

LITIGATION ROSTER

SPECIAL TAXES

NOVEMBER 2018

Special Taxes
LITIGATION ROSTER
NOVEMBER 2018

NEW CASES

Case Name

Case Number

CLOSED CASES

Case Name

Case Number

Please refer to the case roster for more detail regarding new and closed cases

Special Taxes
LITIGATION ROSTER
NOVEMBER 2018

BIG SANDY RANCHERIA ENTERPRISES, a federally-chartered corporation,

v.

**Xavier Bacerra, in his official capacity as Attorney General of the State of California; and
Nicolas Maduros, in his official capacity as Director of the California Department of Tax
and Fee Administration.**

USBC Eastern District – Sacramento: 1:18-CV-00958-DAD-EPG

Filed – 07/16/18

Plaintiffs' Counsel

John M. Peebles/Steven J. Bloxham
Michael A. Robinson/Tim Hennessy

BOE's Counsel

BOE Attorney

Wendy Vierra

Issue(s): Plaintiff, a tribal corporation, seeks declaratory and injunctive relief in this action against the Attorney General and CDTFA, arguing, among other things, that the application and enforcement of the State's Cigarette and Tobacco Products Licensing Act ([Bus. & Prof. Code, §§ 22970 et seq.](#)) and the Cigarette and Tobacco Products Tax Law ([Rev. & Tax. Code, §§ 30001-30483](#)) against it, is preempted by federal law.

Audit/Tax Period: N/A

Amount: Unspecified

Status: On September 17, 2018, CDTFA filed a Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction. On October 8, 2018, plaintiff filed a First Amended Complaint. On October 9, 2018, the District Court issued a minute order denying defendants' motions to dismiss as having been rendered moot in light of plaintiff's filing of a First Amended Complaint, and vacated the hearings set for November 6, 2018. On October 22, 2018, Defendant Maduros filed a Motion to Dismiss Fifth Cause of Action of First Amended Complaint for Lack of Subject Matter Jurisdiction. Defendant Becerra filed a Motion to Dismiss as to the entire First Amended Complaint that same day. A hearing on both motions is scheduled for December 4, 2018. On October 30, 2018, the court continued the hearings on

defendants' motions to dismiss from December 4, 2018, to February 5, 2019. The court also continued the initial scheduling conference set for January 23, 2019, to April 24, 2019.

BNSF RAILWAY CO. & UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD CO. v. California Department of Tax and Fee Administration, et al.

USDC, Northern District of California: 3:16-CV-04311

Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal: 16-17130

Filed – 07/29/16

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Munger, Tolles & Olson – Benjamin Horwich

BOE's Counsel

Linda Gandara

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): Plaintiff contends that Senate Bill 84 [SB 84](#), establishing the Regional Railroad Accident Preparedness and Immediate Response Fund ([Government Code section 8574.30, et seq.](#)) unconstitutionally imposes a schedule of fees on the transport of hazardous materials by rail in California.

Audit/Tax Period: N/A

Amount: Unspecified

Status: On September 13, 2016, the BOE and the Office of Emergency Services (OES) filed an opposition to the Motion for Preliminary Injunction. By Order of the Court, the hearing was continued to October 13, 2016. At the hearing, the Court took the matter under submission. On October 28, 2016, the district Court Judge granted the Motion for preliminary injunction, enjoining the BOE from enforcement of notice and collection requirements of [SB 84](#) pending entry of final judgment resolving this case on the merits. On November 18, 2016, the Department of Justice filed on behalf of the BOE, Governor's Office of Emergency Services, and others, an appeal in the United States Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit from (1) the Order Granting Motion for Preliminary Injunction entered in this action on October 28, 2016, and (2) the Form of Preliminary Injunction entered in this action on November 15, 2016. Defendant/Appellants filed an Opening Brief with the Court of Appeal on January

30, 2017. The BOE is not participating in the appeal. Plaintiff filed their Answering Brief on March 9, 2017. On March 9, 2017, Plaintiffs filed an Answering Brief. On April 10, 2017, Defendants filed a Reply Brief. On April 24, 2017 the Court tentatively set oral argument for August. On July 13, 2017, the BOE filed a Motion with the United States Court of Appeal, Ninth Circuit, to substitute the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration (CDTFA) for the BOE as the Defendant in this action. On July 18, 2017, the Court granted the unopposed Motion substituting the CDTFA for the BOE. On July 21, 2017, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeal Case No. 16-17130 set Oral Argument for August 29, 2017. On August 29, 2017, Oral Argument was held and the Court took the case under submission. On September 11, 2018, the Ninth Circuit affirmed the district court's preliminary injunction, preventing implementation of California [Senate Bill 84](#), which requires railroads to collect fees from customers shipping certain hazardous materials and then to remit those fees to California. Railroads sued to enjoin [SB 84](#), arguing that it violated three federal statutes and the federal Constitution. The district court concluded that the railroads were likely to succeed on the merits of their claims and granted the preliminary injunction. The Ninth Circuit held that the district court did not abuse its discretion in granting the preliminary injunction. The Ninth Circuit concluded that, even if [SB 84](#) imposed a fee rather than a tax, it was preempted under the Interstate Commerce Commission Termination Act because it had a direct effect on rail transportation. In addition, the Ninth Circuit held that [SB 84](#) was not protected from preemption by the Hazardous Materials Transportation Uniform Safety Act because the fees authorized by [SB 84](#) imposed a burden on railroads that were not imposed on the trucking industry, and the fees therefore were not "fair." And finally, the Ninth Circuit held that the district court did not abuse its discretion in evaluating irreparable harm, the balance of the equities, and the public interest when granting the preliminary injunction. The Ninth Circuit issued a mandate on October 5, 2018. The parties set a case management conference for December 6, 2018.

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION I, et al. v. California State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento County Superior Court: 04CS00473 & 03CS01776

Filed – 04/13/04

Third District Court of Appeal: C050289

California Supreme Court: S150518

Filed – 02/23/07

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Daniel Kelly, Esq. Somach Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Carol Boyd

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 [SB 1049](#) is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530](#); [1535-1541](#); [1550-1552](#); and [1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2003-2004

Amount: Unspecified

Status: The California Supreme Court issued its decision on January 31, 2011, affirming the Court of Appeal's judgment holding that the fee statutes at issue are facially constitutional and reversing the Court of Appeal's determination that the statutes and their implementing regulations are unconstitutional as applied. The case was remanded to the Court of Appeal to remand to the trial Court for proceedings consistent with the opinion. On April 20, 2011, the Court denied the petitions for rehearing, and modified its opinion. Remittitur issued May 12, 2011. At the Status Conference on July 29, 2011, the Judge ordered discovery in the Water Rights cases. At the Status Conference on October 21, 2011, the Judge granted BOE's Motion to transfer the Palo Verde case to Sacramento, set a further case management conference for January 13, 2012, and set the case for a two-week trial on July 16, 2012. A Notice of Entry of Dismissal was entered for Petitioner Stone Corral Irrigation District on November 17, 2011. Trial was held from December 4, 2012 through December 19, 2012. The Court scheduled post-trial briefing. On July 1, 2013, Petitioners filed their Reply Brief. Respondents State Water Resources Control Board, et al., filed their post-trial Response Brief on July 1, 2013. On September 6, 2013, Sacramento Superior Court issued its tentative decision in favor of Plaintiffs ruling that the fees imposed by the Water Resources Control Board are invalid, because the statutory fee scheme and

implementing regulations do not provide a fair, reasonable and substantially proportionate assessment of all costs related to the regulation of affected payers. On October 23, 2013, the Department of Justice filed a response on behalf of the Defendants, opposing Petitioners' submission regarding remedies. On October 30, 2013, the Court heard argument concerning its tentative decision. The Court issued its Final Statement of Decision on November 12, 2013, confirming that the fees imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board are invalid. The Court further ruled that the fees charged to contractors are unconstitutional under the supremacy clause. On December 13, 2013, the Trial Court issued its final judgment in favor of the Plaintiffs. The Court determined that the fees imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board are invalid, and further ruled that fees charged to contractors are unconstitutional under the supremacy clause. On February 10, 2014, Respondents filed a Notice of Appeal to the trial Court's water rights decision. On February 21, 2014, Plaintiff, California Farm Bureau Federation filed Opposition to Respondent's Motion to tax costs. Northern California Water Association filed an Opposition to Motion to tax costs on the same date. On February 27, 2014, Respondents filed their reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to tax costs. On April 4, 2014, the Appellant's Notice Designating Record on Appeal was filed. On August 15, 2014, the parties filed a Stipulation for Extension of Time to File Briefs. The Joint Appendix was due December 16, 2014. Appellants' Reply Brief was due February 16, 2015. On or about September 19, 2014, Appellant's filed an application for an extension of time from October 17, 2014, to December 1, 2014 to file its Opening Brief. The Third District Court of Appeal accepted State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) application for an extension to file its Reply Brief. The Brief was due April 16, 2015. On April 10, 2015, the Court granted Appellants' request for an extension to file Reply Brief by June 1, 2015. On June 5, 2015, the Court granted Appellants' Motion to File Corrected Opening Brief and Motion to File Reply Brief exceeding 14,000 words. On June 9, 2015, the Court ordered the Clerk of the Court to strike Appellants' January 5, 2015, Opening Brief and to return it. On June 9, 2015, Appellants filed their corrected Appellants' Opening Brief and the Reply Brief. This case is now fully briefed.

Note: See *Northern California Water Association I* Consolidated Case Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C075866

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION II, et al. v. California State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento County Superior Court: 05CS00538

Filed – 01/13/05

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Daniel Kelly, Esq. Somach Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Carol Boyd

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 [SB 1049](#) is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530](#); [1535-1541](#); [1550-1552](#); and [1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2004-2005

Amount: Unspecified

Status: The parties entered into a stipulation staying this matter pending the outcome of the consolidated cases. See *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 03CS01776; Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C050289.) The consolidated cases were appealed to the California Supreme Court and remanded back to the trial Court. The trial Court rendered its judgment on remand, which is on appeal to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C075866. This matter is stayed pending the outcome of the pending appeal.

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION III, et al. v. California State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento County Superior Court: 06CS00651

Filed – 04/26/06

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Daniel Kelly, Esq. Somach Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Carol Boyd

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 [SB 1049](#) is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530](#); [1535-1541](#); [1550-1552](#); and [1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2005-2006

Amount: Unspecified

Status: The parties entered into a stipulation staying this matter pending the outcome of the consolidated cases. See *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 03CS01776; Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C050289.) The consolidated cases were appealed to the California Supreme Court and remanded back to the trial Court. The trial Court rendered its judgment on remand, which is on appeal to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C075866. This matter is stayed pending the outcome of the pending appeal.

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION IV, et al. v. California State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento County Superior Court: 07CS00485

Filed – 02/11/08

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Daniel Kelly, Esq. Somach Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Carol Boyd

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 [SB 1049](#) is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530](#); [1535-1541](#); [1550-1552](#); and [1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2006-2007; 2007-2008

Amount: Unspecified

Status: The parties entered into a stipulation staying this matter pending the outcome of the consolidated cases. See *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 03CS01776; Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C050289.) The consolidated cases were appealed to the California Supreme Court and remanded back to the trial Court. The trial Court rendered its judgment on remand, which is on appeal to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C075866. This matter is stayed pending the outcome of the pending appeal.

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION V, et al. v. California State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento County Superior Court: 34-2009-80000231

Filed – 05/07/09

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Daniel Kelly, Esq. Somach Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Carol Boyd

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 [SB 1049](#) is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530](#); [1535-1541](#); [1550-1552](#); and [1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2009-2009

Amount: Unspecified

Status: The parties entered into a stipulation staying this matter pending the outcome of the consolidated cases. See *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 03CS01776; Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C050289.) The consolidated cases were appealed to the California Supreme Court and remanded back to the trial Court. The trial Court rendered its judgment on remand, which is on appeal to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C075866. This matter is stayed pending the outcome of the pending appeal.

CALIFORNIA FARM BUREAU FEDERATION VI, et al. v. California State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento County Superior Court: 34-2011-80000880

Filed – 06/10/11

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Daniel Kelly, Esq. Somach Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Carol Boyd

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 [SB 1049](#) is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530](#); [1535-1541](#); [1550-1552](#); and [1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2009-2010, 2010-2011

Amount: Unspecified

Status: On July 1, 2011, Plaintiff dismissed Jerome E. Horton as Chairperson of the Board of Equalization. This case is stayed pending the outcome of the consolidated cases. See *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 03CS01776; Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C050289.) The consolidated cases were appealed to the California Supreme Court and remanded back to the trial Court. The trial Court rendered its judgment on remand, which is on appeal to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C075866. This matter is stayed pending the outcome of the pending appeal.

**CALIFORNIA TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION, et al. v. California Governor's Office of
Emergency Services, et al.**

Sacramento County Superior Court: 34-2016-80002357

Filed – 10/04/2012

Plaintiff's Counsel

Nielsen

BOE's Counsel

Robert Asperger

BOE Attorney

Kiren Chohan

Issue(s): The issue in this case is whether the Hazardous Substances Fee enacted by Senate Bill 84 [SB 84](#), adopted by the California Legislature in June 2015, and codified in [Government Code section 8574.30-8574.48](#), is invalid on the ground that it is a tax, not a fee, and did not acquire the requisite 2/3 approval of all members of each house of the Legislature.

Audit/Tax Period: None

Amount: Unspecified

Status: The Court's tentative ruling was to deny the petition for preliminary injunction. At the hearing, the Court indicated it would likely adopt the tentative but asked for further information regarding the timing of Office of Emergency Services' implementation of the hazardous materials fee. On June 27, 2016, the BOE submitted a letter to the Court identifying the information the Court sought. On July 8, 2016, the Court denied Plaintiff's Motion for a preliminary injunction, and set the hearing on the merits for December 16, 2016. On October 21, 2016, Plaintiffs filed a First Amended Petition for Writ of Mandate and the Court vacated the current briefing schedule and hearing date. Respondents were not required to file a response to the Amended Petition. The Case is currently stayed by order of the court.

HOWARD JARVIS TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION, et al. v. California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, et al.

Third Appellate District: C086660

Sacramento County Superior Court: 34-2012-00133197-CU-MC-GDS

Filed – 10/04/2012

Plaintiff's Counsel

Trevor A. Grimm - Howard Jarvis Taxpayers Foundation

BOE's Counsel

Robert Asperger

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): The issue in this case is whether the Fire Prevention Fee enacted by AB X1 29 (Stats 2011, First Ex. Sess. Ch.8) is a tax and, as such, not enacted without receiving the two-thirds vote required by article XIII A, section 3, of the California Constitution.

Audit/Tax Period: None

Amount: Unspecified

Status: BOE's response was filed on April 26, 2013. At the July 19, 2013 hearing, the Court issued a ruling on the submitted matters: 1) the Court overruled CalFire's demurrer to the first amended complaint for failure to state sufficient facts to allege class action causes for relief; 2) the Court ruled in CalFire's favor that Plaintiffs should have filed a petition for redetermination before filing a claim for refund; and 3) CalFire's Motion to strike certain paragraphs of Plaintiffs' first amended complaint were granted. Plaintiffs filed a second amended complaint on July 29, 2013. BOE's response to Plaintiff's second amended complaint was filed on August 7, 2013. On November 21, 2013, a hearing was held on the Demurrer, and the matter was taken under submission. On December 13, 2013, the Court issued a ruling agreeing with CalFire on CalFire's demurrer to Plaintiffs' second amended complaint. On January 21, 2014, attorneys for Plaintiffs filed opposition to CalFire's Proposed Order on the demurrer and Motion to strike Plaintiffs' second amended complaint. On January 24, 2014, attorneys for Defendant filed notice of order on CalFire's demurrer and Motion to strike regarding Plaintiff's second amended complaint. On January 24, 2014, attorneys for Plaintiffs filed "Class Action" third amended complaint for declaratory relief and refunds. On February 25, 2014, CalFire filed an answer to Plaintiffs' third amended complaint. On February 28, 2014, BOE filed an answer to Plaintiffs' third amended complaint. The Motion for class certification was heard on August 7, 2015. On

August 8, 2015, the Court denied class certification on the declaratory relief cause of action, but granted class certification on the refund claims, limited to those who have paid the fee and exhausted administrative remedies. Plaintiffs are in the process of giving notice to the class members. On January 22, 2016, the Superior Court approved the form of notice of the action to class members. On January 29, 2016, the Court entered an Order approving a proposed form of notice to the members of the certified class in this case. Case is currently dormant. On July 19, 2017, Assembly Bill 398 [AB 398](#) was adopted to add [Public Resources section 4213.05](#), which effective July 1, 2017, suspends the fire prevention fee until January 1, 2031. On September 20, 2017, plaintiff filed a motion for summary judgment. Hearing is set for December 8, 2017. On October 5, 2017, California Department of Tax and Fee Administration (CDTFA) filed a Motion to Dismiss for lack of prosecution. Hearing date is December 8, 2017. On October 31, 2017, the Court entered an order substituting the CDTFA as the party defendant in place of BOE. On December 8, 2017, a hearing was held on CalFire and CDTFA's Motion to Dismiss. On December 11, 2017, the Superior Court granted CalFire's Motion to Dismiss this case due to Plaintiffs' failure to bring this action to trial within five years. The Court signed an Order granting Defendants' CalFire and CDTFA's Motion to Dismiss and the Judgment was filed December 27, 2017. Plaintiffs have indicated that they will appeal. Plaintiff filed an appeal of the trial court judgment in favor of CalFire and CDTFA, in which the court dismissed the action for failure to prosecute within five years. The Court signed an Order granting Defendants' CalFire and CDTFA's Motion to Dismiss and the Judgment was filed December 27, 2017. Plaintiffs have indicated that they will appeal. On March 1, 2018, Plaintiff filed an appeal of the trial court judgment in favor of CalFire and CDTFA, in which the court dismissed the action for failure to prosecute within five years. Appellant's opening brief is due July 11, 2018; and the Respondents' Brief will be due 30 days thereafter. On July 11, 2018, Plaintiffs/Appellants filed their Opening Brief. CDTFA's Respondent's Brief is due on August 20, 2018. On July 24, 2018, Plaintiff stipulated to giving CDTFA up to 60 days to file its Respondent's Brief. The Respondent's Brief is now due October 9, 2018. CalFire filed a Respondent's Brief on October 9, 2018. CDTFA has taken "no position" on the merits of the case, and all the arguments in the Respondent's Brief are made on behalf of CalFire. The parties stipulated to an additional 60 days for Appellant to submit its Reply Brief, which is now due January 7, 2019.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION I, et al. v. California State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento County Superior Court: 03CS01776 & 04CS00473

Filed – 12/17/03

Third District Court of Appeal: C075866

California Supreme Court: S150518

Filed – 2/23/07

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Daniel Kelly, Esq. Somach Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Carol Boyd

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 [SB 1049](#) is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530](#); [1535-1541](#); [1550-1552](#); and [1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2003-2004

Amount: Unspecified

Status: The California Supreme Court issued its decision on January 31, 2011, affirming the Court of Appeal's judgment holding that the fee statutes at issue are facially constitutional and reversing the Court of Appeal's determination that the statutes and their implementing regulations are unconstitutional as applied. The case is remanded to the Court of Appeal to remand to the trial Court for proceedings consistent with the opinion. On April 20, 2011, the Court denied the petitions for rehearing, and modified its opinion. Remittitur issued May 12, 2011. At the Status Conference on July 29, 2011, the Judge ordered discovery in the Water Rights cases. A Notice of Entry of Dismissal was entered for Petitioner Stone Corral Irrigation District on November 17, 2011. Trial was held from December 4, 2012 through December 19, 2012. On July 1, 2013, Petitioners filed their Reply Brief. Respondents State Water Resources Control Board, et al., filed their post-trial Response Brief on July 1, 2013. On September 6, 2013, Sacramento Superior Court issued its tentative decision in favor of Plaintiffs ruling that the fees imposed by the Water Resources Control Board are invalid, because the statutory fee scheme and implementing regulations do not provide a fair, reasonable and substantially proportionate assessment of all costs related to the regulation of affected payors. On October 23, 2013, the Department of Justice filed a response on behalf of the Defendants, opposing Petitioners' submission

regarding remedies. On October 30, 2013, the Court heard argument concerning its tentative decision. The Court issued its Final Statement of Decision on November 12, 2013, confirming that the fees imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board are invalid. The Court further ruled that the fees charged to contractors are unconstitutional under the supremacy clause. On December 13, 2013, the Trial Court issued its final judgment in favor of the Plaintiffs. The Court determined that the fees imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board are invalid, and further ruled that fees charged to contractors are unconstitutional under the supremacy clause. On February 10, 2014, Respondents filed a Notice of Appeal to the trial Court's water rights decision. On February 21, 2014, Plaintiff, California Farm Bureau Federation filed Opposition to Respondent's Motion to tax costs. Northern California Water Association filed an Opposition to Motion to tax costs on the same date. On February 27, 2014, Respondents filed their reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to tax costs. On April 4, 2014, the Appellant's Notice Designating Record on Appeal was filed. On August 15, 2014, the parties filed a Stipulation for Extension of Time to File Briefs. Appellants' Opening Brief is due October 17, 2014. The Joint Appendix was due December 16, 2014. Appellants' Reply Brief was due February 16, 2015. On or about September 19, 2014, Appellants filed an application for an extension of time from October 17, 2014, to December 1, 2014 to file their Opening Brief. The Third District Court of Appeal accepted State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) application for an extension to file its Reply Brief. The Brief was due April 16, 2015. On April 10, 2015, the Court granted Appellants' request for an extension to file Reply Brief by June 1, 2015. On June 5, 2015, the Court granted Appellants' Motion to File Corrected Opening Brief and Motion to File Reply Brief exceeding 14,000 words. On June 9, 2015, the Court ordered the Clerk of the Court to strike Appellants' January 5, 2015, Opening Brief and to return it. On June 9, 2015, Appellants filed their corrected Appellants' Opening Brief and the Reply Brief. Defendant and Appellant State Water Resources Control Board filed a Supplemental Brief on January 20, 2017. Plaintiff and Respondent Northern California Water Association *et al.* filed a Supplemental Brief and Motion to strike on February 3, 2017. Defendant and Appellant State Water Resources Control Board *et al.* filed a Supplemental Brief on February 17, 2017, and an opposition to Plaintiff/Respondent's Motion to Strike on February 21, 2017. On December 6, 2017, the Department received notice that Oral Argument in these cases is set for January 23, 2018. Oral Argument was held on January 23, 2018. The Court of Appeal took the matter under submission. In its published March 2, 2018 opinion, the Court of Appeal overturned the trial court decision and found in favor of the State Water Resources Control Board, concluding that (1) Water Code section 1525, 1540 and 1560 imposed a valid regulatory fee that was assessed on permit and license holders in proportion to the benefits derived by them or the burdens they placed on the State Water Resources Control Board's Division of Water Rights, and (2) California Code of Regulations, title 23, sections 1066 and 1073 were valid. On April 11, 2018, Appellants filed a Petition for Review in the California Supreme Court. The CDTFA filed its answer to the Petition for Review

on May 1, 2018. On May 16, 2018, the California Supreme Court denied the Petition for Review filed by Plaintiffs/Respondents Northern California Water Association and Central Valley Project Water Association. On August 14, 2018, the petitioners Northern California Water Association, California Farm Bureau Federation et al. filed a petition with the United States Supreme Court for a Writ of Certiorari. On October 15, 2018, the US Supreme Court denied plaintiffs/appellants' petition for certiorari.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION II, et al. v. California State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento County Superior Court: 04CS01467
Filed – 10/29/04

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Daniel Kelly, Esq. Somach Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Carol Boyd

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 [SB 1049](#) is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530](#); [1535-1541](#); [1550-1552](#); and [1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2004-2005

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the outcome of the consolidated cases. See *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 03CS01776; Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C050289.) The consolidated cases were appealed to the California Supreme Court and remanded back to the trial Court. The trial Court rendered its judgment on remand, which is on appeal to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C075866. This matter is stayed pending the outcome of the pending appeal.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION III, et al. v. California State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento County Superior Court: 05CS01488

Filed – 10/19/05

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Daniel Kelly, Esq. Somach Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Carol Boyd

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 [SB 1049](#) is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530](#); [1535-1541](#); [1550-1552](#); and [1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2005-2006

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the outcome of the consolidated cases. See *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 03CS01776; Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C050289.) The consolidated cases were appealed to the California Supreme Court and remanded back to the trial Court. The trial Court rendered its judgment on remand, which is on appeal to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C075866. This matter is stayed pending the outcome of the pending appeal.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION IV, et al. v. California State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento County Superior Court: 06CS01517

Filed – 10/18/06

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Daniel Kelly, Esq. Somach Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Carol Boyd

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 [SB 1049](#) is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530](#); [1535-1541](#); [1550-1552](#); and [1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2006-2007

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the outcome of the consolidated cases. See *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 03CS01776; Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C050289.) The consolidated cases were appealed to the California Supreme Court and remanded back to the trial Court. The trial Court rendered its judgment on remand, which is on appeal to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C075866. This matter is stayed pending the outcome of the pending appeal.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION V, et al. v. California State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento County Superior Court: 34-2008-00003004-CU-WM-GDS

Filed – 02/07/08

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Daniel Kelly, Esq. Somach Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Carol Boyd

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 [SB 1049](#) is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530](#); [1535-1541](#); [1550-1552](#); and [1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2007-2008

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the outcome of the consolidated cases. See *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 03CS01776; Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C050289.) The consolidated cases were appealed to the California Supreme Court and remanded back to the trial Court. The trial Court rendered its judgment on remand, which is on appeal to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C075866. This matter is stayed pending the outcome of the pending appeal.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION VI, et al. v. California State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento County Superior Court: 34-2009-80000183

Filed – 03/05/09

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Daniel Kelly, Esq. Somach Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Carol Boyd

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 [SB 1049](#) is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530](#); [1535-1541](#); [1550-1552](#); and [1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2008-2009

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the outcome of the consolidated cases. See *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 03CS01776; Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C050289.) The consolidated cases were appealed to the California Supreme Court and remanded back to the trial Court. The trial Court rendered its judgment on remand, which is on appeal to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C075866. This matter is stayed pending the outcome of the pending appeal.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION VII, et al. v. California State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento County Superior Court: 34-2010-80000461

Filed – 03/04/2010

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Daniel Kelly, Esq. Somach Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Carol Boyd

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 [SB 1049](#) is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530](#); [1535-1541](#); [1550-1552](#); and [1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2009-2010

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the outcome of the consolidated cases. See *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 03CS01776; Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C050289.) The consolidated cases were appealed to the California Supreme Court and remanded back to the trial Court. The trial Court rendered its judgment on remand, which is on appeal to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C075866. This matter is stayed pending the outcome of the pending appeal.

NORTHERN CA WATER ASSOCIATION VIII, et al. v. California State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Sacramento County Superior Court: 34-2011-80000828

Filed – 04/05/2011

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Daniel Kelly, Esq. Somach Simmons & Dunn

BOE's Counsel

Carol Boyd

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 [SB 1049](#) is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530](#); [1535-1541](#); [1550-1552](#); and [1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2010-2011

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the outcome of the consolidated cases. See *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 03CS01776; Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C050289.) The consolidated cases were appealed to the California Supreme Court and remanded back to the trial Court. The trial Court rendered its judgment on remand, which is on appeal to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C075866. This matter is stayed pending the outcome of the pending Appeal.

PALO VERDE IRRIGATION DISTRICT v. California State Water Resources Control Board, et al.

Riverside County Superior Court: INC 043178

Filed – 05/28/04

Plaintiffs' Counsel

David R. Saunders - Clayson, Mann, Yaeger & Hansen

BOE's Counsel

Carol Boyd

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): Whether the water rights fee imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) enacted by the Legislature in 2003 in Senate Bill 1049 [SB 1049](#) is valid ([Water Code sections 1525-1530](#); [1535-1541](#); [1550-1552](#); and [1560](#)).

Audit/Tax Period: 2003-2004

Amount: Unspecified

Status: This case is stayed pending the outcome of the consolidated cases. See *Northern California Water Association, et al. v. State Water Resources Control Board, et al.* (Sacramento County Superior Court Case No. 03CS01776; Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C050289.) The consolidated cases were appealed to the California Supreme Court and remanded back to the trial Court. The trial Court rendered its judgment on remand, which is on appeal to the Court of Appeal, Third Appellate District, Case No. C075866. This matter is stayed pending the outcome of the pending appeal. At the Case Management Conference on October 21, 2011, the Judge in Sacramento granted BOE's Motion to transfer this case to Sacramento to be heard, but not consolidated, with the other water rights cases. Trial was held from December 4, 2012 through December 19, 2012. The Court scheduled post-trial briefing. On July 1, 2013, Petitioners filed their Reply Brief. Respondents State Water Resources Control Board, et al., filed their post-trial response brief on July 1, 2013. On September 6, 2013, Sacramento Superior Court issued its tentative decision in favor of Plaintiffs ruling that the fees imposed by the Water Resources Control Board are invalid, because the statutory fee scheme and implementing regulations do not provide a fair, reasonable and substantially proportionate assessment of all costs related to the regulation of affected payer's. On October 23, 2013, the Department of Justice filed a response on behalf of the Defendants, opposing Petitioners' submission regarding remedies. On October 30, 2013, the Court heard argument concerning its tentative decision. The Court issued its Final

Statement of Decision on November 12, 2013, confirming that the fees imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board are invalid. The Court further ruled that the fees charged to contractors are unconstitutional under the supremacy clause. On December 13, 2013, the Trial Court issued its final judgment in favor of the Plaintiffs. The Court determined that the fees imposed by the State Water Resources Control Board are invalid, and further ruled that fees charged to contractors are unconstitutional under the supremacy clause. On February 10, 2014, Respondents filed a Notice of Appeal to the trial Court's water rights decision. On February 21, 2014, Plaintiff, California Farm Bureau Federation filed Opposition to Respondent's Motion to tax costs. Northern California Water Association filed an Opposition to Motion to tax costs on the same date. On February 27, 2014, Respondents filed their reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to tax costs. On April 4, 2014, the Appellant's Notice Designating Record on Appeal was filed. On August 15, 2014, the parties filed a Stipulation for Extension of Time to File Briefs. The Joint Appendix was due October 17, 2014. Respondents' Brief is due December 16, 2014. Appellants' Reply is due February 16, 2015. On or about September 19, 2014, Appellants filed an application for an extension of time from October 17, 2014, to December 1, 2014 to file their opening brief. The Third District Court of Appeal accepted State Water Resources Control Board's (SWRCB) application for an extension to file its Reply Brief. The Brief was due April 16, 2015. On April 10, 2015, the Court granted Appellants' request for an extension to file Reply Brief by June 1, 2015. On June 5, 2015, the Court granted Appellants' Motion to File Corrected Opening Brief and Motion to File Reply Brief exceeding 14,000 words. On June 9, 2015, the Court ordered the Clerk of the Court to strike Appellants' January 5, 2015, Opening Brief and to return it. On June 9, 2015, Appellants filed their corrected Appellants' Opening Brief and the Reply Brief. This case is now fully briefed.

STESHENKO, GREGORY v. California Board of Equalization, et al.

Santa Cruz County Superior Court: 16CV007757

Filed – 03/25/16

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Pro Se

BOE's Counsel

Robert Asperger

BOE Attorney

John Waid

Issue(s): Plaintiff contends that the fire prevention fee Assembly Bill 29 [AB 29](#) is invalid and unconstitutional, and that exempt funds were illegally seized.

Audit/Tax Period: None

Amount: None

Status: On June 28, 2016, the BOE filed its Reply to Plaintiff's Opposition to Motion to Transfer Action to Sacramento County Superior Court. At the July 6, 2016 hearing, the Court granted the Motion for Change of Venue to Sacramento County Superior Court. On August 29, 2016, the BOE's Proposed Order for change of venue to Sacramento was submitted to Plaintiff for approval as to form. On September 8, 2016, the DAG sent a signed letter to the Court submitting the Proposed Order granting Motion for change of venue, with attachments. On September 28, 2016, the Court entered an Order, transferring the case to Sacramento County Superior Court. On October 11, 2016, Plaintiff filed a petition for writ of mandate with the Sixth Appellate District. The Santa Cruz Superior Court has transferred the case to Sacramento County Superior Court. Sacramento County Superior Court has scheduled a case management conference for May 4, 2017. The case management statement is due April 19, 2017. On February 28, 2017, the Court of Appeal denied the petition for writ of mandate and request for stay. On March 21, 2017, Defendants BOE and CalFIRE filed a demurrer and Motion to strike. The hearing on these moving papers is scheduled for April 27, 2017. On April 26, 2017, the Court continued the hearing to June 2, 2017. On April 27, 2017, the Court issued its tentative ruling on the CMC set for May 4, 2017. It requires the parties to choose trial and settlement conference dates before the end of the year. The hearing on BOE's Demurrer has been continued to July 7, 2017. At the July 7, 2017 hearing, the trial court sustained the demurrers of Defendants California Board of Equalization, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, and Andres Lopez as to the second through fourth causes of action of the complaint; and stayed the entire action on

the grounds that there is another action pending between the same parties on the same cause of action. On July 19, 2017, Assembly Bill 398 [AB 398](#) was adopted to add Public Resources section 4213.05, which effective July 1, 2017, suspends the fire prevention fee until January 1, 2031. On August 3, 2017, the Court entered an order sustaining the Board's demurrer to the second through fourth causes of action and staying the first cause of action on the grounds that there is another action pending between the same parties (the Howard Jarvis case). There has been no action since then. On December 30, 2017, plaintiff filed a motion to lift the stay on this action. No Hearing date has been set. On January 16, 2018, plaintiff filed a Motion to Lift the stay in this action. The hearing on plaintiff's Motion to Lift the stay in this action is April 18, 2018. On April 8, 2018, plaintiff filed a Reply to his Motion to Lift the Stay of proceedings in this case. On April 18, 2018, the court adopted its Tentative Ruling and denied Plaintiff's Motion to Lift the Stay.

TAKI, WAHID AHMAD v. California Board of Equalization

Sacramento County Superior Court: 34-2012-80001335

Filed – 12/14/12

Plaintiffs' Counsel

Caitlin Colman – Attorney at Law

BOE's Counsel

Jane O'Donnell

BOE Attorney

Sharon Brady Silva

Issue(s): The issue in this case is whether the evidence supports BOE's findings of petitioner's violation of [Bus. & Prof. Code sections 22974 and 22974.3, subdivision \(b\)](#), which imposes a 10-day cigarette license suspension.

Audit/Tax Period: None

Amount: Unknown

Status: Petitioner's attorney notified the DAG representing BOE that Petitioner is dismissing his writ petition. To date the dismissal has not been filed with the Court.

Special Taxes
LITIGATION ROSTER
NOVEMBER 2018

CLOSED CASES

Case Name

Case Number

DISCLAIMER

Every attempt has been made to ensure the information contained herein is valid and accurate at the time of publication. However, the tax laws are complex and subject to change. If there is a conflict between the law and the information found, decisions will be made based on the law.

Links to information on sites not maintained by the California Department of Tax and Fee Administration (CDTFA) are provided only as a public service. The CDTFA is not responsible for the content and accuracy of the information on those sites.