

**PENDING LITIGATION – INTERIM REPORT – April 28, 2009
PREPARED BY THE CITY ATTORNEY**

DANILO BENEDIT v. CITY OF CORAL GABLES

United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida – Case No. 08-23558-CIV-SEITZ/O’SULLIVAN

The Plaintiff filed an action claiming the City violated the Whistleblower Act, Sec. 112.3187, Florida Statutes, and the First Amendment to the United States Constitution for allegedly taking adverse action against him for engaging in protected activity under the law. The Court issued an order referring this matter to mediation.

LEO BUENO AND LEO BUENO ATTORNEY, P.A., v. CITY OF CORAL GABLES

Circuit Court – General Jurisdiction Division – Case No. 09-30619 CA 30

Plaintiffs filed for declaratory judgment after the Code Enforcement Board issued a guilty finding for violation of the City Code Sec. 66-21 and 101.168 for failure to pay local business tax for 2008-2009 for which a fine was imposed, and alleges that the City does not have authority to assess a penalty charge on such business tax to attorneys, and seeking to certify this as a class action on behalf of fellow attorneys practicing in the City.

CHURCH OF THE LUKUMI BABALU, AYI, INC. V. CITY OF CORAL GABLES

Circuit Court – General Jurisdiction Division – Case No. 08-38294 CA 02

Petition for Writ of Mandamus was filed with the City in connection with the public records request served on the City, stating that the City’s responses have been overwhelmingly incomplete. Numerous depositions were taken by Petitioner to determine whether any documents were withheld by the City. The depositions did not reveal any such documents. A hearing was also held to review the documents that the City listed on its privilege log and did not turn over. The Court found the documents privileged. At this point, a hearing on the City’s motion to dismiss is scheduled for hearing on April 1, 2009. The Court granted in part and denied in part, and while the order has not yet been issued, the court indicated that the ruling would be that the case is dismissed if the City produces a sworn statement that it does not have the photos in its possession, custody or control, that Plaintiff will not be entitled to fees on that issue, and further that the Court will reserve ruling on fees as to the e-mail production.

**PENDING LITIGATION – INTERIM REPORT – April 28, 2009
PREPARED BY THE CITY ATTORNEY**

CITY OF CORAL GABLES V. A.D.P.T., AND ROBERT RUGILO, INDIVIDUALLY

Circuit Court – General Jurisdiction Division – Case No. 07-33733 CA 01

The City filed a Complaint for Injunctive Relief against the City's former provider of microfilming, digitizing and storing of plans and other documents for the City's Building and Zoning Department, and other departments, seeking an order compelling ADPT to return to the City's custody and control the index to the records which ADPT claims to be proprietary in nature. An Evidentiary Hearing took place December 6, 2007 before the Honorable David C. Miller, Judge Miller ordered a continuation of the hearing wherein the following was to occur: (1) a site visit at the ADPT warehouse before December 24, 2007, with Mr. Rugilo, Mr. Ruck, Dona Lubin and Lourdes Alfonsin Ruiz. This site visit took place on December 12, 2007; (2) a site visit at the Certified Records Management (CRM) warehouse before January 15, 2008, with Mr. Rugilo, Mr. Ruck, Dona Lubin and Lourdes Alfonsin Ruiz; and (3) a presentation by ADPT of its document retrieval process at the City of Coral Gables City Hall. The CRM site visit took place January 11, 2008, at their Tampa warehouse and the ADPT demonstration will be scheduled for late January. The City's complaint for injunctive relief may be amended to include a claim for breach of professional services agreement for failing to provide the City with an index and failure to microfilm and digitize the City's plans and documents. Alternatively, the City may file a separate lawsuit for the claim for breach of agreement. **The City's motion to quash ADPT's answer, affirmative defenses, and counterclaim was filed December 5, 2008.**

PINON V. CITY OF CORAL GABLES

United States Southern District of Florida – Case No. 08-22132

Plaintiff in this case is a former employee of the City. He separated from his employment as chief building inspector on July 1, 2007. In June 2007 he filed a complaint in Florida Circuit Court alleging, generally, that he had been promised by the head of the Building and Zoning Department that he would be compensated for all hours he worked in excess of eight hours per day. He claimed this promise was made in or before 1999. He claimed that the promised compensation would come either in the form of so-called "in-house compensatory hours," that is, time off to match the hours in excess of eight per day, or in an equivalent amount of money, based on his hourly rate at the time. He amended his complaint twice. His legal theories have included: breach of oral or written contract, promissory estoppel, unjust enrichment, quantum merit, violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act for failure to pay overtime, and a claim for attorney's fees under Florida Statutes Section 440.08. The City removed the case to federal court on federal question jurisdiction grounds when Plaintiff added the FSLA count. Trial is scheduled for the period commencing May 11, 2009. During the course of the litigation so far, Plaintiff's counsel has made numerous allegations and or innuendoes regarding alleged

**PENDING LITIGATION – INTERIM REPORT – April 28, 2009
PREPARED BY THE CITY ATTORNEY**

wrongdoing that he implies he intends somehow to incorporate into this litigation. These include allegations or implications of spoliation of evidence, perjury, conflicts of interest, and others. Plaintiff's counsel has indicated he will try to use the discovery process to search for evidence of any and all manner of wrongdoing, including criminal wrongdoing and has implied he will attempt to convert this action into a class or collective action if possible. **The City's special counsel and Plaintiff's attorneys have reached a tentative settlement for the City Commission's consideration.**

CITY OF CORAL GABLES RETIREMENT BOARD, ET AL, V. PINON

Third District Court of Appeal Case No. 3D08-1114; Circuit Court – Appellate Division – Case No. 07-442 AP;

A Petition for Certiorari Review has been filed with the Third District Court of Appeal to review the Circuit Court Appellate Division's decision regarding Pinon's request for equitable relief, modification and/or revocation of his DROP election, on the grounds that the decision is not supported by case law. The Retirement Board filed its own Petition for certiorari review. The Court denied the City's and the Board's petitions, granted Pinon's Motion for appellate costs, and remanded the case to the Retirement Board for further proceedings consistent with the decision of the Circuit Court. Pinon has filed a motion for with the Board seeking an adjusted remedy, costs, and attorney's fees. The City has responded. The Board has not yet announced what form its further proceedings will take and has not yet scheduled further proceedings. **The City's special counsel and Plaintiff's attorneys have reached a tentative settlement for the City Commission's consideration.**

CITY OF CORAL GABLES RETIREMENT SYSTEM v. UBS FINANCIAL SERVICES, INC., F/K/A PAINE WEBBER, INC., ALDO BUSOT AND FLORENCIO OTTO BUSOT

United States District Court – Southern District of Florida – Case No. 04-22539-CIV-Martinez - Circuit Court – General Jurisdiction Division – Case No. 04-19496 CA 10

The City's Retirement System filed a Complaint for Breach of Contract and Demand for Jury Trial alleging that UBS, as asset managers for the City's Retirement System under a Consulting Services Agreement, breached its contract and fiduciary duty to the System, causing substantial losses to the System in excess of \$50 million, and demanded an entry of judgment awarding compensatory damages, interest and costs. Judge Margarita Esquiroz recently denied UBS' Motion for Summary Judgment. Depositions of several Retirement Board Members have been obtained. The deposition of the UBS representative with the most knowledge as to the asset allocation plans was taken. Depositions of several Retirement Board Members and City officers have been obtained. The Defendant, UBS, has filed a Third Party Complaint against former members of the Retirement Board alleging that any alleged losses were caused by the Third Party Defendants, that any liability attributable to UBS is only derivative, technical or vicarious

PENDING LITIGATION – INTERIM REPORT – April 28, 2009
PREPARED BY THE CITY ATTORNEY

to theirs and seeking common law indemnification against them. Discovery is ongoing. UBS has voluntarily dismissed the Third Party Complaint. A mediation conference was held, and an impasse was reached. At the pre-trial conference held December 12, 2008, the court gave the parties five months to complete discovery and to certify that the case is ready for trial. It is anticipated the case would, therefore, be scheduled for trial in the Fall, 2009. **The parties have a tentative settlement agreement which the Board is considering.**

CITY OF CORAL GABLES V. QUANTUM LEAP NETWORK INC.

Circuit court – General Jurisdiction Division – Case No. 09-17991 CA 27

On March 5, 2009, the City filed its Complaint for specific performance of its license agreement for failure of the Defendant to complete the process to effectively transfer the domain name, www.venetianpool.com, to the City of Coral Gables. Defendant filed Answer and Affirmative Defenses. **On April 21, 2009, the Court granted the City's Motion to Strike Quantum Leap's answer and ordered Burr to hire an attorney for Quantum Leap, giving them sixty (60) days to do so.**

CITY OF TAMPA v. MICHAEL C. ADDISON and RICHARD T. PETITT

13th Judicial Circuit in and for Hillsborough County – Case No. 03-5425; Florida Supreme Court – Case No. SC 07-2198; Second District Court of Appeal – Case No. 06-3168

The Second District Court of Appeal certified a defendant class of all cities and counties in the State with an occupational license tax. Tampa filed an appeal challenging the certification of the defendant class on the basis that significant differences between different cities' and counties' occupational license fee ordinances make it inappropriate for a court to treat all ordinances alike. The Florida League of Cities put together a consortium of cities and retained an appellate attorney, with Coral Gables participating as a named party in the filing of an amicus brief to insure that the City's interests are properly represented in this case. The amicus brief was filed October 9, 2006. Oral Argument was heard April 10, 2007. An opinion was rendered by the 2nd District Court of Appeal affirming the order of class certification. Tampa sought further review from the Florida Supreme Court on the class certification. Since the Florida Supreme Court refused to hear the appeal, the matter is back at the trial court level. The City will continue to defend Coral Gables' interests and support the on-going litigation along with the League and other municipalities which stand to be adversely affected in this decision. Hearing was held on June 13, 2008 in the 13th Judicial Circuit on Defendant, City of Tampa's Motion to Amend Answer and Affirmative Defenses on behalf of Tampa, individually, and the Defendant Class. After Plaintiffs filed a Motion to Disqualify the Judge on the basis that he had made several

PENDING LITIGATION – INTERIM REPORT – April 28, 2009
PREPARED BY THE CITY ATTORNEY

disclosures over a period of time about being in the class, he disqualified himself. The Chief Judge is to reassign the matter to another trial judge. On April 20, 2009, the City of Tampa has a special set hearing to argue its Motion to Modify the Certified Class. The basis for Tampa's Motion is the preservation of the common law home venue privilege. As a result, the Motion asks the Court to modify the certified class to exclude all counties and municipalities located outside of Hillsborough County. On April 22, 2009, another special set hearing is scheduled to consider several motions and issues. One key issue relates to competing Notices to Defendant Class Members being proposed by both the Plaintiff and Tampa. Tampa's Notice permits all municipalities and counties to opt-out of the Defendant Class whereas the Plaintiff's Notice does not. Several Cities, including the City of Coral Gables, are filing a Joint Motion for the limited purpose of asserting and arguing the home venue privilege and decertifying the Class to make it a B3 class which provides the right to opt-out of the class. **Order entered on April 20, 2009 that all non-Hillsborough County Defendant Class Members are excluded from the defendant class and, therefore, the City has been dismissed with prejudice from this action, and, further, that no judgment entered in this case shall have a res judicata effect on any non-Hillborough County municipalities or counties.**

DETOURNAY, RANDOL and RIVIERA NEIGHBORHOOD ASS'N v. CITY OF CORAL GABLES and Intervenor, AMACE PROPERTIES

Circuit Court – General Jurisdiction Division – Case No. 07-29458 CA 13

On September 7, 2007, Plaintiffs filed their complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief against the City of Coral Gables seeking to have the Court declare the yacht basin operating at the base of the Mahi Waterway illegal and issue an injunction closing the yacht basin. Amace Properties, Inc., the abutting property owner, moved to intervene in the case. **Amace moved for summary judgment on both claims. The Court denied the motion for summary judgment and indicated that the case should be set for trial. In the meantime, the parties will engage in further discovery as to the legality of the yacht basin and related issues. A trial date has not yet been set.**

GARCIA, OLGA v. CITY OF CORAL GABLES

United States District Court – Southern District of Florida – Case No. 09-20733-CIV-UNGARO

The Plaintiff filed a complaint under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 alleging violation of the overtime provisions while she was employed in the Mayor's Office from 2006 to 2008 seeking compensation for hours worked in excess of forty hours, and including in the complaint

PENDING LITIGATION – INTERIM REPORT – April 28, 2009
PREPARED BY THE CITY ATTORNEY

a collective action under 29 USC § 216 for those employees similarly situated. **City has filed its Answer and Affirmative Defenses.**

GRANADA LLC v. CITY OF CORAL GABLES

Circuit Court – General Jurisdiction Division – Case No. 07-23410 CA 40

Following the City's Notice of Default letter, Granada LLC, the operator of the Country Club of Coral Gables, filed an action for damages including lost profits, prejudgment interest and cost of action, alleging that the City breached its obligations under the Management Agreement and the Operating Agreement to fully fund the capital improvements to the property and that its failure to do so has led the Plaintiff to be exposed to threatened and actual liability from certain vendors including the General Contractor who performed a portion of the capital improvement work, and seeking to recover the loans allegedly made by Plaintiff to City, and the deferred Operator Fees, which Plaintiff contends were used to fund capital improvements. The City filed a Motion to Dismiss Granada's Complaint as it is an unlawful attempt by Granada to force the City to pay for Granada's obligations. The Motion to Dismiss further states that the City, as a sovereign entity, is immune from the claims of implied contractual liability as the City does not have a contractual relationship with Granada. Finally, the motion states that Granada's claims are barred by the Statute of Frauds as there is no memorialized agreement between Granada and the City. On April 14, 2008, Judge Gill S. Freeman denied the City's Motion to Dismiss without oral argument. The City has filed its Answer and Affirmative Defenses and has requested extension to file its counterclaims and third party claims on or about May 24, 2008. The City Attorney's Office was authorized to file a counterclaim against Granada LLC for failure to fulfill its obligations under the operative agreement and for breach of the settlement agreement entered into with Courtelis Construction Company, and a third party complaint against Stuart Bornstein, individually, and breach of the operative agreements, and breach of the settlement agreement entered into with Courtelis Construction Company, and to take all action necessary to represent the interests of the City. **The parties attempted to mediate but were unsuccessful. The court denied the City's Motion for Summary Judgment as premature. The parties are proceeding with discovery.**

IN THE MATTER OF COMCAST CABLE COMMUNICATIONS, LLC, on behalf of its subsidiaries and affiliates

Federal Communications Commission – CSR 6046-E, CSR 6047-E, CSR 6048-E, CSR 6409-E, CSR 6010-E

Comcast has filed a Petition for Special Relief with the FCC. It is seeking a determination that it is subject to effective competition in Coral Gables, along with 14 other franchise areas in Miami Dade County. The City filed its opposition December 3, 2004. To show effective competition,

PENDING LITIGATION – INTERIM REPORT – April 28, 2009
PREPARED BY THE CITY ATTORNEY

Comcast must demonstrate that more than 15% of the City's households subscribe to DBS service and not to Comcast's service. If granted, it will allow Comcast to raise rates whenever it likes for basic tier service and equipment without being subject to FCC rules. It will also eliminate some federal consumer protections such as uniform rates (allowing Comcast to charge different rates in different areas of the city) and anti buy through (allowing Comcast to require subscribers to purchase advanced products such as digital) to obtain premium services (i.e. HBO). On Jan. 31, 2007, the Federal Communications Commission's ("FCC") Media Bureau issued a Memorandum Opinion and Order granting Comcast's Petition for Effective Competition. The City has 30 days, until March 5, 2007, to appeal by filing a Petition for Review with the full FCC. If no appeal is filed, Comcast's rates will be deregulated in the City and Comcast will be able to raise rates whenever and to whatever level it wants, and will be able to charge different rates to different residents in the City. Comcast will also be able to require residents to subscribe to premium and other higher level services if they want to obtain basic service. The City filed its Application for Review of the Media bureau's Order granting Petition, to which Comcast filed its opposition. **The matter remains pending at the Commission.**

**IN RE. PETITION OF TEAMSTERS LOCAL UNION 769 AFFILIATED WITH THE
INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, TO AMEND CERT. NO. 428
State of Florida, Public Employees Relations Commission ("PERC") Case No. AC 2008 016**

The Petitioner, Teamsters Local 769 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, has filed a Petition to Amend Certification No. 428 to reflect a merger with the Coral Gables Employees Association ("Association") whereby Local 769 would assume all of the Association's rights and obligations. A member of the Association's Board intervened in the case to oppose the merger. The City also filed a response to the Petition. On January 29, 2009, the Hearing Officer issued her recommended order dismissing the petition. The Teamsters filed exceptions to the recommended order with PERC. **The City filed a timely response. PERC rejected all of Local 769's exceptions and on March 18, 2009, dismissed Local 769's Petition. Local 769 has 30 days from the date of PERC's order to notice an appeal of the dismissal to the appropriate district court of appeal.**

**R. TUCKER, TRUSTEE, Counter-Plaintiff v. JOEL ISRAEL AND CITY OF CORAL
GABLES, Counter-Defendants**

Circuit Court – General Jurisdiction Division – Case No. 08-30617 CA 06

Counter-Plaintiff, R. Tucker, Trustee, who is the owner of a recorded tax deed on property situated in the MacFarlane Homestead, Lot 27, Block 1-A, filed a countersuit

PENDING LITIGATION – INTERIM REPORT – April 28, 2009
PREPARED BY THE CITY ATTORNEY

against Joel Israel and the City concerning a City waste lien which the City sold to Mr. Israel, and seeks to declare that the City's delegation, authorization and lien sale certificate is invalid and void.

KEARNS, et al v. CITY OF CORAL GABLES

United States District Court – Southern District of Florida – Case No. 07-22310 CIV JORDAN

Plaintiff filed a class action complaint on behalf of himself and those similarly situated seeking damages and injunctive relief from Code Enforcement Citations for violating the pick-up truck ordinance of the City. The City moved to dismiss on various grounds. On March 3, 2008, federal district court Judge Adalberto Jordan issued a ruling on the City's Motion to Dismiss. Judge Jordan first noted that the Plaintiff had admitted that two of his claims--for violation of privacy and for a "taking"--failed to state causes of action. The judge ordered that those claims be dismissed. Judge Jordan denied the City's motion to dismiss the two other claims, which are based on equal protection and the right to freedom of association. The judge's rulings concluded that based on the pleadings alone, he could not rule that the City was entitled to prevail. The judge concluded that he could not rule on the merits of these issues without further information, including "the City's passage and rationale for the ordinance, and the personal situation of the Plaintiff and his father (who the Plaintiff sought to visit)". Plaintiff was given an opportunity to amend his complaint on the two counts which were dismissed, but choose to go forward without those two claims. The City filed its answer on April 8, 2008. On March 28, 2008, the Plaintiff and the City filed a joint scheduling report. The report sets a deadline of December 1, 2008 for the filing and hearing of motions. The matter has been set for two week trial calendar starting March 2, 2009. Kuvn has rejected the City's amendments to the ordinance which were proposed at mediation. On January 15, 2009, the City filed a motion for summary judgment, and a motion arguing the Plaintiff lacks standing to prosecute his lawsuit. On March 3, 2008, the Court granted City of Coral Gables' Motion for Summary Judgment on standing grounds. **Kuvn filed a notice of appeal with the United States District Court of Appeals on March 23, 2009.**

**PENDING LITIGATION – INTERIM REPORT – April 28, 2009
PREPARED BY THE CITY ATTORNEY**

KUVIN v. CITY OF CORAL GABLES

**Third District Court of Appeal – Case No. 3D05-2845
Circuit Court – Appellate Division – Case No. 03-8911-AP;**

Petitioner filed a Petition for Writ of Certiorari seeking a permanent injunction and damages to prohibit the City from enforcing the provisions of its code, arising from a citation which Petitioner received for parking his truck in violation of the Coral Gables Zoning Code Section 8-11 and 8-12. The Court, in a ruling rendered October 14, 2005, granted the City's motion for summary judgment and upheld the constitutionality of the City's truck ordinance. The Plaintiff filed a Notice of Appeal with the Third District Court of Appeal, and the City has filed a Motion to Dismiss. The Court dismissed the appeal for failure of Kuvín to comply with the court's November 10, 2005 order. Upon payment of the filing fee, the appeal was reinstated. Kuvín has filed his initial brief in the district court of appeal, and the City filed its answer brief on Sept. 28th. Kuvín has to file his reply brief. The court heard oral argument on Tuesday, November 14th, 2006 before JJ. Schwartz, Cortinas and Rothenberg. Decision entered August 22, 2007, reversing with directions to enter declaratory judgment for appellant and to vacate the guilty determination of the hearing officer, with J. Rothenberg dissenting with a comprehensive separate opinion. The City has filed with the Third District Court of Appeal a Motion for Rehearing En Banc and a Motion requesting the Court to certify this case to the Florida Supreme Court as a matter of great public importance. **The City has filed with the Third District Court of Appeal a Motion for Rehearing en Banc and Motion for Certification to the Florida Supreme Court as a matter of great public importance. Decision on City's motion is pending.**

NAVARRO, MARILYN and HERNANDEZ, JOE v. CITY OF CORAL GABLES

Circuit Court – General Jurisdiction Division – Case No. 05-18262 (T009835)

Plaintiffs seek a temporary injunction, declaratory relief, and incidental damages arising from a citation which Plaintiffs received for parking a truck in violation of the Coral Gables Zoning Code Section 8-11 and 8-12. As this case challenges the same ordinance on essentially the same grounds as Kuvín, the case is awaiting resolution of the Kuvín appeal. **Plaintiffs filed Motion for Relief from Stay for Final Summary Judgment.**

NAVARRO, MARILYN and HERNANDEZ, JOE v. CITY OF CORAL GABLES

Circuit Court – Appellate Division – Case No. 05-357 (T009646)

Petitioners filed a Petition for Writ of Certiorari Appellate Division seeking review of the citation which was issued for parking a truck in violation of the Coral Gables Zoning Code

PENDING LITIGATION – INTERIM REPORT – April 28, 2009
PREPARED BY THE CITY ATTORNEY

Section 8-11 and 8-12. Meanwhile, the Court granted the City's request to consolidate this case with Case No. 05-422 AP Martinez v. City of Coral Gables. Upon consideration of the Petitioner's Request for Temporary Injunction, the Court denied the request on February 8, 2006. The three-judge panel on March 2, 2006 granted City's Motion to Dismiss petitions for certiorari and to transfer the case to the trial court. **As this case challenges the same ordinance on essentially the same grounds as Kuvin, the case is awaiting resolution of the Kuvin appeal.**

NOA, PERAZA AND PEREZ SIAM v. CITY OF CORAL GABLES

Circuit Court - Appellate Division – Case No. 06-249 AP

Petitioners filed a Notice of Appeal with the Appellate Division seeking review of the citation which was issued for parking a truck in violation of the Coral Gables Zoning Code Section 8-11 and 8-12. The parties agree to abate the action pending final decision in Kuvin. Appellant's counsel will file the motion and agreed order with the court. **As this case challenges the same ordinance on essentially the same grounds as Kuvin, the case is awaiting resolution of the Kuvin appeal.**

SALONE CONSULTING GROUP, INC. v. CITY OF CORAL GABLES

Circuit Court – General Jurisdiction Division – Case No. 09-8439CA 15

Plaintiff in this case is a corporation providing services to the City, under a Professional Services Agreement, to provide functionality to the City Clerk for the effective and secure management of official city records or evidence, claiming monies owed to them under the agreement. **The City has filed a Motion to Dismiss for failure to comply with the mandatory Arbitration Clause of the Professional Services Agreement.**