

NEW MOTOR VEHICLE BOARD
1507 - 21st Street, Suite 330
Sacramento, California 95811
Telephone: (916) 445-1888

STATE OF CALIFORNIA
NEW MOTOR VEHICLE BOARD

In the Matter of the Protest of

MEGA RV CORP. dba MCMAHONS RV,

Protestant,

v.

ROADTREK MOTORHOMES, INC.,

Respondent.

Protest Nos. PR-2244-10 and PR-
2245-10

DECISION

At its regularly scheduled meeting of August 23, 2012, the Public and Dealer Members of the Board met and considered the administrative record and the "Proposed Order Granting Respondent's Motion to Dismiss Protest No. PR-2245-10 (Scotts Valley)", in the above-entitled matter. After such consideration, the Board adopted the Proposed Order as its final Decision in this matter.

This Decision shall become effective forthwith.

IT IS SO ORDERED THIS 23rd DAY OF AUGUST 2012.



RAMON ALVAREZ C.
President
New Motor Vehicle Board

1 NEW MOTOR VEHICLE BOARD
1507 - 21ST Street, Suite 330
2 Sacramento, California 95811
Telephone: (916) 445-1888

CERTIFIED MAIL

3
4
5
6 STATE OF CALIFORNIA
7 NEW MOTOR VEHICLE BOARD

8 In the Matter of the Protest of
9 MEGA RV CORP. dba MCMAHONS RV,
10
11 Protestant,
12 v.
13 ROADTREK MOTORHOMES, INC.,
14 Respondent.

Protest Nos. PR-2199-10, and PR-2201-10

**PROPOSED ORDER GRANTING
RESPONDENT'S MOTION TO DISMISS
PROTEST NO. PR-2245-10 (Scotts Valley)
RE: TERMINATION**

15 In the Matter of the Protest of
16 MEGA RV CORP. dba MCMAHONS RV,
17
18 Protestant,
19 v.
20 ROADTREK MOTORHOMES, INC.,
21 Respondent.

**Protest Nos. PR-2206-10, PR-2208-10, and
PR-2209-10**

22 In the Matter of the Protest of
23 MEGA RV CORP. dba MCMAHONS RV,
24
25 Protestant,
26 v.
27 ROADTREK MOTORHOMES, INC.,
28 Respondent.

**Protest Nos. PR-2205-10, PR-2211-10, and
PR-2212-10**

1 In the Matter of the Protest of
2 MEGA RV CORP. dba MCMAHONS RV,

3 Protestant,

4 v.

5 ROADTREK MOTORHOMES, INC.,

6 Respondent

Protest No. PR-2233-10

7 In the Matter of the Protest of

8 MEGA RV CORP. dba MCMAHONS RV,

9 Protestant,

10 v.

11 ROADTREK MOTORHOMES, INC.,

12 Respondent.

Protest Nos. PR-2244-10 and PR-2245-10

13 To: Michael J. Flanagan, Esq.
14 Gavin M. Hughes, Esq.
15 Danielle R. Vare, Esq.
16 Attorneys for Protestant
LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL J. FLANAGAN
2277 Fair Oaks Boulevard, Suite 450
Sacramento, California 95825

17 James D. McNairy, Esq.
18 Attorney for Respondent
SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
19 400 Capitol Mall, Suite 2350
Sacramento, California 95814-4428

20 Louis S. Chronowski, Esq.
21 Attorney for Respondent
SEYFARTH SHAW LLP
22 131 South Dearborn Street, Suite 2400
Chicago, Illinois 60603

23 ///

24 ///

25 ///

26 ///

27 ///

28 ///

1 **PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND**

2 1. At the time of hearing of this motion, there were 12 protests pending before the New
3 Motor Vehicle Board ("Board") that involve the Protestant, identified in the captions of each of these
4 protests as MEGA RV CORP., dba MCMAHONS RV (hereafter "Protestant" or "Mega") and
5 Respondent, ROADTREK MOTORHOMES, INC. (hereafter "Respondent" or "Roadtrek").¹

6 2. The 12 protests involve three dealership locations that may be identified as "Irvine",
7 "Colton" and "Scotts Valley". Other protests, in addition to the 12 protests, and involving a location
8 identified as "Palm Desert", have previously been dismissed.

9 3. All 12 of the remaining protests were consolidated for purposes of hearing on their
10 merits.² A consolidated evidentiary hearing has been held over a period of 36 days before Diana
11 Woodward Hagle, an Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") of the Board. The final day of that hearing was
12 conducted telephonically on April 26, 2012; the in-person hearing concluded on February 1, 2012. On
13 May 3, 2012, the matter was deemed submitted.³

14 4. About two weeks before the in-person evidentiary hearing was completed, Roadtrek, on
15 January 12, 2012 filed what it captioned "RESPONDENT ROADTREK MOTORHOMES, INC'S
16 MOTION AND BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO DISMISS PROTESTS - SCOTTS
17 VALLEY". The caption of the motion as filed contained three protest numbers. These are "Protest Nos.
18 2198-10, 2209-10, 2211-10". As can be seen from the caption and as will be discussed, the motion is
19 directed only to the protests pertaining to the dealership location indicated as "Scotts Valley". Also, as
20

21 ¹ On March 6, 2012, counsel for Protestant voluntarily requested dismissal of Protest No. PR-2198-10, and the Board issued
22 the Order of Dismissal with prejudice on the same day. This modification protest pertained to Scotts Valley. There are 11
23 protests waiting for decision.

24 ² By order dated January 31, 2012, the order consolidating all 12 protests for the purposes of hearing was amended so that the
25 protests were consolidated by type of action for preparation of the proposed decisions. The protests were consolidated as
26 follows:

- 27 ■ Modification (Protest Nos. PR-2199-10 and PR-2201-10);
- 28 ■ Warranty reimbursement (Protest Nos. PR-2206-10, PR-2208-10, and PR-2209-10);
- Franchisor incentive program reimbursement (Protest Nos. PR-2205-10, PR-2211-10, and PR-2212-10); and,
- Termination (Protest Nos. PR-2244-10 and PR-2245-10).

29 The establishment protest (PR-2233-10) was not consolidated with any other protests.

30 ³ Counsel for the parties stipulated to allow ALJ Hagle 90 days after the matter was deemed submitted (until August 1, 2012)
to submit the proposed decisions. These matters are tentatively scheduled for Board consideration on August 23, 2012, in
Riverside, California.

1 will be discussed, the text of the motion is requesting dismissal of a fourth protest involving Scotts
2 Valley, Protest No. PR-2245-10.

3 5. Mega, on January 25, 2012, filed "PROTESTANT'S OPPOSITION TO ROADTREK
4 MOTORHOMES, INC'S MOTION TO DISMISS PROTESTS-SCOTTS VALLEY".

5 6. Roadtrek, on January 31, 2012, filed "RESPONDENT ROADTREK MOTORHOMES,
6 INC'S REPLY IN SUPPORT OF ITS MOTION TO DISMISS PROTESTS-SCOTTS VALLEY".

7 7. The hearing on this motion was held on February 17, 2012, before Anthony M. Skrocki,
8 an ALJ of the Board.

9 8. Roadtrek, the moving party, was represented by Louis S. Chronowski, Esq. and Kavitha
10 Janardhan, Esq. of Seyfarth Shaw LLP.⁴ Mega was represented by Michael J. Flanagan, Esq. and
11 Danielle R. Vare, Esq. of the Law Offices of Michael J. Flanagan.

12 **PRELIMINARY MATTER**

13 9. Although the caption of the motion refers to dismissal of three protests, the text of the motion is
14 directed to all four of what are referred to as the "Scotts Valley protests"⁵ and the reply of Mega and the
15 oral arguments of both sides were applicable to all four of the Scotts Valley protests. There is no dispute
16 that the motion, the other pleadings, and the arguments, addressed all four of the Scotts Valley protests.

17 10. These four Scotts Valley protests will be referred to as follows:

18

PROTEST NAME	PROTEST NO.	DATE FILED	VEHICLE CODE SECTION ⁶
The "modification protest" ⁷	PR-2198-10	January 29, 2010	3070
The "warranty claims protest"	PR-2209-10	February 18, 2010	3075
The "incentive claims protest"	PR-2211-10	February 18, 2010	3076
The "termination protest"	PR-2245-10	May 11, 2010	3070

19
20
21
22
23

24 ///

25 ///

26 ⁴ Ms. Janardhan subsequently left the firm on June 1, 2012.

27 ⁵ Whether these are in fact "Scotts Valley protests" will be discussed below. This terminology may be used herein to refer to
protests relating to Mega's franchise for that location.

28 ⁶ Unless otherwise indicated all statutory citations shall be to the California Vehicle Code.

⁷ See Footnote 1.

1 22. The “franchise” at issue here is a “recreational vehicle franchise” which is defined in
2 Section 331.3 as follows:

3 A “recreational vehicle franchise” is a written agreement between two or more persons
4 having both of the following conditions:

5 (a) A commercial relationship of definite duration or continuing indefinite duration.

6 (b) The franchisee is granted the right to offer for sale or lease, or to sell or lease at
7 retail, new recreational vehicles, as defined in subdivision (a) of Section 18010 of the
8 Health and Safety Code, that are manufactured or distributed by the franchisor, or the right
9 to perform authorized warranty repairs and service, or the right to perform any
10 combination of these activities.

11 23. Protestant is correct that it (Mega) is the “franchisee” identified as the party to the
12 “franchise” as stated in the Dealer Agreement that is at issue in these four protests.¹¹ The Dealer
13 Agreement in part states: “THIS AGREEMENT MADE BETWEEN: ROADTREK
14 MOTORHOMES...and MEGA RV CORPORATION doing business as MCMAHON’S RV, having its
15 head office at 1312 RV Center Drive #16, Colton CA, USA, 92324 and doing business at 5060 Scotts
16 Valley Drive, Scotts Valley, CA 95066 (herein after called ‘Dealer’”).

17 24. The Dealer Agreement is also signed properly in behalf of Mega, as follows:

18 MEGA RV CORPORATION,
19 doing business as MCMAHON’S RV
20 Per: s/ B. McMahon (seal)
21 Name (print): Brent McMahon
22 Title: President
23 Birth date: [Deleted due to privacy concerns.]
24 Dated: This 31st day of January 2008

25 25. It is concluded that Mega RV Corp. is the “franchisee” of the “franchise” that comes
26 within Section 3070 and is the subject of these four protests.

27 26. Nowhere in the franchise is there any reference to an entity or “person” identified as
28 “Scotts Valley RV”, or any permutation of the Scotts Valley name, to indicate the franchisee was any
entity or “person” other than Mega.

///

///

///

¹¹ Mega has a separate franchise (“Dealer Agreement”) specifically for its Scotts Valley location. The terms of this franchise differ from the terms of Mega’s franchise (“Dealer Agreement”) for the Irvine and Colton locations.

1 As to Who is the "Dealer"

2 27. Section 3070 uses the terms "dealer", "recreational vehicles" and "franchisee". These
3 terms are defined in the Vehicle Code.

4 28. Section 285 defines "dealer" as follows:

5 "Dealer" is a person not otherwise expressly excluded by Section 286 who:

6 (a) For commission, money, or other thing of value, sells, exchanges, buys, or offers for
7 sale, negotiates or attempts to negotiate, a sale or exchange of an interest in, a vehicle
8 subject to registration, a motorcycle, snowmobile, or all-terrain vehicle subject to
9 identification under this code, or a trailer subject to identification pursuant to Section
10 5014.1, or induces or attempts to induce any person to buy or exchange an interest in a
11 vehicle and, who receives or expects to receive a commission, money, brokerage fees,
12 profit, or any other thing of value, from either the seller or purchaser of the vehicle.

13 (b) Is engaged wholly or in part in the business of selling vehicles or buying or taking in
14 trade, vehicles for the purpose of resale, selling, or offering for sale, or consigned to be
15 sold, or otherwise dealing in vehicles, whether or not the vehicles are owned by the
16 person.

17 29. Mega is a "person" that comes within this definition. There was no evidence before the
18 Board to indicate there is or was such an entity or "person" as "Scotts Valley RV" in existence.

19 30. The products that Mega sells are "vehicles" and are "motor vehicles".¹² Section 670
20 defines "vehicle" as "a device by which any person or property may be propelled, moved, or drawn upon
21 a highway, excepting a device moved exclusively by human power or used exclusively upon stationary
22 rails or tracks." As indicated in footnote 10 above, Section 415 defines a "motor vehicle" in part as
23 follows:

24 ...
25 (c) For purposes of Chapter 6 (commencing with Section 3000)¹³ of Division 2, "motor
26 vehicle" includes a recreational vehicle as that term is defined in subdivision (a) of Section
27 18010 of the Health and Safety Code, but does not include a truck camper.

28 31. "Recreational vehicle" is defined in Health and Safety Code section 18010 as follows:

"Recreational vehicle" means both of the following:

(a) A motor home, travel trailer, truck camper, or camping trailer, with or without
motive power, designed for human habitation for recreational, emergency, or other
occupancy, that meets all of the following criteria:

///

¹² Further, "recreational vehicles" are expressly stated by the statutes to be within the statutes administered by the Board, and are deemed to be "motor vehicles" even if they have no motors. (See Section 415(c).)

¹³ These are the statutes under which the Board operates.

1 (1) It contains less than 320 square feet of internal living room area, excluding built-in
2 equipment, including, but not limited to, wardrobe, closets, cabinets, kitchen units or
3 fixtures, and bath or toilet rooms.

4 (2) It contains 400 square feet or less of gross area measured at maximum horizontal
5 projections.

6 (3) It is built on a single chassis.

7 (4) It is either self-propelled, truck-mounted, or permanently towable on the highways
8 without a permit.

9 (b) A park trailer, as defined in Section 18009.3.

10 32. The records of the DMV for the dealer license issued for the address of the dealership in
11 Scotts Valley indicate the following:

12 Branch Location Information
13 MCMAHONS RV
14 5060 SCOTTS VALLEY DR
15 SCOTTS VALLEY, CA 95066
16 Tel: (949) 279-4493
17 Branch Opened: 09/12/2006
18 Branch Closed: (blank)

19 ...

20 Main Location Information:
21 MCMAHONS RV
22 6441 BURT RD 10¹⁴
23 IRVINE, CA 92618
24 Tel: (949) 653-6711
25 Location Opened: 04/09/2001
26 Location Closed: (blank)

27 Status of License: Valid

28 License Number: 52559
29 License First Issued: 04/09/2001
30 Owner of Business: MEGA RV CORP

31 33. Applying these various statutes, it is concluded that Mega is a "dealer" that sells
32 "recreational vehicles" which are "vehicles" for "the purposes of" the Board's statutes, and that there is a
33 "franchise" in existence under which Mega is the "franchisee". In addition it is clear that it is Mega that
34 is the licensed dealer for the sale of vehicles at the Scotts Valley location.

35 34. It is concluded that the "person" that is the "Protestant", the "franchisee", and the "Dealer"
36 is Mega. It is also concluded that the protests were properly brought by Mega and that it is Mega that has
37 standing to file the protests relating to the Scotts Valley location of Mega. There is nothing to indicate
38 there ever was an entity in existence known as Scotts Valley RV or some similar name.

14 This is based upon the information submitted to the Board at the time of the hearing of this motion.

1 35. Even the pleadings filed by Roadtrek in support of this motion refer to the Protestant as
2 “Mega RV Corp.”, state that the protests and issues relate to the “Scotts Valley location”, and state that
3 “Mega closed the Scotts Valley location”.

4 36. References to the “Scotts Valley dealership”, or to the “Scotts Valley Protests”, (or
5 perhaps even to the “Scotts Valley franchise”) have been made as a matter of convenience for
6 differentiating these four protests from the other protests filed by Mega relating to the other locations of
7 other dealerships owned by Mega and for which Mega had franchises with Roadtrek (Irvine, Colton, and
8 Palm Desert).

9 37. Such references do not remove Mega from its status as the “franchisee” or deprive Mega
10 of its ownership of the business that was being conducted at the Scotts Valley location. Nor do such
11 references create a new entity or “person” that never existed in law or fact.

12 38. Therefore, it is still “Mega RV Corp.” that is the “Protestant”, “franchisee” and “dealer”
13 that had and still has standing to protest the intended termination of Mega’s franchise for its dealership
14 that had been located in Scotts Valley.

15 **WHETHER THE TERMINATION PROTEST OF MEGA REGARDING**
16 **ITS FRANCHISE FOR THE SCOTTS VALLEY LOCATION IS MOOT**

17 39. The fact that Mega is the entity with such standing as discussed above does not mean that
18 its protest challenging the intended termination of the franchise for the Scotts Valley location prevents
19 the protest from being moot.

20 40. It is undisputed that there is a separate franchise between Mega and Roadtrek specifically
21 for the dealership in Scotts Valley and it is this franchise that is being discussed.

22 41. The protest challenging the termination of Mega’s franchise for the Scotts Valley location
23 was filed on May 11, 2010, by Mega, the franchisee. Again, it is clear that in “approximately” October
24 2010, Mega closed the Scotts Valley dealership “for all purposes”.

25 42. It is noted that a franchise, as is the case here, grants the franchisee the right to operate a
26 dealership at a specific location and the license issued by the DMV is limited to operation of that
27 dealership for that line-make as authorized by the franchise for the specific address as stated in both the
28 franchise and the license.

1 43. As it is undisputed that the Scotts Valley dealership has already closed and there was no
2 indication that it will or can be re-opened, the issue becomes simply what would be the effect of a Board
3 Decision that sustained the protest.

4 44. First it is noted that there are both theoretical as well as practical distinctions between the
5 “termination of a franchise” and the “closure of a dealership” as a “franchise” and a “dealership” are not
6 synonymous. The “franchise”, here a “recreational vehicle franchise”, is the contractual relationship
7 between the franchisor and the franchisee that comes into existence when there is the written agreement
8 between them creating certain rights in the franchisee as stated in Section 331.3 (See paragraph 22).

9 45. Except for the writing which is required by the statute to evidence the existence of the
10 franchise, the “franchise” is the intangible contractual relationship between the franchisor and the
11 franchisee creating rights and duties in both parties. As stated in the statute, the “franchise” is the
12 “agreement” between the parties. It is this contractual agreement and its rights and duties that are within
13 the purview of Section 3070 and which may not be terminated by the franchisor unless there has first
14 been compliance with Section 3070’s requirements.

15 46. As compared to the “franchise” which is the “agreement” that created the rights and duties
16 of both parties, the “dealership” is generally the physical facility and the premises for which the
17 occupational license was or will be issued and which enables the franchisee to perform its obligations and
18 exercise its rights under the franchise. Although the termination of the franchise (the contractual
19 relationship) and the closure of the dealership (the physical facilities) are not identical, the dealership
20 cannot operate as a “franchisee” of that line-make unless there is a franchise and the closure of the
21 dealership prevents the franchisee from performing its duties and exercising its rights under the franchise.

22 47. Section 3070 restricts the power of a franchisor to terminate “the franchise” (the
23 “agreement”) and does not directly address the “closure of a dealership” (other than as one determinant of
24 the length of time affecting the time for termination of the agreement and the time to file a protest). This
25 is partly because it will probably be the franchisor who will be desirous of exercising its claimed right to
26 “terminate the franchise” (the contractual relationship) whereas the franchisor will not have a right to
27 “terminate the dealership” (i.e. “close the dealership”).

28 48. Because the franchise is the “agreement”/contractual relationship, it may be terminated in

1 various ways, many of which may be stated in the franchise itself, perhaps including mutual rescission or
2 mutual cancellation, or perhaps by the right of the franchisor to terminate the contract in the event of the
3 occurrence or non-occurrence of certain conditions (subject to statutory limitations). The franchise may
4 even state that the franchisee has the right to terminate the contract without cause merely by giving notice
5 to the franchisor.

6 49. The "dealership", however, is not generally something jointly owned or jointly created by
7 the parties and it will be the franchisee alone who may chose to terminate its existence. Doing so may be
8 a breach of the franchise permitting the franchisor to terminate the "franchise"/agreement, but the
9 franchisor cannot terminate the "dealership".¹⁵

10 50. Here the statutory scheme administered by the Board precludes a franchisor (Roadtrek)
11 from terminating the franchise of a franchisee (Mega) unless the requirements of the Vehicle Code are
12 met. Although properly worded in terms of preventing the termination of the "franchise" (the
13 agreement/contractual relationship), the statute in fact is concerned about the impact of the termination of
14 that agreement upon the financial and physical operation of the "dealership" that is essential to the
15 performance of the obligations of the franchise. The statutes evidence that the legislature was concerned
16 about the loss of the rights under the franchise that could severely affect the franchisee's investment in
17 the "dealership" and it is the loss to the public of the benefits of the "dealership" that will result if the
18 rights granted under the franchise were terminated. The "loss of the franchise" will likely result in the
19 "loss of the dealership", with possible adverse consequences upon the franchisee, the motor vehicle
20 business in the area, and upon the public.

21 51. Because of the interrelationship between the "franchise" (the "agreement" that grants the
22 rights and imposes the duties), and the "dealership" (what is necessary to exercise the rights and carry out
23 the duties), it is difficult to analyze them separately. Loss of the franchise rights will impact the
24 dealership and loss of the dealership will impact the franchise rights. And, as stated above, loss of the
25 franchise that results in loss of the dealership could also result in serious negative consequences to the
26 three areas of legislative concern, the consuming public, the automotive business, and the franchisee.

27
28 ¹⁵ This may not be accurate in the case of a "dealer development" situation, when the franchisor may own part or even a
majority interest in the entity that owns the dealership, but that does not exist here.

1 52. The legislature, in the exercise of its powers, has by statute mandated that the “franchise”
2 continue in existence and the status quo be maintained for a specific time or times, first to permit the
3 affected franchisee to file a protest. Then, if a timely protest is filed, the statute mandates that the
4 “franchise” (agreement), and presumably the status quo as to the existence of the dealership, must
5 continue in effect until there is a hearing before the Board and the Board makes its determinations as to
6 whether there is good cause for the termination. If good cause has not been established by the franchisor,
7 the Board may order that the protest be sustained in which case the statute prevents the franchisor from
8 terminating the franchise, and thus presumably preventing the closure of the dealership.

9 53. Of course, it is the loss of the “dealership” that is of practical significance. During the
10 time periods involved, the public would ordinarily continue to have access to the goods and services
11 provided by the dealership, the dealership’s employees can remain “on the payroll”, the tax base of the
12 community is not adversely affected by a shutdown of the dealership, the owner of the dealership has not
13 had its source of income or the value of its investment reduced or totally eliminated, and the automotive
14 business in the area is not potentially adversely affected by the loss of that dealership.

15 54. The rationale for limiting the power of a franchisor from terminating a franchisee includes
16 the recognition that a franchisor will likely suffer no adverse consequences if it terminates any one
17 dealership but the franchisee, likely to have a large investment in the operation of that dealership, is
18 likely dependent upon the franchisor for most if not all of its “livelihood” and that the franchisee may
19 suffer irreparable harm if the franchise is terminated. It is also recognized that the public is dependent
20 upon franchised dealerships for a source of those products as well as obtaining parts for and service of
21 those vehicles.

22 55. If there is not good cause for the termination of the franchise, the Board’s Decision
23 sustaining the protest will protect not only the franchisee’s investment but will also keep the dealership in
24 operation thus protecting the benefits that flow from having the dealership as an ongoing enterprise,
25 including providing the public with access to the goods and services available at that dealership.

26 56. In the present situation, although Mega, the franchisee, continues in existence, the Mega
27 dealership in Scotts Valley has already closed and there is little or no likelihood that it would be able to
28 reopen. The legislative intent of maintaining the status quo and possibly preventing the loss of the

1 investment of the franchisee and the loss to the public of the goods and services provided by that
2 franchisee's dealership cannot now be effectuated. A decision of the Board sustaining the protest will
3 not protect the franchisee's investment in that dealership or prevent the loss of the benefits to the public
4 that flow from an ongoing enterprise.

5 57. The Mega dealership in Scotts Valley is no longer in operation and the public has already
6 lost the benefits of access to it as a supplier of the goods and services that had been available to it.

7 58. Any decision issued by the Board that the protest be sustained and that Roadtrek not be
8 permitted to terminate the franchise of Mega for the Scotts Valley dealership will not have the effect of
9 maintaining the existence of the dealership with all of the benefits generated by an ongoing business and
10 avoiding all of the negatives that would occur if Roadtrek were permitted to terminate the franchise
11 (which would ordinarily result in the closure of an ongoing dealership).

12 59. Although the evidentiary portion of the hearing has been completed, the outcome of the
13 hearing is uncertain. Following the briefs will be preparation of the findings of fact by the ALJ and the
14 submission by the ALJ to the Board of a Proposed Decision. However, under the undisputed facts as
15 discussed below, there is no need to determine whether Roadtrek had established good cause to terminate
16 the franchise for the Scotts Valley location.

17 60. In evaluating whether there is good cause for the termination of a franchise, the Board is
18 required to take into account "the existing circumstances" as well as the specific factors as stated in the
19 Vehicle Code. Much of the analysis will be on: the effect upon the franchisee if the dealership ceases
20 operations; whether the franchisee is adequately serving the public; the impact upon the public if the
21 franchisee's dealership ceases to exist, and whether the franchisee is performing its obligations owed to
22 the franchisor.

23 61. The statute clearly makes the "existing circumstances" the primary focus of what must be
24 considered by the Board. The existing circumstances now include the undisputed fact that the Scotts
25 Valley dealership is closed, has been closed for over a year (since October 2010), and will not reopen
26 even if the protest is sustained. Therefore, it is difficult if not impossible to compare the effect upon the
27 franchisee and the public "if" the dealership is closed, which is the usual result if the termination of the
28 franchise is permitted. There is no operating dealership currently in existence, there has not been an

1 operating dealership for almost a year and a half, and there will be no operating dealership in the future
2 against which a comparison could be made. The existing circumstances now involve “evaluating the
3 factors with a closed dealership” as compared to “evaluating the factors if the dealership will be closed.”

4 62. This is a case of concluding that “a rose is a rose” meaning that, regardless of the outcome
5 of the hearing on the merits of the protest, as to the operation or non-operation of the dealership, there
6 will be no difference to the franchisee, no difference to the franchisor, and no difference to the
7 consuming public or the motor vehicle business, regardless of the result of any determination by the
8 Board as to whether Roadtrek has good cause to terminate the franchise for Mega’s dealership in Scotts
9 Valley. This is so because the dealership is already out of operation, has been out of operation for well
10 over a year, and will not resume operation.

11 63. Because the Scotts Valley dealership has been closed for well over a year and because
12 there is little or no chance that it will reopen, there is no need to apply the good cause factors in
13 determining what would occur if there is a loss of the dealership if the franchise is terminated. A
14 Decision of the Board that sustains the protest and concludes that Roadtrek may not terminate the
15 franchise of Mega’s dealership in Scotts Valley is meaningless as to the practical considerations called
16 for in the statutory scheme. Likewise, a Decision of the Board that overrules the protest and permits
17 Roadtrek to terminate the franchise of Mega’s dealership in Scotts Valley is also meaningless as to the
18 practical considerations which are the focus of the statutory scheme. If it were to be determined that
19 good cause to terminate the franchise was not established and that the protest should be sustained, the
20 issuance of a Decision so stating will not result in accomplishing the legislative goal of protection of the
21 public or protection of the franchisee by preventing the closure of the dealership. As indicated above, the
22 Scotts Valley dealership has been closed since October 2010 and no Decision of the Board will be
23 effective to resurrect it.

24 **THE EFFECT OF ROADTREK’S MOTION TO DISMISS THE TERMINATION PROTEST**

25 64. Roadtrek is seeking a dismissal of the “termination protest” filed by Mega with the motion
26 based upon the fact that the Scotts Valley dealership has been closed since October 2010. Roadtrek is
27 asserting that this fact makes the termination protest moot and therefore there is no need for a Decision of

28 ///

1 the Board on the merits of the protest.¹⁶

2 65. In essence, Roadtrek is asserting that there is no need for a hearing on the merits of the
3 protest as Roadtrek is satisfied that the closure of the dealership has already occurred. If Roadtrek is
4 seeking dismissal of the protest as it is satisfied that the Scotts Valley dealership has already been closed
5 and if, as stated above, the Board cannot by its Decision prevent the closure that has already occurred or
6 order that the dealership be re-opened, logic dictates that there is no reason to further consider whether
7 Roadtrek has good cause for the occurrence of an event which has already occurred (the closure of the
8 Scotts Valley dealership).

9 66. Roadtrek, in seeking a dismissal of the protest is asking that the Board not rule on the
10 merits of the protest as the closure of the dealership has rendered the issue of good cause to terminate the
11 franchise moot.

12 67. Mega, in opposing the motion, is seeking that the Board proceed with the consideration of
13 the merits of the protest in the hope that the Board will conclude that Roadtrek did not meet its burden to
14 prove good cause to terminate the franchise for the Mega dealership in Scotts Valley. However, Mega
15 cannot be asking that the Board order that Mega be permitted to continue in existence as an operating
16 Roadtrek dealer at the Scotts Valley location as Mega has already ceased such operations over a year ago.

17 68. If this motion to dismiss the termination protest is granted because of mootness, what will
18 be removed from consideration is the assertion before the Board by Roadtrek that there is good cause for
19 the termination of the Mega franchise for the Scotts Valley dealership. Dismissal of the termination
20 protest will be based upon "mootness", as asserted and desired by Roadtrek, rather than whether there is
21 good cause for its decision to terminate the franchise.

22 69. Dismissal of the protest because of mootness is not a finding by the Board that the Mega
23 franchise for its Scotts Valley location may or may not be terminated. Such an order is doing nothing
24 more than stating that any decision of the Board as to the merits of the protest would not be meaningful
25 and would not effectuate the legislative intent.

26
27
28 ¹⁶ It is noted that Roadtrek is not seeking dismissal of the termination Protest on the basis that as a matter of law, the factors
the Board must consider evidence good cause to terminate the franchise. That would be akin to seeking a summary judgment.

1 70. The issues of whether either party is in breach of the franchise (a contract) and entitled to
2 cancel the contract and recover damages or some other remedy as against the other can be resolved in a
3 civil action, with the usual rules for an action for breach of contract in play. Absent other specific
4 statutes to the contrary, such claims are not within the jurisdiction of the Board and may be pursued
5 without the need for any prior decision by the Board as to whether the "existing circumstances" including
6 the statutory good cause factors would or would not allow a termination of the franchise.¹⁷

7 **PROPOSED ORDER**

8 After consideration of the pleadings, exhibits, and oral arguments of counsel, it is hereby ordered
9 that Respondent's Motion to Dismiss Protest No. PR-2245-10 (Scotts Valley) Re: Termination is granted.
10 *Mega RV Corp. dba McMahon's RV v. Roadtrek Motorhomes, Inc.*, Protest No. PR-2245-10 is dismissed
11 with prejudice.

12
13 I hereby submit the foregoing which constitutes my
14 proposed order in the above-entitled matter, as the
15 result of a hearing before me, and I recommend this
16 proposed order be adopted as the decision of the
17 New Motor Vehicle Board.

18 DATED: July 24, 2012

19 By: 
20 ANTHONY M. SKROCKI
21 Administrative Law Judge

22 George Valverde, Director, DMV
23 Mary Garcia, Branch Chief,
24 Occupational Licensing, DMV

25 ¹⁷ In fact, what the Board must consider as to whether there is good cause for termination of the franchise may not be what a
26 court might consider in evaluating whether either party is in material breach of the contract so as to entitle the aggrieved party
27 to a remedy for that breach, including termination of the contract. It is possible that, under general principles of contract law,
28 there could be a material breach of the contract however such breach may not constitute good cause to terminate the franchise
if the Board were applying the Vehicle Code. Section 3071(g), that states, "The extent of franchisee's failure to comply with
the terms of the franchise", makes breach of the contract only one of the specific good cause factors the Board must consider
in proceedings before it.