		-
1	GLENN L. BLOCK (SB#208017) ARTHUR J. HAZARABEDIAN (SB#137324) 3429 Ocean View Blvd., Suite L	EXEPTEDONEENCE PES [Govt. Code § 6103]
2	3429 Ocean View Blvd., Suite L Glendale, CA 91208	NOV 18 2020
3	Telephone: (818) 957-0477 Facsimile: (818) 957-3477	CLERK OF MENDOCINO COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT OF CAMEGORINA
4	Attorneys for Plaintiff MENDOCINO RAILV	VAY - HYRA
6	SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
7		
8	FOR THE COUNTY	OF MENDOCINO
9	MENDOCINO RAILWAY,	SCHWIN CVED- 20-74846
10	Plaintiff,	[APN 008-130-02]
11	ν.	
12		PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PREJUDGMENT POSSESSION
13	LORENA RUTH SHEA; MENDOCINO COUNTY TREASURER-TAX COLLECTOR;	(CCP§1255.410); MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES;
14	CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH CARE SERVICES; All other persons	DECLARATION OF ROBERT JASON PINOLI IN SUPPORT
15	unknown claiming an interest in the property; and DOES 1 through 100,	
16	inclusivé,	Date: January 29, 2021
17	Defendants.	Time: 9:30 a.m. Dept: E
18		
19		
20	TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR ATTORNEYS O	F RECORD:
21	PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on Janu	ary 29, 2021 at 9:30 a.m., or as soon as
22	thereafter as the matter may be heard	in Department E of the above-entitled
23	Court, located at 100 North State Street	, Ukiah, California, plaintiff MENDOCINO
24	RAILWAY will move for an order for prejudgment possession of the property to be	
25	acquired in the above-captioned action ("Subject Property"). Said order shall	
26	empower Plaintiff to take possession ten (10) days following service of the order.	
27	The motion is made pursuant to Code Civ. Proc. § 1255.410. It is made on	
28	the grounds that Plaintiff:	

Ш

By tax.

1	 is entitled to condemn the Subject Property by eminent domain;
2	and
3	 has deposited the amount of probable compensation with the
4	Court.
5	In the event this motion is opposed, it is further made on the grounds that
6	Plaintiff:
7	 has an overriding need for possession of the Subject Property prior
8	to final judgment and will suffer a substantial hardship if this motion
9	is denied or limited; and,
10	 will suffer a substantial hardship if this motion is denied, which
11	hardship outweighs any hardship on the defendants if this motion is
12	granted.
13	This motion is based on this notice, the attached Memorandum of Points
14	and Authorities and Declaration of Robert Jason Pinoli, the Court's file in this
15	matter, any matters of which the Court may take judicial notice, and on such
16	further and other arguments or matters as may be raised at or before the time of
17	hearing on this matter.
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
	PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ORDER FOR PREJUDGMENT POSSESSION
	- 2 -

NOTICE IS HEREBY FURTHER GIVEN pursuant to Code Civ. Proc. §1255.410(a) that you have the right to oppose this motion for an order of possession of your property. If you oppose this motion, you must serve the plaintiff and file with the court a written opposition to the motion within thirty (30) days from the date you were served with this motion.

Dated: November 16, 2020	CALIFORNIA EMINENT DOMAIN LAW GROUP, a Professional Corporation By Glenn L. Block Attorneys for Plaintiff Mendocino Railway

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

1

2

This is an eminent domain action by which plaintiff, Mendocino Railway ("Plaintiff"), a California railway corporation, seeks to acquire a property in the City of Fort Bragg located at 476 Alger Street (the "Subject Property") in connection with construction and maintenance of Plaintiff's ongoing and future freight and passenger rail operations (the "Project").

The Subject Property is improved with an abandoned single-family 8 residence in a state of serious disrepair adjacent to plaintiff's ongoing rail 9 operation. The Subject Property has been and continues to be periodically 10 illegally used as a gathering place for the use of illegal drugs and other criminal 11 activity, as well as an unauthorized access point for those engaged in such 12 criminal activity and others to plaintiff's adjacent rail facilities. As a result of its 13 condition and the above-referenced criminal activity, the structure on the 14 Subject Property has been "red-tagged" as uninhabitable by the City of Fort 15 Braga. (Declaration of Robert Jason Pinoli, para. 4). The state of disrepair, drug 16 and other criminal activity at the Subject Property, and use of the Subject 17 Property as an unauthorized access point to plaintiff's rail facilities, has posed and 18 continues to pose a danger to Plaintiff's adjacent rail operations and the public 19 20 so long as it is permitted to remain. (Pinoli Decl., para. 5).

The record owner of the Subject Property is Defendant Lorena Ruth Shea. (Pinoli Decl., Para. 6). Plaintiff has reached out to Ms. Shea and her family, and has been informed by Ms. Shea's daughter that Ms. Shea no longer resides on the Subject Property and is in an assisted living facility, and that the family will not oppose Plaintiff's acquiring the Subject Property by eminent domain. (Pinoli Decl., Para. 7).

It is necessary for Plaintiff to acquire the Subject Property in order to
properly maintain the safety of Plaintiff's rail operations adjacent to and near the

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ORDER FOR PREJUDGMENT POSSESSION

1	Subject Property. The ongoing illegal activities at the Subject Property
2	immediately adjacent to Plaintiff's rail facilities, and the fact that criminals and
3	other members of the public are utilizing the Subject Property as an unauthorized
4	access point to dump garbage, take drugs and conduct other illegal activities on
5	Plaintiff's adjacent rail facilities presents a danger to the public and Plaintiff's rail
6	operations. (Pinoli Decl., Para. 8).
7	
8	
9	ARGUMENT
10	I. <u>ALL REQUIREMENTS FOR PREJUDGMENT POSSESSION ARE SATISFIED</u>
11	Code of Civil Procedure sections 1255.410(a) and 1255.410(d)(1) provide
12	that a public agency may obtain prejudgment possession of property being
13	acquired by eminent domain. The code sections set forth two requirements for a
14	motion for prejudgment possession. They are:
15	 that Plaintiff is entitled to condemn the Subject Property by eminent
16	domain; and
17	 that Plaintiff deposited the amount of probable compensation before
18	possession is ordered.
19	If the motion is unopposed within 30 days, the Court "shall" issue an Order
20	for Prejudgment Possession upon making these two findings. <u>Cal. Civ. Proc. Code</u>
21	§ 1255.410(d)(1). As noted, Plaintiff expects that this motion will be unopposed, so
22	these should be the only two requirements for granting of the motion. As
23	discussed below, both are satisfied here.
24	
25	A. <u>Plaintiff Is Entitled To Condemn The Subject Property</u>
26	Plaintiff is authorized to acquire the Subject Property for the public use
27	described herein, i.e., construction and maintenance of Plaintiff's ongoing and
28	future freight and passenger rail operations, pursuant to the California
	PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ORDER FOR PREJUDGMENT POSSESSION
	5

Constitution Article 1, section 19; California Public Utilities Code §§ 229, 230, 611
 and 7526(g); and Code of Civil Procedure sections 1230.010 et seq.

Specifically, without limitation, California Public Utilities Code section 611 3 4 provides: "A railroad corporation may condemn any property necessary for the construction and maintenance of its railroad." Cal. Pub. Utilities Code § 611. A 5 '[r]ailroad corporation' includes every corporation or person owning, controlling, 6 7 operating, or managing any railroad for compensation within this State." Cal. 8 Pub. Utilities Code § 230. Plaintiff is a California corporation which owns, operates 9 and manages a railroad in California for compensation. (Pinoli Decl., paras. 2, 3). Plaintiff is thus a railroad corporation, and therefore has the right and power to 10 exercise eminent domain for purposes of maintaining its rail facilities pursuant to 11 Public Utilities Code section 611. 12

Plaintiff accordingly has the right to condemn the Subject Property as a
matter of law.

- 15
- 16

B. Plaintiff Has Deposited the Amount of Probable Compensation

As set forth in the Notice of Deposit of Probable Compensation filed with
the Court concurrently with this Motion, Plaintiff deposited \$155,000 with the State
Treasurer as probable compensation for the Subject Property.

The deposited amount represents the appraised value of Subject Property as conducted by an independent certified appraiser. (Pinoli Decl., para. 9). The real property appraisal was conducted by Maryellen Sheppard, a State Licensed General Appraiser, with a date of value of October 9, 2020. (Id.).

24 The second – and final - prerequisite to issuance of an Order for

25 Prejudgment Possession without opposition is thus also met. Accordingly,

26 assuming no opposition is filed within 30 days of service of this motion, the Order

27 for Prejudgment Possession "shall" issue. <u>Cal. Civ. Proc. Code</u> § 1255.410(d)(1).

28

1	II. EVEN IF THE MOTION IS OPPOSED, PLAINTIFF IS ENTITLED TO PREJUDGMENT POSSESSION
2	If the motion is opposed within 30 days – which Plaintiff does not expect –
3	the Court is required to make two additional findings as a prerequisite to granting
4	this motion:
5	 that Plaintiff has an overriding need for possession of the property prior
6	to final judgment and that it will suffer a substantial hardship if this
7	motion is denied or limited; and
8	 that the hardship Plaintiff will suffer if this motion is denied or limited
9	outweighs any hardship on the Defendants if this motion is granted.
10	<u>Cal. Civ. Proc. Code</u> § 1255.410(d)(2).
11	
12	A. <u>Plaintiff Has An Overriding Need For Prejudgment Possession And Will</u> Suffer A Substantial Hardship If The Motion Is Denied Or Limited
13	Suffer A Substantial Hardship It The Motion is Denied Or Limited
14 15	1. Plaintiff Has an Overriding Need For Prejudgment Possession.
16	The criminal activity and trespassing on Plaintiff's rail facilities emanating
17	from the Subject Property are continuing and ongoing. Plaintiff needs possession
18	of the Subject Property as soon as possible in order to ensure public safety and
19	the safe operation of its rail facilities. (Pinoli Decl., para. 10). Any delay in
20	possession would delay Plaintiff's ability to secure the Subject Property and
21	prevent further trespasses and criminal activity emanating therefrom to Plaintiff's
22	rail facilities. (Id.).
23	BIT I DW MARK O. W. A Collin Low Roll How Solds of The Marken Is Destand
24	2. Plaintiff Will Suffer A Substantial Hardship If The Motion Is Denied Or Limited
25	Plaintiff will suffer a substantial hardship if prejudgment possession is denied
26	or limited for the same reasons it has an overriding need for prejudgment
27	possession. The criminal activity and trespassing on Plaintiff's rail facilities
28	emanating from the Subject Property are continuing and ongoing and Plaintiff
	needs possession of the Subject Property as soon as possible in order to ensure
	PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ORDER FOR PREJUDGMENT POSSESSION
	7

Н

public safety and the safe operation of its rail facilities. (Pinoli Decl., para. 10). If
possession is delayed until conclusion of this action, public safety and the safety
of Plaintiff's rail facilities and passengers would remain at risk throughout the
pendency of this action as Plaintiff would be unable to secure the Subject
Property and prevent access from the Subject Property to Plaintiff's rail facilities.
(Pinoli Decl., para. 11).

- 7
- 8

B. Plaintiff's Hardship Outweighs That Of Any Defendant

The hardship Plaintiff would suffer if this motion is denied or limited 9 outweighs any hardship that Defendants would suffer if this motion is granted. 10 As discussed previously, the Subject Property is a vacant, abandoned, 11 dilapidated, red-tagged single family residence used only by trespassers largely 12 13 for criminal drug activity and other illegal activities. The record owner, Lorena Ruth Shea, no longer occupies the Subject Property. (Pinoli Decl., paras. 6, 7). No 14 owner or lawful occupant will be displaced as a result of granting Plaintiff 15 possession. (Pinoli Decl., para. 12). The only other known Defendants are 16 potential lienholders whose interest is strictly potential entitlement to 17 compensation. (Pinoli Decl., para. 13). Whatever entitlement to compensation 18 they may have, if any, will be unimpacted by the Court's granting of this motion. 19 20 In fact, to the contrary, by Plaintiff's depositing probable compensation in 21 support of this motion, the lienholder Defendants may be able to obtain compensation earlier than they otherwise would. 22 The hardship that Plaintiff will suffer if prejudgment possession is denied or 23 limited, on the other hand, is significant for the reasons set forth above. It is 24

25 therefore evident that Plaintiff's hardship would be greater than any potential
26 hardship of Defendants.

- 27
- 28

	\checkmark	
1	CONCLUSION	
2	For the reasons set forth above, Plaintiff's Motion for an Order for	
3	Prejudgment Possession should be granted, effective 10 days following the	
4	service of the Order (Cal. Civ. Proc. Code § 1255.450 (b)).	
5		
6	Dated: November 16, 2020 CALIFORNIA EMINENT DOMAIN LAW GROUP, a Professional Corporation	
7	I NI	
8	ByReack	
9	Glenn L. Block Attorneys for Plaintiff Mendocino Railroad	
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15 16		
10		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ORDER FOR PREJUDGMENT	
	POSSESSION	

.

DECLARATION OF ROBERT JASON PINOLI l I, Robert Jason Pinoli, hereby declare as follows: 2 I am, and at all relevant times herein was, the Vice President of 1. 3 Mendocino Railway. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein, and 4 if called upon as a witness, I could and would competently testify thereto. 5 Mendocino Railway is a California corporation which owns, operates 2. 6 and manages a railroad in California for compensation. 7 Specifically, without limitation, Mendocino Railway owns, operates 8 3. and manages the California Western Railroad "Skunk Train," a Class III Common 9 Carrier, which runs through the redwood forests of Northern California. The Skunk 10 Train's tracks run immediately adjacent, in part, to a property located at 476 11 Alger Street, Fort Bragg, California, the property which is the subject of this 12 eminent domain action (the "Subject Property"). 13 The Subject Property is improved with an abandoned single-family 4. 14 residence in a state of serious disrepair adjacent to plaintiff's ongoing rail 15 operation. The Subject Property has been and continues to be periodically 16 illegally used as a gathering place for the use of illegal drugs and other criminal 17 activity, as well as an unauthorized access point for those engaged in such 18 criminal activity and others to plaintiff's adjacent rail facilities. As a result of its 19 condition and the above-referenced criminal activity, the structure on the 20 Subject Property has been "red-tagged" as uninhabitable by the City of Fort 21 Bragg. 22 The state of disrepair, drug and other criminal activity at the Subject 5. 23 Property, and use of the Subject Property as an unauthorized access point to 24 plaintiff's rail facilities, has posed and continues to pose a danger to Plaintiff's 25 adjacent rail operations and the public so long as it is permitted to remain. 26 Per the title report obtained by Mendocino Railway, the record 6. 27 owner of the Subject Property is Defendant Lorena Ruth Shea. 28

7. My office has reached out to Ms. Shea and her family, and has
 spoken with Ms. Shea's daughter. Ms. Shea's daughter informed my office that
 Ms. Shea no longer resides on the Subject Property and is in an assisted living
 facility, and that the family would not oppose Mendocino Railway's acquiring the
 Subject Property by eminent domain.

It is necessary for Mendocino Railway to acquire the Subject Property 8. 6 in order to properly maintain the safety of its rail operations adjacent to and near 7 the Subject Property. The ongoing illegal activities at the Subject Property 8 immediately adjacent to Plaintiff's rail facilities, and the fact that criminals and 9 other members of the public are utilizing the Subject Property as an unauthorized 10 access point to dump garbage, take drugs and conduct other illegal activities on 11 Plaintiff's adjacent rail facilities presents a danger to the public and Plaintiff's rail 12 operations. 13

In or around October, 2020, Mendocino Railway retained a California 9. 14 licensed general appraiser, Maryellen Sheppard, to appraise the Subject 15 Property. Ms. Sheppard valued the Subject Property as of October 9, 2020, and 16 concluded to a fair market value of \$155,000. Mendocino Railroad has 17 deposited the amount of \$155,000 with the California State Treasurer as probable 18 compensation for the Subject Property in this eminent domain action. 19 The criminal activity and trespassing on Mendocino Railway's railroad 10. 20

10. The childred delivity and hespassing of Mendocino Railway's Hambara
facilities emanating from the Subject Property are continuing and ongoing.
Mendocino Railway needs possession of the Subject Property as soon as possible
in order to ensure public safety and the safe operation of its rail facilities. Any
delay in possession would delay Mendocino Railway's ability to secure the

Subject Property and prevent further trespasses and criminal activity emanating
therefrom to Mendocino Railway's rail facilities.

11. If possession is delayed until conclusion of this action, public safety
and the safety of Mendocino Railway's rail facilities and passengers would remain

PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ORDER FOR PREJUDGMENT POSSESSION

1	at risk throughout the pendency of this action as Mendocino Railway would be	
2	unable to secure the Subject Property and prevent access from the Subject	
3	Property to Mendocino Railway's rail facilities.	
4	12. No owner or lawful occupant will be displaced as a result of granting	
5	Mendocino Railway's motion seeking prejudgment possession.	
6	13. Aside from Ms. Shea, the only other potential claimants to the	
7	Subject Property of which I am aware are the Mendocino County Tax Collector,	
8	who I am informed has a lien for property taxes, and possibly the California	
9	Department of Health Services, who I am informed might assert a lien against the	
10	Subject Property related to a potential Medi-Cal reimbursement issue.	
11		
12	I, Robert Jason Pinoli, hereby declare under penalty of perjury that the	
13	foregoing is true and correct.	
14	Executed this <u>17th</u> day of November, 2020 at Fort Bragg, California.	
15		
16		
17	Robert Jason Pinoli, Vice President	
18	Mendocino Railway	
19		
20		
21 22		
22		
23 24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR ORDER FOR PREJUDGMENT POSSESSION	
	12	

•