

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

JOSEPH W. COTCHETT (SBN 36324; jcotchett@cpmlegal.com)
PHILIP L. GREGORY (SBN 95217; pgregory@cpmlegal.com)
FRANK C. DAMRELL, JR (SBN 37126; fdamrell@cpmlegal.com)
STEVEN N. WILLIAMS (SBN 175489; swilliams@cpmlegal.com)
ANNE MARIE MURPHY (SBN 202540; amurphy@cpmlegal.com)
CAMILO ARTIGA-PURCELL (SBN 273229; cartigapurcell@cpmlegal.com)

COTCHETT, PITRE & McCARTHY, LLP
840 Malcolm Road, Suite 200
Burlingame, California 94010
Telephone: (650) 697-6000
Facsimile: (650) 692-3606

RICHARD DOYLE (SBN 88625; cao.main@sanjoseca.gov)
NORA FRIMANN (SBN 93249; cao.main@sanjoseca.gov)

OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY

200 East Santa Clara Street, 16th Floor
San José, California 95113
Telephone: (408) 535-1900
Facsimile: (408) 998-3131

*Attorneys for Plaintiffs the City of San José; the City of San José,
as successor agency to the Redevelopment Agency of the City of
San José; and the San José Diridon Development Authority*

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSÉ DIVISION**

**CITY OF SAN JOSÉ; CITY OF SAN
JOSÉ AS SUCCESSOR AGENCY TO
THE REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY OF
THE CITY OF SAN JOSÉ; and THE SAN
JOSÉ DIRIDON DEVELOPMENT
AUTHORITY,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

**OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER OF
BASEBALL, an unincorporated association
doing business as Major League Baseball;
and ALLAN HUBER “BUD” SELIG,**

Defendants.

Case No. 13-CV-02787-RMW

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES OF PLAINTIFFS IN
OPPOSITION TO DEFENDANTS’
REQUEST FOR JUDICIAL NOTICE IN
SUPPORT OF MOTION TO DISMISS
PLAINTIFFS’ COMPLAINT**

**Hearing Date: October 4, 2013
Time: 9:00 a.m.
Judge: Hon. Ronald M. Whyte
Date Filed: June 18, 2013
Trial Date: None Set**

1 “Generally, a district court may not consider any material beyond the pleadings in ruling
2 on a Rule 12(b)(6) motion.” *Hal Roach Studios, Inc. v. Richard Feiner & Co.*, 896 F.2d 1542,
3 1555 (9th Cir. 1989). “All allegations of material fact are taken as true and construed in the light
4 most favorable to Plaintiffs.” *Epstein v. Washington Energy Co.*, 83 F.3d 1136, 1140 (9th Cir.
5 1996). Under certain limited scenarios, pursuant to Federal Rule of Evidence 201, a court may
6 take judicial notice of “matters of public record.” *Lee v. City of Los Angeles*, 250 F.3d 668, 688-
7 689 (9th Cir. 2001), internal citation omitted. However, a court may not take judicial notice of a
8 fact that is “subject to reasonable dispute.” Fed. R. Evid. 201(b). Further, while the court may
9 take judicial notice of the general meaning of words, phrases, and legal expressions, “documents
10 are judicially noticeable only for the purpose of determining what statements are contained
11 therein, not to prove the truth of the contents or any party’s assertion of what the contents mean.”
12 *United States v. S. Cal. Edison Co.*, 300 F.Supp.2d 964, 975 (E.D. Cal. 2004).

13 Defendants’ Request for Judicial Notice should be denied because the subject documents
14 are unauthenticated, incomplete, contested, and/or irrelevant to a determination of Defendants’
15 Rule 12(b)(6) motion:

- 16 **1. Exhibit A:** Plaintiffs challenge the authenticity of Exhibit A, titled “RESOLUTION
17 NO. 74908,” because, despite attestation signature lines, it is unsigned by either San
18 José City Clerk Lee Price or Mayor Chuck Reed. *See* Fed R. Evid. 901(a), 902(2); *see*
19 *also Botelho v. U.S. Bank, N.A.*, 692 F.Supp.2d 1174, 1177 (N.D. Cal. 2010); *Lopez v.*
20 *Mortgage*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 108415 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2009) (taking judicial
21 notice of those loan documents which the parties agreed were authentic, but declining
22 to do so for the one loan document whose authenticity plaintiff disputed). Moreover,
23 the root of the Uniform Resource Locator (“URL”) provided by Defendants indicates
24 “THIS WEBSITE IS NO LONGER BEING UPDATED,” further calling into question
25 the authenticity of Exhibit A. *See* <http://www3.sanjoseca.gov/clerk/>. Finally,
26 assuming *arguendo* Exhibit A is an authentic reproduction of Resolution No. 74908,
27 this Court may only take judicial notice of its contents, not Defendants’ “assertion of
28 what the contents mean.” *S. Cal. Edison Co.*, 300 F.Supp.2d at 975.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

2. **Exhibit B:** Plaintiffs challenge the authenticity of Exhibit B, titled “PROFESSIONAL SPORTS ANTITRUST IMMUNITY,” on the basis there are extraneous markings on the cover page and the document is incomplete. *See* Fed R. Evid. 901(a), 902(2); *see also Botelho v. U.S. Bank, N.A.*, 692 F.Supp.2d 1174, 1177 (N.D. Cal. 2010); *Lopez v. Mortgage*, 2009 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 108415 (E.D. Cal. Nov. 19, 2009). Further, even if valid, Exhibit B has no bearing on this Court’s determination of Defendants’ motion to dismiss, and is offered solely as legal argument. *See* MP&A ISO Mnt Dismiss, 8, fn 7; *see also See Santa Monica Food Not Bombs v. City of Santa Monica*, 450 F.3d 1022, 1025 (9th Cir. 2006) (court declined to take judicial notice of two Staff Reports, as they were not relevant to resolution of the appeal); *S. Cal. Edison Co.*, 300 F.Supp.2d at 975 (courts may *not* take judicial notice of “what the contents [of a document] mean”).

3. **Exhibit C:** Plaintiffs oppose judicial notice of Exhibit C, Report with Minority Views regarding the Curt Flood Act of 1997, on the basis it is offered solely as legal argument. *See* MP&A ISO Mnt Dismiss, 8, fn 7; *see also Santa Monica Food Not Bombs v. City of Santa Monica*, 450 F.3d 1022, 1025 (9th Cir. 2006). Indeed, for purposes of Defendants’ motion to dismiss, the Curt Flood Act of 1997 speaks for itself. In this vein, to the extent this Court takes judicial notice of Exhibit C, it may only take judicial notice of its contents, not Defendants’ “assertion of what the contents mean.” *S. Cal. Edison Co.*, 300 F.Supp.2d at 975.

4. **Exhibit D:** Plaintiffs oppose judicial notice of Exhibit D, California State Controller John Chiang’s March 2013 Review Report, because it is offered to contest the validity of the Option Agreement (*see* Complaint, Exhibit 3). MP&A ISO Mtn Dismiss, 16, fn 17; *see also* Fed. R. Evid. 201(b) (court may *not* take judicial notice of a fact that is “subject to reasonable dispute”). To the extent this Court takes judicial notice of Exhibit D, it may only take judicial notice of its contents, not Defendants’ “assertion of what the contents mean.” *S. Cal. Edison Co.*, 300 F.Supp.2d at 975.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

5. Exhibit E: Plaintiffs oppose judicial notice of Exhibit E, an October 24, 2011 Memorandum of City Manager and San José RDA Executive Director, because it is offered solely to argue “the Athletics would need to purchase many additional parcels in order to build a ballpark on the proposed cite.” MP&A ISO Mtn Dismiss, 20, fn 21. Not only is this assertion contested, it is outside the pleadings and irrelevant at the motion to dismiss stage. *See* Fed. R. Evid. 201(b) (court may *not* take judicial notice of a fact that is “subject to reasonable dispute”). To the extent this Court takes judicial notice of Exhibit E, it may only take judicial notice of its contents, not Defendants’ “assertion of what the contents mean.” *S. Cal. Edison Co.*, 300 F.Supp.2d at 975.

For the foregoing reasons, Plaintiffs respectfully request that this Court deny Defendants’ Request for Judicial Notice in its entirety.

Dated: September 6, 2013

COTCHETT, PITRE & McCARTHY, LLP

By: /s/ Joseph W. Cotchett
JOSEPH W. COTCHETT
Attorneys for Plaintiffs