



2004 DEC 22 PM 4: 58

ONE FRANK H. OGAWA PLAZA • 6TH FLOOR • OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA 94612

Office of the City Attorney John A. Russo City Attorney

January 4, 2005

(510) 238-3601 FAX: (510) 238-6500 TTY/TDD: (510) 238-3254

Honorable City Council Oakland, California

City Council President Ignacio de la Fuente and Members of the City Council:

Subject:

Resolution Authorizing the City Attorney to File (1) a Letter in Support of a Petition for Review in the California Supreme Court, (2) a Request to Depublish (not publish), and/or (3) an Amicus (Friend of the Court) Brief in Support of the City of Santa Monica in Action Apartment v. Santa Monica in which the California Court of Appeal Held that State Law Preempts a Provision of Santa Monica's Ordinance that Provides Tenants Remedies for Landlords' False or Misleading Allegations in Eviction Notices

## Summary of Action Requested

This matter was discussed in closed session on December 21, 2004 and placed on the open session agenda for the Council to take action.

The City of Santa Monica has asked that the City of Oakland and other cities join in its efforts to overturn the decision of the California Court of Appeals in Action Apartment v. Santa Monica, 123 Cal.App.4th 47 (2004). In Action Apartment the appellate court ruled that state law preempted a provision of Santa Monica's Tenant Harassment Ordinance that provided remedies for tenants whose landlords evicted or attempted to evict them based on false or misleading allegations in an eviction notice. Santa Monica will request that the appellate court depublish (not publish) the Action Apartment decision so that the decision will bind only the parties to the litigation and attorneys will be precluded from citing or relying on Action as precedent in other cases. Santa Monica also will seek review in the California Supreme Court.

## Background

President de la Fuente and Members of the City Council

Subject: Report and Resolution Authorizing the City Attorney to Request Depublication or File an Amicus Brief in *Action Apartment v. Santa Monica* 

December 21, 2004

Page Two

In *Action Apartment*, a landlord organization challenged provisions of Santa Monica's Tenant Harassment Ordinance that provided remedies for tenants when their landlord evicted or attempted to evict them based on false or misleading allegations in an eviction notice. The Santa Monica City Council enacted the ordinance to address its concern that landlords were harassing tenants into vacating so that the landlords could increase rents to market level.<sup>1</sup>

The Court of Appeals ruled that eviction notices are part of eviction litigation, and therefore are protected by the litigation privilege. Accordingly, the Court of Appeals decided that Civil Code § 47(b) preempted the ordinance's remedies that permitted a tenant to recover damages from a landlord for issuing a false or misleading eviction notice.

If the *Action Apartment* decision stands, preemption by Civil Code § 47(b) could impair the City's from enact meaningful remedies for some of its ordinances.

## Fiscal Impact

The City will not incur any outside counsel expenses because the letter or brief will be prepared and filed by the staff in the City Attorney's Office.

## Recommendation

We recommend that the City Council authorize the City Attorney to support Santa Monica's efforts to depublish the decision in *Action Apartment and* seek reversal of the decision in the California Supreme Court.

Respectfully submitted,

JOHN A. RUSS City Attorney

Attorney Assigned: Richard F. Illgen

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> State law allows landlords to charge market rate rents if a tenant voluntarily vacates a rental property or is evicted for cause. (Costa-Hawkins Rental Housing Act, (Cal. Civil Code § 1954.50, et seq.)

Approved as to Form and Legality

0=== /	HERD	-	Approved as to Form and Legality
OFFICE OF	THE CITY CLER CKLAND Oaklan 22 PM 4: 58	d City Cou	ncil
2004 DEC 2	<sup>2</sup> 2 PM 4: <u>5</u> 8	011 <b>y</b> 000	
	RESOLUTION	No	C.M.S.
INTRO	DUCED BY COUNCILMEN	IBER	
	Petition for Review in the Depublish (not publish), a Support of the City of Sarwhich the California Communication of the Cali	he California Supreme and/or (3) an Amicus (Fr ata Monica in <i>Action Apa</i> urt of Appeal Held tha a's Ordinance that Provid	I) a Letter in Support of a Court, (2) a Request to iend of the Court) Brief in rtment v. Santa Monica in t State Law Preempts a des Tenants Remedies for tion Notices
Califor	nia Court of Appeal ruled tha	nt certain tenant remedies in	123 Cal.App.4th 47 (2004) the n the City of San Monica's Tenant de 47(b) (the litigation privilege);
	WHEREAS, Action Apartmeter te without state law preemption	•	mpact on the authority of cities to
	WHEREAS, Action Apartme enforcement mechanisms for		verse impact on cities' ability to
	WHEREAS, the City of Salish or appeal Action Apartm	•	er cities assist with its efforts to court; therefore be it
Action letter	following (1) request the ( Apartment decision so that supporting Santa Monica's (3) file an amicus (friend of	Court of Appeal or Suprer it cannot be cited as lega petition for review before	City of Oakland, is authorized to me Court decision depublish the I authority or precedent, (2) file a e the California Supreme Court Santa Monica's appeal in <i>Action</i>
IN CO	UNCIL, OAKLAND, CALIFO	PRNIA,	
PASS	ED BY THE FOLLOWING V	OTE:	
AYES:	BROOKS, BRUNNER, ODE LA FUENTE	CHANG, NADEL, QUAN, F	REID, WAN AND PRESIDENT
NOTE			
ABSE			
ABSTI	ENTION-		
	,	Attest:	CEDA FLOYD
		City Clerk and	Clerk of the Cou Oakland, California

333888\_1