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THE CLERK: Calling calendar item ten, CV-11-8083, Courthouse News Service vs. Michael Planet, et cetera, et al.

MS. MATTEO-BOEHM: Rachel Matteo-Boehm appearing on behalf of plaintiff Courthouse News Service.

MR. GREEN: David Green for Courthouse News Service.
MR. NAEVE: Robert Naeve and Erica Reilley on behalf of the defendants.

THE COURT: Counsel, anything to add to the documents which have been filed?

MS. MATTEO-BOEHM: Your Honor, just a very brief point in response to the reply filed in support of defendant's motion to dismiss.

Defendant complains that Courthouse News Service is seeking special access. That's not correct. We're seeking simply an end to the delays in access to newly filed complaints caused by the defendant's policy of not permitting access until after he's completed all of those administrative tasks associated with those documents.

But it's worth pointing out that in the Richmond Newspapers case, the U.S. Supreme Court recognized, Look, in the context of courtroom proceedings, there's limited seating; it's appropriate to give some of that seating to the press. For the same reason, as many courts currently do, it's
appropriate to set special procedures for members of the press who visit the court every day for the expressed purpose of reviewing newly filed complaints. Indeed, this is one of the alternatives to restricting access that should be considered in the third part of the First Amendment test.

THE COURT: All right.
MR. NAEVE: Our only point was that the
First Amendment doesn't grant special access and that the access offered to the public has been offered to CNS. But other than that, we stand on our papers, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Both plaintiff and defendant agree that the Eleventh Amendment bars plaintiff's third cause of action. As such, plaintiff's third cause of action is dismissed.

As for plaintiff's first and second causes of action, the Court concludes that abstention is appropriate under both the O'Shea doctrine and the Pullman doctrine. The abstention doctrine, first articulated in O'Shea vs. Littleton, 414 U.S. 488, 1974, counsels federal courts to decline to exercise their equitable powers in cases seeking to reform state institutions. Horne vs. Flores, 129 S.Ct. 2579, 2009. "Federalism concerns are heightened when a federal decree has the effect of dictating state and local budget priorities."

In E.T. v. Cantil-Sakauye, 657 F.3d 902, Ninth Circuit 2011, the Ninth Circuit recently noted that O'Shea's equitable restrain considerations are nearly absolute when the
state agency in question is a state court. Here, the relief CNS seeks for would interfere with the administration of the Ventura Superior Court's operations. The Ventura Clerk's Office would be required to make all new complaints available the same day they were filed. Failure to do so would require judicial proceedings to evaluate the constitutionality of each delay.

This would be a potentially significant disruption of the court's operations, and could possibly lead to a significant reallocation of court services. This Court hesitates to dictate state and local budget priorities. State and local governments have limited funds. When a federal court orders that money be appropriated for one program, the effect is often to take funds away from other important programs. The decision about how to allocate resources is better left to the elected representatives.

Under the Pullman doctrine, first articulated in Railroad Commission of Texas vs. Pullman Company, 312 U.S. 496, 1941, "federal courts should abstain from decision when difficult and unsettled questions of state law must be resolved before a substantial federal constitutional question can be decided." Hawaii Housing Authority vs. Midkiff, 467 U.S. 229, 1984.

In the Ninth Circuit, federal courts have the discretion to abstain under Pullman when: (1) the complaint
touches a sensitive area of social policy upon which federal courts ought not enter unless no alternative is available; (2) a determination of the state ground is capable of resolving the controversy; and, (3) the proper resolution of the state ground for the decision is uncertain. Smelt vs. County of Orange, 447 F.3d 673, Ninth Circuit 2006.

Here, all three factors are present. First, the complaint touches a sensitive area of social policy. CNS is asking the Court to direct and oversee administrative operations of the Ventura Superior Court, a potentially sensitive area of state sovereignty. The second and third prongs are also present. Cal. Government Code $\$ 68150(1)$ already provides that court records of all types shall be made reasonably accessible to all members of the public. However, the term "reasonable access" has not yet been defined by either the state courts or the California legislature. If reasonable access were defined to mean "same-day access," this would avoid the necessity of this Court deciding the federal constitutional issues, a determination that may be premature at this time. Thus, defendant's motion to abstain is granted.

Under those certain circumstances, the preliminary injunction is therefore denied.

Counsel to prepare the order.
MR. NAEVE: Thank you, Your Honor.
(Proceedings concluded.)



