

AGENDA

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Meeting: 9:45 a.m., Wednesday, March 25, 2015
Glenn S. Dumke Auditorium

Lou Monville, Chair
Rebecca D. Eisen, Vice Chair
Roberta Achtenberg
Talar A. Alexanian
Kelsey Brewer
Adam Day
Douglas Faigin
Debra S. Farar
Margaret Fortune
Lupe C. Garcia
Steven M. Glazer
Lillian Kimbell
Hugo N. Morales
J. Lawrence Norton
Steven G. Stepanek

Consent Items

Approval of Minutes of Meeting of November 13, 2014

Discussion Items

1. General Counsel's Litigation Report, *Information*

**MINUTES OF MEETING OF
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**

**Trustees of The California State University
Glenn S. Dumke Conference Center
401 Golden Shore
Long Beach, California**

November 13, 2014

Members Present

Lou Monville, Chair
Rebecca D. Eisen, Vice Chair
Roberta Achtenberg
Talar A. Alexanian
Kelsey Brewer
Adam Day
Douglas Faigin
Debra S. Farar
Margaret Fortune
Lupe C. Garcia
Steven M. Glazer
Lillian Kimbell
J. Lawrence Norton
Steven Stepanek
Timothy P. White, Chancellor

Approval of Minutes

Chair Monville, hearing no objections, approved the minutes of March 26, 2014.

Information Item

Framroze Virjee, Executive Vice Chancellor and General Counsel, Dianne Harrison, President, California State University, Northridge and Leslie E. Wong, President, San Francisco State University provided an update regarding preventing, addressing and eliminating sexual violence on CSU campuses.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

General Counsel's Litigation Report

Presentation By

Fram Virjee
Executive Vice Chancellor & General Counsel

Litigation Report

This is the annual report on the status of significant litigation confronting the CSU, and is presented for information. "Significant" for purposes of this report is defined as litigation: (1) with the potential for a systemwide impact on the CSU; (2) that raises significant public policy issues; (3) brought by or against another public agency; or (4) which, for other reasons, has a high profile or is likely to generate widespread publicity. *New information since the date of the last report is printed in italics.*

The cases contained in this report have been selected from 82 currently active litigation files; in 3 CSU is the party pursuing relief.

New Cases

Alliance of SLO Neighborhoods v. CSU
San Luis Obispo
San Luis Obispo County Superior Court

Alliance of SLO Neighborhoods (ASLON), an affiliation of San Luis Obispo residents, filed suit challenging the Trustees' May 2014 approval and certification of a project Environmental Impact Report for a 1,475-bed freshman student housing complex on the southeastern edge of the Cal Poly campus. The proposed project will be located on campus land in close proximity to homes owned by ASLON members. ASLON's primary contention is that CSU failed to adequately analyze alternative project sites that would have placed the dorms further away from their homes and the surrounding community, but which would also place them further away from other student freshman housing and amenities like dining facilities, which are located near the project site. The matter is being briefed and is scheduled for hearing on April 20, 2015.

Whole
Agenda Item 1
March 24-25, 2015
Page 2 of 12

Burns v. SDSU, et al.

San Diego
San Diego County Superior Court

Former women's basketball coach, Beth Burns, has sued the University for breach of contract, breach of the covenant of good faith and fair dealing, and retaliation. She contends that she was forced to resign for having demanded that women's basketball be given all of the same facilities, equipment, marketing, and staffing as the men's basketball program. She further contends that the reasons given by the University were a pretext. The case is in the discovery stage.

CSU v. Pacific Gas & Electric Company

Chico
Butte County Superior Court

The University and the CSU Chico Research Foundation have sued PG&E to recover money spent on costly remedial activities and disposal of waste discovered during the construction of an activity center on the Chico campus. The waste was created by an old manufactured gas plant. PG&E is responsible for the manufactured gas plant. The case is in the discovery phase.

CSU v. SELF

Systemwide
Los Angeles County Superior Court

This is a coverage dispute with the Schools Excess Liability Fund (SELF), a joint powers authority. During the time CSU was a member of and insured by SELF, CSU was involved in six lawsuits/claims. CSU requested that SELF reimburse it for monies expended and/or paid by CSU in connection with those matters. SELF denied CSU's requests for reimbursement. As required by their underlying agreement, CSU and SELF proceeded to non-binding arbitration in 2014. CSU was awarded \$5.2 million. Subsequently, CSU filed a lawsuit against SELF seeking reimbursement of all expenses and monies expended in connection with the six lawsuits/claims at issue. The case is in the discovery stage.

Dell'Osso v. CSU

Fullerton
Orange County Superior Court

Gary Dell'Osso is a 61 year old student that has been continuously enrolled since 1980. In January 2014, he was administratively graduated and was awarded a B.A., B.S and 3 minors. He alleges violation of California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 40411 and violation of the due process clause under the U.S. and California constitutions. He seeks to be re-enrolled to complete a B.S. in Mathematics and damages. The case is in the discovery phase. Trial is set for July 6, 2015.

In re: Albert Stephen Moriarty, Jr. (USBK - CA)
In re: Albert Stephen Moriarty, Jr. (USBK - WA)
San Luis Obispo
U.S. Bankruptcy Court

Bankruptcy Trustee, Michael P. Klein, filed this 2014 action to recover a 2009 \$625,000 gift made by alumnus Albert Moriarty whose 2012 Chapter 7 Bankruptcy is pending in the State of Washington. Pursuant to the gift agreement, the funds were used to build a scoreboard in Cal Poly SLO's Spanos Stadium, bearing the name "Moriarty Enterprises" for the life of the scoreboard. The Trustee alleges that Moriarty was insolvent at the time of the gift and that it was a product of Moriarty's fraudulent conduct in connection with a Ponzi scheme. The Trustee claims that Cal Poly SLO should have known it was benefitting from Moriarty's fraudulent activity, and alleges causes of action for avoidance of fraudulent transfer and recovery of avoided transfer. The case is in the pleading stage and is set for status conference on March 12, 2015.

The second matter is related to the Moriarty bankruptcy matter described above. CSU filed a Motion for Abandonment and Relief from Stay in the Chapter 7 bankruptcy proceedings pending in the State of Washington asking the court to abandon the bankruptcy estate's alleged rights and interests in the Moriarty Scoreboard Fund Gift Agreement because it has no current value or benefit to the bankruptcy estate. CSU requested relief from the automatic stay in order to immediately cover or remove the Moriarty name from the scoreboard. The court reluctantly denied the motion.

J.A.L. v. Santos, et al.
San Jose
U.S. District Court, San Jose

SJSU police officers Mike Santos and Frits Van Der Hoek confronted Antonio Guzman Lopez, a homeless man holding a sharp object, on the edge of campus. After Lopez ignored their instructions and moved quickly toward Van Der Hoek, Officer Santos fired, killing Lopez. Plaintiff J.A.L. is Lopez' minor son. Through his guardian ad litem, J.A.L. brings claims against Santos and Van Der Hoek, for unreasonable search and seizure, violation of due process, wrongful death and negligence. The case is in the pleading stage.

Whole
Agenda Item 1
March 24-25, 2015
Page 4 of 12

Jennum v. CSU, et al.
San Marcos
San Diego County Superior Court

Plaintiff is the former women's basketball coach at CSU San Marcos. She contends that the defendants wrongfully concluded after an investigation that she had discriminated against, harassed, and retaliated against players on her team on the bases of race and disability. Based on the results of this investigation, she alleges, the campus notified her that her employment was being terminated. In this lawsuit, she alleges causes of action for defamation based on the campus having disclosed her termination prior to it being final and intentional infliction of emotional distress. The case is in the pleading stage.

Lor, et al. v. CSU, et al.
Chico
Butte County Superior Court

On August 27, 2013, Pa Houa Lor, a student at CSU Chico, was struck by two falling tree limbs while sitting in a courtyard on the CSU Chico campus. Ms. Lor died as a result of the injuries she sustained. The complaint, filed by Ms. Lor's parents, is asserted against the University, as well as Richard's Tree Service, Inc., the CSU vendor responsible for tree maintenance at CSU Chico. The single cause of action is for wrongful death. The matter was filed in June 2014, and the case is in the pleading stage.

Richardson v. CSU, et al.
San Diego
U.S. District Court, San Diego

Plaintiff alleges that, in the early morning hours of June 16, 2013, he was stopped by a SDSU police officer as he was attempting to climb the fence into a gated housing facility. He alleges that the officer used excessive force in attempting to stop him. As a result, he alleges, he fell down a flight of stairs, suffering injuries to his face and arm. He alleges causes of action for violation of Section 1983 of the federal Civil Rights Act, negligence, battery, and violation of the California Bane Act (California Civil Code Section 52.1). The case is in the discovery stage.

Sackos, et al. v. NCAA; NCAA Division I Member Schools; et al.
Systemwide
United States District Court

This case is a collective action brought under the federal Fair Labor Standards Act, filed by Samantha Sackos (a student-athlete from the University of Houston) against the NCAA and all Division I member institutions. She alleges that the NCAA and all D-I institutions have conspired to violate the wage-and-hour laws by unlawfully failing to classify student-athletes as

temporary employees. The complaint compares student-athletes to work study employment, and suggests that athletes should earn minimum wage for all time spent in athletics programs. Plaintiff contends that athletics is a non-academic function, earning her no academic credit, and is actually work that benefits the member schools and the NCAA. Plaintiff also contends that scholarship funds are not compensation. She seeks monetary damages and injunctive relief. The NCAA has retained the Littler law firm (at the NCAA's expense) to represent it and all D-I institutions at the pleading stage. The preliminary strategy will be to seek dismissal on various theories, such as: lack of standing; failure to state a claim; 11th Amendment immunity (for public institutions); and lack of personal jurisdiction. The case is still in the pleading stage, with motions to dismiss due to be filed in April 2015.

Construction Cases

CSU v. Clark, et al.

San Jose

Santa Clara County Superior Court

CSU filed this complaint for breach of contract and negligence against the architect and general contractor for plumbing repair and replacement costs for SJSU's Campus Village dormitory complex. Construction was completed in 2005. CSU has repaired or replaced major portions of the plumbing system with final repair work completed in summer 2012. CSU's complaint seeks approximately \$29 million in damages. *CSU has settled in principle with all defendants. Trial is scheduled for July 6.*

Employment Cases

Fayek v. CSU, et al.

Chico

Butte County Superior Court

Plaintiff, Abdel-Moaty Fayek, was a faculty member in the Department of Computer Science. He contends he entered into a self-funded buy-out agreement with the campus where he would gain industry experience while on an approved leave. From approximately 1997 to 2006, plaintiff received his campus salary and reimbursed it to the Research Foundation as part of the alleged agreement. The campus discovered this arrangement and immediately contacted CalPERS and the State Controller's Office to correct the employee's payroll records. Plaintiff has sued the campus, the Research Foundation, three individual defendants and CalPERS to restore his service credit. *The Court granted CSU Defendants' motion challenging all claims except one, and dismissing CalPERS. Plaintiff accepted CSU's offer of \$27,000 to resolve the remaining claim. We are awaiting Court's final judgment pursuant to resolution of remaining claim.*

Whole
Agenda Item 1
March 24-25, 2015
Page 6 of 12

Gibson v. CSU, et al.
Chancellor's Office
Los Angeles County Superior Court

Plaintiff Bruce Gibson was the former Senior Director of Human Resource Services and Systemwide EEO & Whistleblower Compliance. CSU terminated Gibson's employment in September 2012. This lawsuit claims the termination was in retaliation for his having made various disclosures he claimed were protected. *The matter proceeded to trial in February 2015 and the jury found in favor of CSU on all counts.*

Liu v. CSU
East Bay
Alameda County Superior Court

Jerry Liu, a former East Bay Assistant Professor of Finance, was denied tenure and promotion. He filed claims for national origin discrimination, hostile work environment, and retaliation, arguing his failure to advance resulted from having blown the whistle on alleged favoritism and various financial irregularities in the College of Business and Economics, and for filing various grievances, discrimination complaints, and participating anonymously in the Dean's five-year review. Liu was also disciplined (suspended and then terminated during his terminal year) for a wide variety of escalating and disruptive, harassing, disturbing and threatening behaviors toward colleagues, administrators and staff. *After a month-long jury trial ending in April 2014, CSU prevailed with a complete defense verdict and an award of its costs in the amount of \$42,615.00 against Liu. Liu appealed the verdict. The appeal has been briefed. Liu requested oral argument which has not yet been scheduled.*

Ohlund v. CSULA, et al.
Los Angeles
Los Angeles County Superior Court

Following her 2012 evaluation, assistant professor of English Jennifer Ohlund (the plaintiff), received a terminal year of employment during which she failed to submit for review materials for her Working Professional Action File. She sued the department chair and University for gender-based discrimination and harassment, claiming her assigned workload was disproportionately different in quality and quantity than her male counterparts. She further alleged that when she complained about the workload and harassment the University failed to prevent the conduct and retaliated. She claimed she refused to submit her documentation because the University did not act when she reported discrimination. *The case went to trial in January 2015, and CSU achieved a defense verdict.*

SETC-United v. CSU, et al.
Systemwide
San Francisco County Superior Court

The State Employees Trades Council's collective bargaining agreement with CSU expired on June 30, 2008. The Education Code requires prevailing wages be paid to certain hourly laborers unless a collective bargaining agreement states otherwise. SETC claims that when its collective bargaining agreement expired, its employees should have been paid prevailing wages. It is CSU's contention that because CSU pays SETC employees on a monthly, not an hourly basis, the Education Code requirement should not apply. *CSU won its motion to dismiss for failure to prosecute in April 2014, and the case is now closed.*

Sharp v. CSU, et al.
Sacramento
Sacramento County Superior Court

Jeffrey Sharp, a Development Associate Alumni Relations at Sacramento State, has filed a complaint against CSU and a former employee alleging sexual harassment, retaliation and disability discrimination. *The case was set for trial on March 3, 2015. The University settled the case and Sharp signed a general release of all claims and agreed to resign and not seek re-employment in the CSU. The settlement amount was \$123,000.00 (which included \$35,000.00 for wages, \$3,000.00 for COBRA, and attorney's fees).*

Environmental Cases

City of Hayward v. CSU
East Bay
Court of Appeal

The City of Hayward filed a CEQA challenge to the 2009 CSU East Bay Master Plan Environmental Impact Report, claiming the University failed adequately to analyze impacts on public services, including police, fire, and emergency services. The City demanded that the University provide funding for additional fire facilities.

The Hayward Area Planning Association and Old Highlands Homeowners Association, two local residential homeowners' associations, filed a second CEQA challenge to the 2009 CSU East Bay Master Plan EIR, alleging shortcomings in nearly every aspect of the environmental findings, with an emphasis on the University's alleged failure to consider bus and other improvements to public transit access to the campus. On September 9, 2010, the trial court ruled in favor of the petitioners on nearly every issue and enjoined the University from proceeding with construction. The University appealed.

In June 2012, the Court of Appeal ruled the CSU East Bay Master Plan EIR is adequate, except for failing to analyze impacts on local recreational facilities. The Court's ruling includes a finding that CSU's determination that new fire protection facilities will not result in significant environmental impacts was supported by substantial evidence. Importantly, the Court also held that the obligation to provide adequate fire and emergency services is the responsibility of the City of Hayward, and the need for additional fire protection services is not an environmental impact that CSU must mitigate. The City and HAPA/OHHA filed a petition for review with the California Supreme Court. The petition for review was granted in October 2012, but the matter has been deferred pending resolution of the SDSU Master Plan EIR case, which is awaiting oral argument.

City of San Diego, et al. v. CSU (and related cases)
San Diego
San Diego County Superior Court

The Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") for the 2005 SDSU Master Plan was challenged in three lawsuits filed by the City of San Diego, Alvarado Hospital and Del Cerro Neighborhood Association, each alleging the EIR did not adequately address necessary mitigation measures. The Alvarado lawsuit was dismissed. After the Supreme Court's City of Marina decision, SDSU prepared a revised 2007 Master Plan EIR which was challenged again by the City of San Diego, and also by the San Diego Metropolitan Transit System and the San Diego Association of Governments (SANDAG). Each alleged that the EIR did not adequately address necessary mitigation measures and that the University must fund all mitigation costs, irrespective of Legislative funding. The Del Cerro lawsuit and these three lawsuits have been consolidated. In February 2010, the court denied the challenges to SDSU's 2007 Master Plan EIR, finding the University met all of the requirements of the City of Marina decision and CEQA by requesting legislative funding to cover the cost of local infrastructure improvements, and that the University is not required to fund those projects on its own, or to consider other sources of funding for them. The decision also held that the EIR properly considered potential impacts and was supported by substantial evidence, that the University properly consulted with SANDAG, and that petitioners were barred from proceeding on other sources of funding because it was not raised in the underlying administrative proceedings. Del Cerro agreed to dismiss its lawsuit for the University's waiver of costs; the City of San Diego, SANDAG and MTS appealed. On December 13, 2011, the Court of Appeal reversed the trial court's decision and ordered the Master Plan be vacated. The California Supreme Court granted CSU's petition to review the case. The matter has been briefed and is awaiting oral argument.

Keep Fort Ord Wild v. County of Monterey, et al.
Monterey Bay
Monterey County Superior Court

Keep Fort Ord Wild filed a petition against the Fort Ord Reuse Authority and the County of Monterey alleging they failed to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act in connection with a proposed roadway project. Keep Fort Ord Wild also named CSU Monterey Bay as a party because a portion of the roadway is on property that will be deeded to the campus in the future. *The case is in the briefing phase.*

LandValue 77, et al. v. CSU, et al.
Fresno
Fresno County Superior Court

LandValue 77, a private business entity in Fresno, filed a CEQA challenge to the Campus Pointe project, with a claim of conflict of interest involving former Trustee Moctezuma Esparza, whose company was slated to operate a movie theater in the project. In July 2009, the court determined the environmental impact analysis for Campus Pointe fully complies with CEQA, except for additional analysis required on overflow parking and traffic, and certain water and air quality issues. The court also determined that because former Trustee Esparza had a financial interest in a sublease between Maya Cinemas and Kashian Enterprises, the developer on the project, an irresolvable conflict of interest existed when the Board took the vote on the Campus Pointe EIR, and the theater sublease must be voided. LandValue appealed the trial court's ruling.

In February 2011, the appellate court ruled that voiding the Esparza theater sublease was a sufficient remedy to address the conflict of interest issue. The court formally set aside the EIR, and did not expand the scope of the required environmental review. The University was given an opportunity to fix the original three deficiencies identified by the trial court and reissue the EIR. A revised EIR addressing the court's concerns was circulated for public review and subsequently approved by the Board. In February 2012, the trial court found CSU had addressed all CEQA issues. LandValue had requested attorneys' fees and costs as the prevailing party. Finding LandValue had pursued this action for primarily its own financial interests, and that it had failed to meet its burden to show the cost of bringing the litigation transcended the monetary benefits it received, the trial court denied LandValue's request. LandValue appealed the attorneys' fees decision.

In its January 2014 ruling, the Court of Appeals upheld the trial court's decision and denied LandValue's request for attorneys' fees. *On February 26, 2014, LandValue filed a petition for review with the California Supreme Court. The petition for review was denied on April 16, 2014.*

Personal Injury Cases

Khosh v. CSU, et al.

Channel Islands

Ventura County Superior Court

On March 16, 2013, Al Khosh, an outside electrical contractor, sustained catastrophic arc flash burn injuries while working on the CSUCI campus. CSUCI planned a power shutdown to allow technicians to complete a back-up power project which would enable the campus to energize in the event of an area power outage. Al Khosh was one of those technicians. An explosion occurred while Khosh and his co-worker, Edgar Martinez, were inside the sub-station. Khosh was not authorized to be in the cabinet where he was injured, nor was that within the scope of his work for that day. Both Khosh and Martinez were employed by an electrical contractor, Myers Systems. Khosh has already incurred nearly \$5,000,000 in medical bills. The case remains in the discovery phase.

Naghash v. CSU, et al.

Sacramento

Sacramento County Superior Court

Ashley Naghash, a freshman at CSU Sacramento, alleges she was sexually assaulted in a campus dormitory by a fellow student after she had consumed numerous alcoholic beverages. She claims that CSU failed to prevent the incident from occurring and failed to provide adequate protection in the dorm. The court granted CSU's challenge to the sufficiency of the original, first and second amended complaints, but gave plaintiff an opportunity to amend. Plaintiff did not amend her complaint and the court subsequently granted CSU's motion to dismiss and for entry of judgment. Plaintiff has filed a notice of appeal. *The appeals court has granted Naghash several extensions. Her appellate brief is now due March 2, 2015.*

Student Cases

Donselman, et al. v. CSU

Systemwide

San Francisco County Superior Court

Five students brought this class action to challenge the increases to state university fee and non-resident tuition rates, and the implementation of the new Graduate Business Professional fee, in Fall 2009. The court granted plaintiffs' motion to certify two subclasses (that exclude four campuses where fees were posted late and/or students received financial aid to cover their increased fees). The two subclasses comprise approximately 175,000 students (down from over 400,000). CSU filed writs in the Court of Appeal and the California Supreme Court to challenge the class certification decision. Both were denied. Notice of the litigation was provided to the

class members. After plaintiffs changed their legal theories to add alternative contract formation arguments, CSU's motion to decertify the class was denied. The parties filed competing motions for summary judgment. All of plaintiffs' motions were denied. CSU won partial summary judgment on all of the breach of contract claims. The court denied CSU's motion for judgment on the claims for breach of implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, so that theory will proceed to trial. *The parties attempted mediation in December 2014 but that was futile. Plaintiffs filed a motion to bifurcate liability from damages, but that motion was denied. CSU filed a motion to bifurcate the subclass challenging the Graduate Business Professional Fee from the main class challenging the State University Fee and Non-Resident Tuition, and the court granted that motion. The first trial (main class) is set for April 6, 2015, and the GBPF subclass trial is set for October 26, 2015. The court recently assigned a new judge to this case, and she is still getting up to speed on the background, facts, and legal issues. One of the named class representatives was recently dropped from the case due to her falling out of contact with class counsel. The discovery phase is closing, and significant trial preparations are under way.*

Meyers v. CSU

Fullerton

Orange County Superior Court

Student Kurt Meyers claims he was denied access to early class registration in Spring 2011 because of his status as a disabled student. Plaintiff did register and attend classes during Spring 2011. *The case went to a bench trial in May 2014 and resulted in a defense victory for the University.*

Scoras, etc. v. CSU

Sacramento

U.S. District Court, Sacramento

Scoras is the sister of a former student (Ken Costello) at Sacramento State who is now deceased. She has filed a claim under the Americans with Disabilities Act alleging that CSU failed to provide appropriate accommodation to Mr. Costello and as a result Costello suffered emotional distress and took his life. *The University settled the lawsuit in exchange for a general release of all claims. The settlement amount is \$5,000.00 which the plaintiff agreed to gift to the University's foundation to establish a scholarship in memory of Ken Costello. The University also agreed to additional training for employees who handle student accommodation requests*

Other Cases

Barrett v. Greenup, et al.
Fullerton
U.S. District Court, Santa Ana

John Barrett, a CSU Fullerton student, is suing another CSU Fullerton student, Nolan Greenup, a CSU Fullerton Parking Services Officer, who wrote Barrett a ticket for not displaying a disabled parking placard on his car that was parked in a disabled parking space. Barrett backed out of the space as the ticket was being written, ran over Greenup's foot, and drove away. Barrett was later arrested and subjected to student discipline. Barrett is suing Greenup for defamation, malicious prosecution, violation of federal civil rights and false imprisonment. CSU filed a motion to strike on Greenup's behalf, arguing that in writing his report and speaking to the police, he was supporting a criminal prosecution and immune. CSU's motion was sustained on the defamation, malicious prosecution and false imprisonment causes of action. CSU was awarded approximately \$5,500 for its fees and costs in filing (and winning) the motion to strike which Plaintiff now owes CSU. In a second amended complaint Plaintiff added two new CSU defendants Jose Rosales and Peter Dupree, University police officers involved in his arrest. Plaintiff then filed a third amended complaint adding new causes of action against new non-CSU defendants, the Orange County Sheriff's Department and certain employees of the Orange County Jail. In September 2014 CSU's motion to move the case to federal court was granted. In September 2014 the Orange County defendants settled with the Plaintiff but despite efforts to do so, CSU was unable to settle with Plaintiff. *Trial started on January 6, 2015; at the end of the second day CSU successfully moved for mistrial. The basis for the motion was Plaintiff's failure to comply with pre-trial orders of the court excluding evidence of the disposition of the criminal charges against the defendant. A new trial date has been set for September 22, 2015.*

City and County of San Francisco v. Regents of the UC, et al.
San Francisco
San Francisco County Superior Court

The City and County of San Francisco filed a lawsuit against the University, as well as the University of California and U.C. Hastings College of the Law. The City and County of San Francisco are asking the court to require the University to collect the S. F. Parking Tax of 25% on all University parking spaces. *The court ruled in favor of the Universities. The City and County of San Francisco just filed an appeal.*