G A R V E Y S C H U B E R T B A R E R "PUBLIC USE" **BEFORE KELO Edward J. Sullivan Garvey Schubert Barer** January 2006 G× S∨ B∪ "PUBLIC USE" • MOST TAKINGS ISSUES ARE OVER MONEY – I.E., "JUST COMPENSATION" FIFTH AMENDMENT TO THE FEDERAL CONSTITUTION ALSO PROHIBITS TAKINGS "FOR PUBLIC USE" WITHOUT JUST COMPENSATION EVEN IF MONEY IS PAID, THERE ARE SOME LAND TAKINGS THAT MAY STILL NOT OCCUR, BECAUSE THEY ARE NOT FOR A "PUBLIC USE" "PUBLIC USE" CLAUSE IS ALSO IN MOST STATE CONSTITUTIONS AS WELL • U.S. SUPREME COURT HAS TAKEN DEFERENTIAL APPROACH TO PUBLIC USE OVER THE LAST FIFTY **BERMAN V. PARKER** 348 US 26 (1954) FACTS • D.C. URBAN RENEWAL PLAN SLUM CLEARANCE • WELL-MAINTAINED STRUCTURE IN MIDST OF **BLIGHT** • JUST COMPENSATION TENDERED

BERMAN V. PARKER 348 US 26 (1954)

• ISSUE

• OWNER CLAIMED NO PUBLIC USE, AS **PROPERTY** AGGREGATED AND SOLD BY RENEWAL **AUTHORITY**





BERMAN V. PARKER 348 US 26 (1954)

SUPREME COURT OPINION

- CONGRESSIONAL DECISION "WELL-NIGH CONCLUSIVE" IN SOCIAL LEGISLATION AND EMINENT DOMAIN
- AND EMINENT DOMAIN
 URBAN RENEWAL PLAN FOR
 GENERAL AREA
 CONCEPT OF GENERAL
 WELFARE "BROAD AND
 INCLUSIVE" AND VALUES
 "SPIRITUAL AS WELL AS
 PHYSICAL "AND "AESTHETIC
 AS WELL AS MONETARY"
 DEEL ECTS NEW DEAL COURT.
- REFLECTS NEW DEAL COURT WITH HANDS-OFF APPROACH TO LEGISLATIVE VALUE JUDGMENTS
- SLUM CLEARANCE WAS A "PUBLIC USE"





HAWAII'S HOUSING AUTHORITY v. MIDKIFF, 467 U.S. 229 (1984)

FACTS

- HISTORICAL LAND OLIGOPOLY - 49% OF LAND OWNED BY PUBLIC, ANOTHER 47% OWNED BY 72 LANDOWNERS AND 18 OWNED 40% OF ALL PRIVATE LAND
- MOST LAND LEASED
- STATE CONDEMNED LESSOR'S INTEREST AND FINANCED LESSEE PURCHASE THROUGH BOND **SCHEME**



HAWAI'I HOUSING AUTHORITY v. MIDKIFF, 467 U.S. 229 (1984)

• ISSUE

 WAS LAND REDISTRIBUTION A "PUBLIC USE," EVEN IF COMPENSATION GIVEN?





HAWAI'I HOUSING AUTHORITY v. MIDKIFF, 467 U.S. 229 (1984)

 SUPREME COURT OPINION

- "PUBLIC USE" FOUND UNLESS LEGISLATIVE CHOICE "PALPABLY UNREASONABLE"
- IF HAWAI'I LEGISLATURE COULD HAVE BELIEVED SCHEME COULD ACHIEVE ITS PURPOSE, PUBLIC USE REQUIREMENT SATISFIED
- BOTH BERMAN AND MIDKIFE INVOLVED PUBLIC ACQUISITION AND SALE OF LAND FROM ONE PRIVATE PARTY TO ANOTHER AND DEFERENCE TO LOCAL OR STATE POLICY DECISIONS





SKEPTICISM OVER DEFERENCE OF THE PUBLIC USE DOCTRINE IN CERTAIN CASES

THREE CASES ILLUSTRATE THE POINT





99 CENTS ONLY STORES V. LANCASTER REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, 237 F SUPP2d 1123 (C.D. CAL, 2001)

FACTS

CIVIL RIGHTS ACTION
 TO ENJOIN CITY
 AGENCY FROM
 TAKING RETAIL
 STORE SITE LEASE
 TO ALLOW
 EXPANSION BY
 MAJOR TENANT
 (COSTCO) – STRONG
 POLITICAL PRESSURE



<10

99 CENTS ONLY STORES V. LANCASTER REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, 237 F SUPP2d 1123 (C.D. CAL, 2001)

• ISSUE

 WAS LAND ACQUISITION FOR PRIVATE USE – IS PUBLIC PURPOSE SUFFICIENT



 \leq 11

99 CENTS ONLY STORES V. LANCASTER REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY, 237 F SUPP2d 1123 (C.D. CAL, 2001)

- HOLDING
- ACQUISITION PROCEEDINGS "PRETEXTUAL" (NO BLIGHT REMOVAL) SO NO DEFERENCE
- NO "FUTURE BLIGHT" PURPOSE UNDER CALIFORNIA LAW TO ALLOW TRANSFER OF MALL RETAIL SPACE TO COSTCO



SOUTHWESTERN ILLINOIS DEVELOPMENT **AUTHORITY v. NATIONAL CITY ENVIORMENTAL,**

119 Ill2d 225, 768 NE2d 1 (2002)

FACTS

- ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY ACQUIRED PRIVATE LAND FOR TRANSFER TO COMPANY FOR MOTORSPORT FACILITY **PARKING**
- COMPANY AGREED TO PAY SWIDA'S ACQUISITION COSTS



SOUTHWESTERN ILLINOIS DEVELOPMENT **AUTHORITY v. NATIONAL CITY ENVIORMENTAL,**

119 Ill2d 225, 768 NE2d 1 (2002)

• ISSUES

 WAS LAND NEEDED AND WAS THERE A "PUBLIC USE?"



SOUTHWESTERN ILLINOIS DEVELOPMENT **AUTHORITY v. NATIONAL CITY ENVIORMENTAL,**

119 Ill2d 225, 768 NE2d 1 (2002)

- MAJORITY HOLDING
- ISSUE WAS NOT ULTIMATE OWNERSHIP, BUT WHETHER "PUBLIC PURPOSE" PRESENT, A JUDICIAL DETERMINATION
- COURT HAS DUTY TO INQUIRE AS TO PUBLIC PURPOSE
- NO OVERALL PARKING PLAN
- NO OVERALL PARKING PLAN SWIDA SAID IT WOULD CONDEMN FOR A PRICE AS A "DEFAULT LAND BROKER" FOR MOTORSPORT COMPANY AND SAVE IT THE COSTS OF OTHER ALTERNATIVES



15

SOUTHWESTERN ILLINOIS DEVELOPMENT **AUTHORITY v. NATIONAL CITY ENVIORMENTAL,**

119 Ill2d 225, 768 NE2d 1 (2002)

DISSENT

- MAJORITY DECISION INCONSISTENT WITH PUBLIC AUTHORITY DEFERENCE UNDER BERMAN AND MIDKIFF
- ILLINOIS LEGISLATURE AUTHORIZED SUCH ACQUISITIONS AND DISPOSALS OF LAND
- COURTS SHOULD NOT SECOND-GUESS AGENCY ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACTIONS
- SUPPORTED BY STRONG EVIDENCE



16

COUNTY OF WAYNE v. HATHCOCK,

684 NW2d 765 (Mich., 2004)

• FACTS

- STATE CONSTITUTION ISSUE - "PUBLIC USE" WHERE DEPRESSED HOME RULE COUNTY SOUGHT ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT FOR JOBS AND PUBLIC REVENUE
- NONRESIDENTIAL LANDOWNER **OBJECTED TO** CONDEMNATION



COUNTY OF WAYNE v. HATHCOCK, 684 NW2d 765 (Mich., 2004)

- ISSUE
- DID MICHIGAN CONSTITUTION (1963) PROHIBIT PUBLÍC ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY IN ABSENCE OF USE BY PUBLIC OR BLIGHT?
- SHOULD POLETOWN NEIGHBORHOOD COUNCIL v. DETROIT, 410 Mich. 616, 304 NW2d 455 (1981) BE **OVERRULED?**



18

COUNTY OF WAYNE v. HATHCOCK, 684 NW2d 765 (Mich., 2004) MICHIGAN CONSTITUTIONAL "PUBLIC USE" STANDARD MORE STRICT THAN FEDERAL STANDARD HOLDING FEDERAL STANDARD BLIGHT AND ACTUAL USE BY PUBLIC AUTHORIZED BY STATE CONSTITUTION ACQUISITION FOR TRANSFER TO PRIVATE PARTY IS NOT <19

