ENDORSED FILED SAN MATEO COUNTY

SEP 0 2 2004

Clerk of the Superior Court

By SANDRA HARRIS

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF SAN MATEO

HALF MOON BAY COASTSIDE FOUNDATION aka SAVE OUR BAY, OSCAR BRAUN, ANDREA BRAUN, AND H. JOHN PLOCK, JR. Petitioners,

VS.

SAN MATEO COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISION AND DOES 1 through 200, inclusive

Respondent,

MID-PENINSULA REGIONAL OPEN SPACE DISTRICT

Real Parties in Interest

Case No.: CIV 439808

DECISION REGARDING PETITION FOR PERMANENT RESTRAINING ORDER

This matter was assigned to this Court by the Presiding Judge for hearing on the request for a permanent injunction as part of Petitioners' request for a writ of mandate action they filed on June 7, 2004. On July 22 and 23, 2004 an evidentiary hearing was held in this Department. H. Ann Liroff and Peter W. Daniel of Hannig Law Firm LLP represented Petitioners. Carol Woodward of the San Mateo County Counsel's Office represented Respondent. Ellison Folk and Richard Taylor of Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP and Susan Schectman represented Real Party in Interest.

Real Party in Interest presented to Respondent an "application for annexation of 140,000 acres of San Mateo County coastal lands." Respondent approved the proposed annexation by adopting

Resolution No. 960.² As a result Respondent set the proposal for hearing as required by law.³ Notice of

the hearing must be given⁴ with certain requirements within the notice.⁵ Prior to the conclusion of this

hearing any affected owner of land or registered voter within the affected area to be annexed is entitled

to protest the proposed annexation. The number of valid protests filed determines what action

Respondent must take. If there are more than 25% but less than 50% "of the registered voters residing

Mateo County Department of Elections, applied the incorrect standard in determining the "value of

written protests filed and not withdrawn" as required when deciding whether sufficient protest votes

have been filed to challenge a proposal approved by Respondent. Most of the evidentiary hearing and

Respondent from ordering the "change of organization" that would otherwise take place in light of the

fact that Respondent has determined in its mind that insufficient valid protest votes have been filed. 10

law. 11 Furthermore, "[t]here is a general rule against enjoining public officers or agencies from

performing their duties. [Citations omitted] This rule would not preclude a court from enjoining

unconstitutional or void acts, but to support a request for such relief the plaintiff must make a significant

In order to obtain injunctive relief Petitioners must establish the lack of an adequate remedy at

arguments were directed toward this issue. At this point Petitioners seek an injunction prohibiting

Petitioners contend in this portion of their action that Respondent, through their agent the San

within the affected territory" then a confirmation election must be held.⁷

1

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

25

26

27

See Petitioners' Petition for Writ of Mandamus filed June 7, 2004 at page 2.

See Petitioners' Exhibit 15. 24

See Government Code § 57002 and 57050.

See Government Code § 57025.

See Government Code § 57026.

See Government Code § 57051.

See Government Code § 57075(a)(2)(A).

⁸ See Government Code § 57052.

⁹ See Government Code § 57075.

¹⁰ See Petitioners' Exhibit 15.

¹¹ See Grettenberg v. Goggin (1931) 113 Cap. App. 252. See also Code of Civil Procedure § 526(a)(4)(5) and Civil Code § 3422.

showing of irreparable injury." No such showing has been made here to justify an injunction in light of Petitioners' right to file a validation action pursuant to Code of Civil Procedure section 863. Here contrary to Petitioners position a validation action would be an adequate remedy at law raising the issues that Petitioners raise here. As a result IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that: 1. Petitioners' request for a permanent restraining order is denied; and 2. The July 13, 2004 temporary restraining order shall be lifted. Dated this September 2, 2004 W. HOLM

¹² Tahoe Keys Property Owners' Assn. V. State Water Resources Control Bd. (1994) 23 Cal. App. 4th 1459, 1471.

AFFIDAVIT OF MAILING: CASE NO: CIV439808

HALF MOON BAY COASTSIDE FOUNDATION aka SAVE OUR BAY, OSCAR BRAUN, ANDREA BRAUN and H. JOHN PLOCK, JR., Petitioners, v. SAN MATEO COUNTY LOCAL AGENCY FORMATION COMMISSION, and DOES through 200, inclusive, Respondent, MID-PENINSULA REGIONAL OF ENSURE SAN MATEO COUNTY SPACE DISTRICT, Real Party in Interest

SEP 0 2 2004

Clerk of the Superior Court DOCUMENT: DECISION REGARDING PETITION FOR PERMANENTAINDRA HARRIS RESTRAINING ORDER

I declare, under penalty of perjury, that on the following date I deposited in the United State Post Office Mail Box at Redwood City, California a true copy of the foregoing document, enclosed in an envelope, with the proper and necessary postage pre-paid thereon and addressed to the following:

H. Ann Liroff Peter W. Daniel Hanning Law Firm LLP 2991 El Camino Real Redwood City, CA 94061 Carol Woodward Hall of Justice and Records 400 County Center Redwood City, CA 94063

Ellison Folk Shute, Mihaly & Weinberger LLP 396 Hayes Street San Francisco, CA 94102

Susan Schectman 333 Distel Circle Los Altos, CA 94022-1633

Executed on September 2, 2004 At Redwood City, CA

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT

By: SANDRA HAPRIS
Deputy Clerk