

STATE OF CALIFORNIA



MEMO

To : BISMARCK OBANDO, PRESIDENT

Date: December 19, 2013

**From : WILLIAM G. BRENNAN
ROBIN PARKER**

Subject: APPOINTMENT OF BOARD MEMBER DESIGNEE IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE BOARD'S 1997 "REVISED BOARD POLICY REGARDING REPRESENTATION IN COURT ACTIONS", BY BOARD PRESIDENT

In response to the 1996 Performance Audit conducted by Business, Transportation & Housing Agency, the former Judicial Policies and Procedures Committee (members Livingston and Skobin) developed the initial policy regarding representation in court actions that was adopted by the Board at its October 22, 1996, General Meeting. One aspect of the initial policy concerning the Office of the Attorney General filing a "perfunctory answer with the court" was problematic as the Attorney General's Office was reluctant to make any appearance on the Board's behalf without thoroughly reviewing the underlying action. At its February 12, 1997, General Meeting, the Board adopted the attached "Revised Board Policy Regarding Representation in Court Actions" (hereinafter collectively referred to as "Policy").

According to the Policy, the Board, as a general rule, should not substantively participate in mandamus actions in which a Board decision is challenged. The Policy specifically provides that:

When the Board renders a final decision which is challenged by way of a petition for writ of administrative mandamus, and an important state interest is not raised in the mandamus proceeding, then the Board shall notify the parties to the proceeding (the petitioner and the real party in interest) of the Board's policy not to appear in the mandamus action, and request that the parties so notify the court. As such, unless the court specifically requests otherwise, the Board would not file any pleadings in the court action, which would obviate the necessity of involvement by the office of the Attorney General. (See attached Revised Policy, paragraph 2).

However, in mandamus actions in which an important state issue is raised, the Board would have the option to participate by the filing of pleadings opposing the petition and by presenting oral arguments on only those limited issues affecting the state interest...In such situations, prior to Board

participation, the matter would be presented to the full Board for review at a regularly scheduled meeting of the Board. In the absence of sufficient time for consideration at a noticed Board meeting, the President, or a Board member designated by the President, can authorize the filing of appropriate pleadings in opposition to the petition and/or the presentation of oral arguments. When this occurs, a copy of the petition and supporting documents would be mailed to each Board member with an indication that the President, or his designee, has authorized Board participation. Any Board member who objects to Board participation would then immediately so notify staff, and the matter would be scheduled for discussion at either the next general meeting of the Board or, if three public members request, then at a special meeting of the Board...Any appearance by the Board would be made by the office of the Attorney General or, with the consent of the Attorney General, by the Board's own counsel... (See attached Policy, paragraph 4, pages 2-3).

The above policy was modified in 2008 to provide that when a Dealer Member is President, only those matters in which a Dealer Member would be disqualified from having heard in the first place are delegated. Furthermore, if you have a Dealer Member as Board President, and a Public Member as Vice President, then the designation should automatically go to the Vice President.

The designation of a Board Member by the Board President consistent with this Policy is being amended for the February 4, 2014, General Meeting.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at (916) 324-6197 or Robin at (916) 323-1536.

Attachments