38159.03002\40808277.1

Case No. 3:22-cv-05377-WHO

DEFENDANT CITY OF ALBANY'S BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF JUDICIAL REFERRAL OF DETERMINING

> 3:22-CV-05377-WHO CITY OF ALBANY'S BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF JUDICIAL REFERRAL OF DETERMINING RELATIONSHIP

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The City of Albany ("City") submits this brief in support of the Referral for Purpose of Determining Relationship issued by Judge William H. Orrick for consideration of whether the above captioned case is related to Lions Club of Albany, California v. City of Albany, Case No. 17-05236-WHA.

The City is now, and has been for some time, the fee owner of the real property (i.e., Albany Hill Park) on which a cross is located, more particular described as Assessor Parcel Numbers 066-2754-14-05 and 066-2754-40-03 ("Subject Property"). The City acquired the Subject Property on or about August 21, 1973, after it accepted a land donation from the corporation that purchased the Subject Property from Plaintiff's former member. As part of the conveyance from Plaintiff's former member to the corporation, and, eventually, from the corporation to the City, the seller excepted from the sale an easement, in Plaintiff's favor, for ingress/egress over the Subject Property to maintain the cross on Albany Hill Park. This complex transaction involving Plaintiff, its former member, the corporation, and the City, among others, resulted in a series of lawsuits concerning the Subject Property. Lions Club of Albany, California v. City of Albany, 323 F.Supp.3d 1104 (N.D. Cal. 2018) ("Lions Club I") (summarizing history of the litigation.)

On September 11, 2017, Plaintiff filed an action in this court against the City for alleged violations of the First and Fourteenth Amendments. In Lions Club I, Plaintiff alleged the City ordered the Pacific Gas and Electric Company to shut down power to the cross for 106 days. Plaintiff alleged this decision was part of a continued campaign to harass Plaintiff even though the City had legitimate safety concerns in carrying out that decision, including the ongoing fire hazard to the public. The City thereafter filed a Cross-Complaint against Plaintiff for Quiet Title, Trespassing, Nuisance, and Declaratory relief. The matter was assigned to the Honorable Judge William Alsup.

The parties eventually filed dueling summary judgment motions, which Judge Alsup granted in part, and denied in part. In so doing, Judge Alsup stated, in no uncertain terms, that "The City Must Remedy Its First Amendment Violation." Judge Alsup also held that "the public park

DETERMINING RELATIONSHIP

¹ The instant lawsuit is sometimes herein referred to as *Lions Club III*.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

with the cross violates the Establishment Clause" and that the "land cannot continue as a public park with the cross on it." Because of this key finding, Judge Alsup identified three possible choices for the City to overcome this critical issue. First, the City could sell the portion of the Subject Property to a private owner where the easement and cross are located. Second, the City could condemn the easement through its eminent domain power. Third, the City could adopt a zoning ordinance to ban all religious symbols from its public spaces. The Ninth Circuit affirmed Judge Alsup's order. See, Lions Club of Albany, California v. City of Albany, 788 F. App'x 428 (9th Cir. 2019). After careful consideration, and in line with one of the options Judge Alsup provided to the City, the City decided to explore condemning Plaintiff's easement interest in the Subject Property.

Thereafter, amongst other reasons, in an attempt to rectify the Establish Clause problem Judge Alsup noted, the City initiated an eminent domain lawsuit to condemn the Lion Club's easement and remove the cross. The City's proposed acquisition, including removal of the cross, is (1) for the public purposes and necessity of enabling the public to more fully use and enjoy Albany Hill Park as an open space without the encumbrance, and (2) to avoid any potential Establishment Clause issue arising from Plaintiff maintaining the cross. The City adopted a resolution of necessity to acquire the easement and remove the cross.

On May 4, 2022, the City filed its Complaint in Eminent Domain in the Alameda County Superior Court, styled as City of Albany v. Albany Lions Club, Lions International, et al., and bearing case number 22CV010822 ("Lions Club II" or "State Court Action"). The City filed a Motion for Prejudgment Possession of Plaintiff's easement two days later, and it deposited \$500,000 in the State of California Condemnation Deposits Fund for withdrawal by Plaintiff as probable just compensation for the easement. Plaintiff opposed the Motion for Prejudgment Possession, raising similar, if not the identical, arguments, positions, and claims being asserted in this current federal lawsuit, i.e., Lions Club III. On August 30, 2022, the Court in Lions Club II granted the City's Motion for Prejudgment Possession, and in the event the City decided to remove the cross, it ordered the City to preserve the cross in a safe location pending trial and final judgment

Case 3:22-cv-05377-WHO Document 22 Filed 10/28/22 Page 4 of 6

1 in the State Court Action. 2 As Judge Alsup is familiar with the topics at issue in this matter, and provided a previous ruling that provided direction to the City regarding the cross, it seems appropriate for Judge Alsup 3 4 to handle this present lawsuit. 5 6 Dated: October 28, 2022 BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP 7 8 By: /S/ Scott W. Ditfurth SCOTT W. DITFURTH 9 ANDREW G. SAGHIAN Attorneys for Defendant 10 CITY OF ALBANY, a Charter City 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

- 4 -

BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP
ATTORNEYS ATLAW
3390 UNIVERSITY AVENUE, 5TH FLOOR
RIVERSIDE, CALIFORNIA 92502

3:22-CV-05377-WHO CITY OF ALBANY'S BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF JUDICIAL REFERRAL OF DETERMINING RELATIONSHIP

PROOF OF SERVICE

At the time of service I was over 18 years of age and not a party to this action. My business address is 3390 University Avenue, 5th Floor, P.O. Box 1028, Riverside, California 92502. On October 28, 2022, I served the following document(s):

DEFENDANT CITY OF ALBANY'S BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF JUDICIAL REFERRAL OF DETERMINING RELATIONSHIP

- By fax transmission. Based on an agreement of the parties to accept service by fax transmission, I faxed the documents to the persons at the fax numbers listed below. No error was reported by the fax machine that I used. A copy of the record of the fax transmission, which I printed out, is attached.
- By United States mail. I enclosed the documents in a sealed envelope or package addressed to the persons at the addresses listed below (specify one):
 - ☐ Deposited the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service, with the postage fully prepaid.
 - Placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary business practices. I am readily familiar with this business's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing. On the same day that correspondence is placed for collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business with the United States Postal Service, in a sealed envelope with postage fully prepaid.

I am a resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or package was placed in the mail at Riverside, California.

- By messenger service. I served the documents by placing them in an envelope or package addressed to the persons at the addresses listed below and providing them to a professional messenger service for service. A Declaration of Messenger is attached.
- By overnight delivery. I enclosed the documents in an envelope or package provided by an overnight delivery carrier and addressed to the persons at the addresses listed below. I placed the envelope or package for collection and overnight delivery at an office or a regularly utilized drop box of the overnight delivery carrier.

3:22-CV-05377-WHO CITY OF ALBANY'S BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF JUDICIAL REFERRAL OF DETERMINING RELATIONSHIP BEST BEST & KRIEGER LLP Attorneys atlaw 3390 University Avenue, 5th Roor Riverside, Californa 92502

	Case 3.22-CV-03377-WHO Document 22 Filed 10/26/22 Fage 0 01 0
1	By the Court's CM/ECF system. All registered CM/ECF users in this
2	case, including the following, will be served with the foregoing
3	document by receiving a notification of such filing (NEF) and a hyperlink to said document, by the court's CM/ECF system.
4	Robert E. Nichols Attorneys for Plaintiff,
5 6	Richard W. Covert 713 Key Route Blvd. Albany, California 94706 The Lions Club of Albany, California
7	Telephone Number: (510) 710-7033 E-mail: renichols01comcast.net
8	
9	I declare that I am employed in the office of a member of the bar of
10	this court at whose direction the service was made.
11	Executed on October 28, 2022, at Riverside, California.
12 13	MANA SOLO
14	Ana Horta
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
20	