial Conference and Related Cut-Off Dates
08/10/17	Joint Stipulation to Continue Deadline to Complete Settlement Discussions
08/11/17	Order Continuing Deadline to Complete Settlement Discussions
10/11/17	Joint Application and Stipulation to Amend Scheduling Order; Proposed Order Filed
10/13/17	Court's Amended Scheduling Order Issued
12/13/17	Joint Stipulation to Amend Scheduling Order Filed
12/14/17	Court's Order Modifying Scheduling Order
02/01/18	Court's Order Granting Stipulation Modifying Scheduling Order
03/05/18	Notice of Motion and Motion for Protective Order re Depositions of Jim Righeimer and Tom Hatch
03/05/18	Joint Stipulation re Motion for Protective Order Filed
03/06/18	City's Notice of Motion and Motion for Summary Judgment Against Plaintiff CWR
03/07/18	CWR's First Stipulation for Extension of Time to File Response
03/08/18	Order Setting Scheduling Order re City's Motion for Summary Judgment
03/09/18	CWR's Second Request for Extension of Time to File Response
03/12/18	City's Notice of Motion and Motion for Partial Summary Judgment on Certain Claim's Made by Plaintiff Yellowstone
03/14/18	Order Setting Revised Scheduling Order re City's Motion for Summary Judgment
03/14/18	Joint Stipulation to Amend Scheduling Order
03/15/18	Order Modifying Scheduling Order
03/28/18	Stipulation to Continue Hearing on Motion for Protective Order
03/29/18	Order Granting Request to Continue Hearing on Motion for Protective Order
04/05/18	Court's Order Continuing Hearing on Motion for Summary Judgment to May 7, 2018
04/06/18	Joint Stipulation to Continue Hearing from May 7, 2018 to June 11, 2018 re Motion for Summary Judgment
04/09/18	Scheduling Notice re Motion for Protective Order
04/09/18	Court's Order Granting Stipulation to Continue Hearing Date
04/10/18	Notice of Withdrawal of Joint Stipulation re Motion for Protective Order
04/25/18	Plaintiffs' Notice of Motion and Motion to Compel Documents
05/03/18	Plaintiffs' Application to Exceed Page Limitation for Response to City's Motion for Summary Judgment
05/03/18	Plaintiffs' Supplemental Brief in Support of Motion to Compel
05/04/18	Court's Order Enlarging Page Limitation for Response to City's Motion for Summary Judgment
05/07/18	Stipulation for Extension of Time to File Oppositions and Replies to City's Motions for Summary Judgment
05/08/18	Court's Order Granting Extension of Time
05/08/18	Plaintiffs' Compendium of Exhibits in Opposition to City's Motions
05/08/18	Plaintiff California Women's Recovery's Opposition to Notice of Motion and Motion for Summary Judgment Against California Women's Recovery
05/09/18	Plaintiff California Women's Recovery's Opposition to Motion for Partial Summary Judgment against Plaintiff Yellowstone
05/09/18	Court's Order Granting in Part Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel

	05/23/18	City's Statement of Complaint with Order re Plaintiffs' Motion to Compel
	05/30/18	Joint Stipulation to Extend Discovery Cut-Off Date Filed
	05/30/18	City's Reply in Support of Notice of Motion and Motion For Summary Judgment Against California Women's Recovery Filed
	05/30/18	City's Reply in Support of Notice of Motion and Motion For Partial Summary Judgment Against Yellowstone Filed
	06/01/18	Plaintiffs' Application for Extension of Time to Notice of Need for Further Proceedings re Motion to Compel Filed
	06/04/18	Court's Order Granting Extension of Time to Meet and Confer re Remaining Disputes
	06/07/18	Plaintiffs California Women's Recovery and Sober Living Network's Notice of Motion and Motion for Partial Summary Judgment Against City Filed
	06/08/18	Court's Order Extending Deadline for Taking Expert and Fact Witness Depositions
	06/08/18	Plaintiffs' Status Report re Proceedings Pursuant to Discovery Orders Filed
	06/11/18	Hearing on City's Motions for Summary Judgment and Partial Summary Judgment
	06/12/18	Court's Order Requesting Additional Briefing from Yellowstone
	06/13/18	Joint Stipulation to Amending Hearing and Briefing Schedule
	06/14/18	Court's Order Resetting Hearing and Briefing Schedule
	06/19/18	Plaintiffs' Memorandum in Opposition to Notice of Motion and Motion for Partial Summary Judgment
	06/21/18	City's Reply in Support of Notice of Motion and Motion for Partial Summary Judgment
	06/21/18	Plaintiff's Objection to City's Reply in Support of Motion for Partial Summary Judgment
	06/25/18	Notice of Motion and Motion to Amend Scheduling Order Filed by City
	06/29/18	City's Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Partial Summary Judgment
	06/29/18	City's Objections to Plaintiffs' Request for Judicial Notice
<b>Written Discovery</b>	09/30/15	Plaintiffs' Interrogatories (ROGS) to City, Set One
	09/30/15	Plaintiffs' ROGS to City, Set Two
	10/01/15	Plaintiffs' Requests for Production (RFPS) to City, Set One
	11/20/15	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set One
	11/20/15	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set Two
	11/23/15	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set One
	09/07/16	Plaintiffs' ROGS to City, Set Three
	09/20/16	City's ROGS to Plaintiff California Women's Recovery ("CWR"), Set One
	09/20/16	City's RFPS to Plaintiff CWR, Set One
	09/20/16	City's ROGS to Plaintiff Sober Living Network ("SLN"), Set One
	09/20/16	City's RFPS to Plaintiff SLN, Set One
	09/20/16	City's ROGS to Plaintiff Yellowstone, Set One
	09/20/16	City's RFPS to Plaintiff Yellowstone, Set One
	09/20/16	City's RFPS to Plaintiff CWR, Set Two
	09/29/16	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Two
	10/09/16	Plaintiffs' ROGS to City, Set Four
	10/09/16	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Three
	10/10/16	Plaintiffs' Initial Disclosures
	10/10/16	City's Initial Disclosures
	10/10/16	City's Supplemental Responses to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set One

10/10/16	City's Supplemental Responses to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set Two
10/10/16	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set Three
10/10/16	City's Supplemental Responses to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set One
10/11/16	Plaintiffs' Requests for Admissions (RFAS), Set One
10/16/16	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Four
10/19/16	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Five
10/28/16	City's RFPS to Plaintiff SLN, Set Two
10/28/16	City's RFPS to Plaintiff Yellowstone, Set Two
10/28/16	City's Supplemental Responses to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set Three
10/28/16	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Six
11/01/16	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Two
11/03/16	Plaintiff CWR's Objections and Responses to City's RFPS, Set One
11/03/16	Plaintiff CWR's Objections and Answers to City's ROGS, Set One
11/03/16	Plaintiff SLN's Objections and Answers to City's ROGS, Set One
11/03/16	Plaintiff SLN's Objections and Responses to City's RFPS, Set One
11/03/16	Plaintiff Yellowstone's Responses to City's Special ROGS, Set One
11/03/16	Plaintiff Yellowstone's Responses to City's RFPS, Set One
11/04/16	Plaintiffs' First Supplemental Disclosures
11/06/16	Plaintiffs' ROGS to City, Set Five
11/06/16	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Seven
11/14/16	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set Four
11/14/16	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set One
11/14/16	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Three
11/14/16	Plaintiffs' RFAS to City, Set Two
11/14/16	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Eight
11/17/16	City's RFPS to Plaintiff CWR, Set Three
11/17/16	City's ROGS to Plaintiff CWR, Set Two
11/17/16	City's RFPS to Plaintiff SLN, Set Three
11/17/16	City's RFPS to Plaintiff Yellowstone, Set Three
11/17/16	Plaintiffs' ROGS to City, Set Six
11/17/16	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Nine
11/21/16	Plaintiffs' Second Supplemental Disclosures
11/21/16	Plaintiffs' Amended RFAS, Set One
11/30/16	Plaintiff Yellowstone's Responses to City's RFPS, Set Two
11/25/16	Plaintiff CWR's Objections and Answers to City's ROGS
12/02/16	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Five
12/02/16	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Six
12/02/16	City's Amended Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set One
12/04/16	Plaintiffs' ROGS to City, Set Seven
12/04/16	Plaintiffs' RFAS to City, Set Three
12/14/16	City's RFPS to Plaintiff SLN, Set Four
12/14/16	City's RFPS to Plaintiff Yellowstone, Set Four
12/15/16	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set Five
12/15/16	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Seven
12/17/16	Plaintiffs' ROGS to City, Set Eight
12/17/16	Plaintiffs' RFAS to City, Set Four
12/17/16	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Ten
12/23/16	Plaintiffs' ROGS to City, Set Nine
01/06/17	City's Amended Responses to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set Five

01/06/17	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set Six
01/06/17	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set Seven
01/06/17	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set Two
01/06/17	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set Three
01/06/17	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Eight
01/16/17	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set Eight
01/16/17	Plaintiffs' ROGS to City, Set Ten
01/16/17	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set Four
01/16/17	Plaintiffs' RFAS to City, Set Five
01/16/17	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Ten
01/16/17	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Eleven
01/19/17	City's RFPS to Plaintiff CWR, Set Four
01/19/17	City's ROGS to Plaintiff CWR, Set Three
01/20/17	Plaintiff Yellowstone's Supplemental Responses to City's RFPS, Set One
01/20/17	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Twelve
01/20/17	Plaintiffs' RFAS to City, Set Six
01/25/17	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set Nine
02/10/17	City's Amended Responses to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Eight
02/10/17	City's Amended Responses to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Nine
02/10/17	City's Amended Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set Two
02/10/17	City's Amended Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set Three
02/10/17	City's Supplemental Responses to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set Six
02/10/17	Plaintiffs' ROGS to City, Set Eleven
02/10/17	Plaintiffs' RFAS to City, Set Seven
02/14/17	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Thirteen
02/21/17	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Eleven
02/21/17	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set Five
02/21/17	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set Ten
02/21/17	Plaintiff CWR's Responses to City's ROGS
02/24/17	City's ROGS to Plaintiff SLN, Set Two
02/24/17	City's RFPS to Plaintiff SLN, Set Five
02/25/17	Plaintiff SLN's Supplemental Responses to City's ROGS
03/03/17	City's RFAS to Yellowstone, Set One
03/03/17	City's RFPS to Yellowstone, Set Five
03/03/17	City's ROGS to Yellowstone, Set Two
03/16/17	Plaintiff CWR's Corrections to Responses to ROGS
03/17/17	City's Response to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set Seven
03/17/17	City's Responses to Plaintiff SLN's ROGS, Set Eleven
03/17/17	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Fourteen
03/17/17	Plaintiffs' ROGS to City, Set Twelve
03/20/17	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Thirteen
03/27/17	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Fifteen
04/05/17	Plaintiff Yellowstone's Responses to City's Special ROGS, Set Two
04/05/17	Plaintiff Yellowstone's Responses to City's RFAS, Set One
04/09/17	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Sixteen
04/11/17	City's RFPS to Yellowstone, Set Six
04/19/17	City's Response to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Fourteen
04/19/17	City's Response to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set Twelve
04/25/17	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Seventeen

04/25/17	Plaintiffs' ROGS to City, Set Thirteen
05/01/17	City's Response to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Fifteen
05/12/17	City's Response to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Sixteen
05/15/17	Plaintiff Yellowstone's Responses to City's RFPS, Set Six
05/30/17	City's Response to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set Thirteen
05/30/17	City's Response to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Seventeen
06/05/17	City's RFPS to Yellowstone, Set Seven
06/14/17	Plaintiffs' ROGS to City, Set Fourteen
06/16/17	Plaintiffs' ROGS to City, Set Fifteen
06/16/17	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Eighteen
07/17/17	City's Response to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set Fourteen
07/19/17	City's Response to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set Fifteen
07/19/17	City's Response to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Eighteen
07/21/17	City's RFPS to Plaintiff SLN, Set Six
07/21/17	City's ROGS to Plaintiff SLN, Set Three
07/31/17	Plaintiffs' Supplemental Answers to City's ROGS
08/16/17	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Nineteen
10/10/17	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Nineteen
10/18/17	Plaintiffs' RFAS to City, Set Eight
11/05/17	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Twenty
11/07/17	Plaintiffs' RFAS to City, Set Nine
11/07/17	Plaintiffs' RFAS to City, Set Ten
11/10/17	City's Amended Responses to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Nineteen
11/10/17	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Twenty
11/20/17	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set Eight
12/14/17	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set Nine
12/14/17	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set Ten
12/30/17	Plaintiffs' RFAS to City, Set Thirteen
12/30/17	Plaintiffs' ROGS to City, Set Seventeen
01/12/18	City's RFPS to Plaintiff CWR, Set Five
01/14/18	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Twenty-Two
01/15/18	City's Amended RFPS to Plaintiff CWR, Set Five
01/16/18	City's ROGS to Yellowstone, Set Nine
01/16/18	City's ROGS to Plaintiff SLN, Set Five
01/19/18	Plaintiffs' RFPS to City, Set Twenty-Three
01/19/18	Plaintiffs' ROGS to City, Set Twenty
01/21/18	Plaintiffs' ROGS to City, Set Twenty-One
01/22/18	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set Eleven
01/22/18	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set Twelve
01/22/18	City's Amended Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set Nine
02/01/18	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' ROGS, Set Sixteen
02/02/18	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set Thirteen
02/06/18	Yellowstone's Responses to City's RFPS, Set Eight
02/13/18	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Twenty-One
02/14/18	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set Fourteen
02/15/18	City's Amended Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set Eleven
02/16/18	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set Fifteen
02/16/18	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Twenty-Two
02/23/18	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFPS, Set Twenty-Three

	02/23/18	City's Responses to Plaintiffs' RFAS, Set Sixteen
	02/25/18	Plaintiffs' Request for Supplementation to City



## **CASES BEING HANDLED BY OUTSIDE COUNSEL**

**City of Costa Mesa v. Michael Cohen in his official capacity as  
Director of the State of California Department of Finance; Jan E. Grimes in her  
official capacity as Orange County Auditor-Controller**

<b>Case Name</b>	City of Costa Mesa v. Michael Cohen in his official capacity as Director of the State of California Department of Finance; Jan E. Grimes in her official capacity as Orange County Auditor-Controller	<b>Case Number</b>	34-2013-80001675-CU-WM-GDS
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. Michael P. Kenny	<b>Venue</b>	Superior Court of California, County of Sacramento
<b>Attorney(s) for City</b>	David A. Robinson Benjamin P. Pugh Enterprise Counsel Group	<b>Opposing Attorney(s)</b>	Office of the Attorney General
<b>Date of Loss</b>	Not applicable.	<b>Complaint Filed</b>	10/28/2013
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred to Date</b>	All attorneys' fees and costs were paid by the State of California as administrative expenses.		
<b>Causes of Action</b>	1. Declaratory Relief 2. Writ of Mandate		
<b>Summary</b>	City filed a lawsuit against the Director of the California Department of Finance (DOF) and the Orange County Auditor-Controller following the enactment of ABX1 26, which dissolved all redevelopment agencies (RDAs) effective October 1, 2011, prevented RDAs from engaging in new activities, and outlined a process for winding down a RDA's financial affairs, after the DOF disallowed two loan repayments from the former RDA to the City and ordered the City to repay these amounts to the Orange County Auditor-Controller.		
<b>Status</b>	Counsel for City obtained primary objective of lawsuit by reviving City's loan to its former redevelopment agency.		

**The Kennedy Commission, et al. v. City of Costa Mesa, et al.**

<b>Case Name</b>	The Kennedy Commission, et al. v. City of Costa Mesa, et al.	<b>Case Number</b>	30-2016-00832585
<b>Judge</b>	Hon. Mary H. Strobel, Dept. 86 (writ causes of action 1, 2, 3)	<b>Venue</b>	Superior Court of California, County of Los Angeles
<b>Petition/Complaint Filed</b>	01/28/2016		
<b>Petitioners/Plaintiffs</b>	The Kennedy Commission, Mehrnoosh Barimani, Timothy Dadey, Denise Riddell and Anthony Wagner as successor-in-interest to Patricia Wagner (deceased) (together, "Petitioners")	<b>Attorneys for Petitioners/Plaintiffs</b>	Jeremy D. Matz Julian C. Burns Bird, Marella, Boxer, Wolpert, Nessim, Drooks, Lincenberg & Rhow  Richard Walker Public Law Center  Lili V. Graham Legal Aid Society of Orange County  Navneet K. Grewal Richard A. Rothschild Western Center on Law & Poverty  Michael Rawson Deborah Collins Public Interest Law Project
<b>Respondents/Defendants</b>	City of Costa Mesa, Costa Mesa City Council (together, "Costa Mesa")	<b>Attorneys for Costa Mesa</b>	Celeste Stahl Brady Allison E. Burns David C. Palmer Stradling Yocca Carlson & Rauth, P.C. ("Stradling")
<b>Real Parties in Interest</b>	Miracle Mile Properties, LP and Diamond Star Associates, Inc. (together, "RPIs")	<b>Attorneys for Real Parties in Interest</b>	Elizabeth "Ellia" Thompson Allan Cooper Jeffrey Harlan Ervin Cohen & Jessup, LLP ("ECJ")
<b>Legal Fees and Costs Incurred 02/01/16-05/31/18</b>	\$738,703.08—To date, all City legal fees and costs have been paid by Real Party in Interest, Miracle Mile Properties		
<b>Causes of Action and Summary</b>	Petition for Writ of Mandate challenged four land use actions by the City Council (together, "Development Approvals"): (1) General Plan Amendment (GP 14 04); (2) Rezone (R 14 04); (3) Zoning Code Amendment (CO-14-02); and		

	<p>(4) Master Plan (PA-14-27).</p> <p>Petition alleges the Development Approvals were adopted in violation of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) State Density Bonus Law (Government Code sections 65915 – 65917)</li> <li>(b) City’s General Plan, including the Housing Element;</li> <li>(c) Government Code section 65008 (alleged housing discrimination); and</li> <li>(d) State Relocation Assistance Act (CRAA, Gov’t Code section 7260, <i>et seq.</i>), which is the pending fourth cause of action.</li> </ul> <p>On May 11, the Court (i) ruled the Development Approvals were set aside <i>to the extent</i> development incentives or other density bonuses were provided in a manner inconsistent with the state density bonus law ((a) above); and, (ii) the Court denied the petition in all other respects ((b) and (c) above) including that no housing discrimination occurred since development of the subject commercial property was not intended to be protected by Government Code section 65008, and (iii) Petitioners’ CRAA claim ((d) above) was transferred to an individual calendar court (Dept. 71) because Petitioners had not shown they were entitled to a writ of mandate for the CRAA claim and that claim was not proper in the writ department.</p>
<b>Status</b>	The parties recently settled the matter.