

#36.300

5/30/75

Memorandum 75-47

Subject: Study 36.300 - Eminent Domain (Settlement Offers)

Attached is a letter from Roger M. Sullivan objecting to the amendment that the Commission has decided to make in Section 1250.410. See the P.S. to the letter.

Respectfully submitted,

John H. DeMouilly  
Executive Secretary

Memorandum 75-47

LAW OFFICES  
THORPE, SULLIVAN, WORKMAN, THORPE & O'SULLIVAN  
FOURTH FLOOR  
800 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD  
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017  
TELEPHONE (213) 680-9940

OF COUNSEL  
EDWARD P. DOWNES

PLEASE REFER TO  
OUR FILE NO.

JOHN G. THORPE  
ROGER M. SULLIVAN  
HENRY K. WORKMAN  
VINCENT W. THORPE  
THOMAS E. O'SULLIVAN  
JOHN J. DEE  
C. FREDERICK REISH  
MICHAEL R. SULLIVAN  
CHARLES D. CUMMINGS

May 23, 1975

John H. Demouilly  
Executive Secretary  
California Law Revision Commission  
Stanford School of Law  
Stanford, California 94305

Re: Proposed Section 1250.410 Settlement Offers

Dear Mr. Demouilly:

I've just completed reading Mr. Fairman's letter to you dated May 5 concerning proposed amendments to the above section. I do not agree with Mr. Fairman's characterization of the sections as a "one-way street" and feel that the Commission should be aware that the present CCP §1249.3 has turned out to be a very effective means of promoting settlements. It has been my experience this year to settle two major cases which in my opinion would not have settled had the section not been in effect.

In my opinion, if the additional phrase "in the light of testimony given under Evidence Code Section 813(a)" is added, this will reduce the incentive on the part of the condemnors to make reasonable offers and thereby settle cases prior to trial.

I feel that section 1250.410 is working out in practice to be much better than the comparable Uniform Eminent Domain Code section would. Therefore, having found something that is working, I question the wisdom of tinkering with it.


As Mr. Fairman is aware, the only way that the Section could not be considered a "one-way street" is to deny costs to the property owner if he did not make a reasonable offer. As it is, the property owner stands to lose his liti-

ES	
AES	
AC	

John H. Demouilly  
May 23, 1975  
Page Two

gation expenses. Inasmuch as these are far in excess of the recoverable court costs, it certainly is not a "one-way street" in this respect.

Yours very truly,



Roger M. Sullivan  
of THORPE, SULLIVAN, WORKMAN,  
THORPE & O'SULLIVAN

RMS:mb

P. S. On further examination of the Law Revision Commission minutes of May 13, it appears that the Commission has already decided to recommend amending Section 1250.410 to include the phrase "evidence submitted and the." In my opinion, this amendment is ill-advised for the same reason which applied in Mr. Fairman's proposal. If your goal is to promote settlements, I recommend that this section be left as is.