

1 KAMALA D. HARRIS
 Attorney General of California
 2 SALLY MAGNANI
 Senior Assistant Attorney General
 3 JANILL L. RICHARDS (SBN # 173817)
 Supervising Deputy Attorneys General
 4 1515 Clay Street, 20th Floor
 P.O. Box 70550
 5 Oakland, California 94612-0550
 Telephone: (510) 622-2100
 6 Fax: (510) 622-2270
Attorneys for People of the State of California, ex
 7 *rel. Kamala D. Harris, Attorney General*

8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 9 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

11 **PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,**
ex rel. KAMALA D. HARRIS, ATTORNEY
 12 **GENERAL,**
 13 **Plaintiff,**
 14 **v.**
 15 **FEDERAL HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY;**
et al.,
 16 **Defendants.**
 17
 18
 19 **– and consolidated cases –**

Case No. 10-cv-03084 CW (LB)
 Consolidated Case Nos.:
 10-cv-03270 CW (LB)
 10-cv-03317 CW (LB)
 10-cv-04482 CW (LB)
 [PROPOSED] JUDGMENT

21 This matter, which challenges certain actions taken by Defendants relating to Property
 22 Assessed Clean Energy Programs (PACE), originally was filed as four separate actions. All four
 23 matters have now been consolidated and, accordingly, the Court enters this single judgment to
 24 fully and finally dispose of all claims brought by all Plaintiffs against all Defendants. Plaintiffs in
 25 this action are: the People of the State of California, *ex rel.* Kamala D. Harris, Attorney General;
 26 the County of Sonoma, the County of Placer, the City of Palm Desert, and the Sierra Club.
 27 Defendants in this action are the Federal Housing Finance Agency (FHFA); Edward Demarco, in
 28 his capacity as Acting Director of the Federal Housing Finance Agency; Federal Home Loan

1 Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac); Charles E. Haldeman, Jr., in his capacity as Chief
2 Executive Officer of the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation; Federal National Mortgage
3 Association (Fannie Mae); and Michael J. Williams, in his Capacity as Chief Executive Officer of
4 Federal National Mortgage Association.

5 By stipulation, all claims against Defendants Charles E. Haldeman, Jr. and Michael J.
6 Williams, who were sued in their official capacities as Chief Executive Officers for Fannie Mae
7 and Freddie Mac, were dismissed.

8 The Court hereby enters Judgment in favor of remaining Defendants on the following
9 claims, each of which is dismissed with prejudice, for the reasons stated in the Court's Order
10 Granting in Part and Denying in Part Defendants' Motions to Dismiss, dated August 25, 2011:

11 That FHFA's actions violated the Constitution's Tenth Amendment Commerce Clause
12 (Placer County only);

13 That FHFA's actions violated the Constitution's Spending Clause (Placer County only);

14 That Plaintiffs are entitled to a declaration that under California law, debt obligations
15 created by PACE programs are assessments, not loans (California, Sonoma County and Placer
16 County); and

17 That Plaintiffs are entitled to relief under state law, specifically:

18 That Fannie Mae's and Freddie Mac's actions constituted unfair business practices under
19 California Business & Professions Code § 17200 (California only);

20 That Fannie Mae's and Freddie Mac's actions constituted negligent interference with
21 prospective economic advantage (Placer County only);

22 That Fannie Mae's and Freddie Mac's actions constituted intentional interference with
23 prospective economic advantage (Placer County only);

24 That Fannie Mae's and Freddie Mac's actions constituted intentional interference with
25 contractual relations (Placer County only); and

26 That Fannie Mae's and Freddie Mac's actions constituted interference with prospective
27 contractual relations (Sonoma County only).

28

1 The Court hereby enters Judgment in favor of Plaintiffs on the following claim for the
2 reasons stated in the Court's Order Granting Plaintiffs' Motion for Summary Judgment, and
3 Denying Defendants' Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment, dated August 9, 2012:

4 That FHFA failed to comply with required notice and comment procedures set forth in the
5 Administrative Procedures Act (APA).

6 The Court declines to rule on the remaining claims, brought against FHFA under the APA
7 and the National Environmental Policy Act, for the reasons stated in the Court's August 9, 2012
8 Order.

9 FHFA shall complete the notice and comment process on its proposed rule concerning
10 PACE and publish a final rule to consummate that process no later than 210 days from the date of
11 entry of this Judgment. FHFA shall submit to the Court a status report on the progress of its
12 rulemaking by January 18, 2013. FHFA may seek a further extension of the deadline if, for good
13 cause shown, FHFA requires additional time to conduct its rulemaking, and FHFA reserves its
14 right to seek a stay of the deadline if the Ninth Circuit has not ruled on its appeal as the deadline
15 approaches.

16 All parties shall bear their own costs.

17 The Court retains jurisdiction of this action as necessary to ensure compliance with this
18 Judgment.

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20
21 Dated: 11/2/2012



22 CLAUDIA WILKEN
23 Chief Judge
24 United States District Court
25
26
27
28