

No. 04-340

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SAN REMO HOTEL, L.P., THOMAS FIELD,
ROBERT FIELD, AND T & R INVESTMENT CORP.,
Petitioners,

v.

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO,
DEPARTMENT OF CITY PLANNING,
CITY PLANNING COMMISSION, BOARD OF
PERMIT APPEALS, BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
OF THE CITY AND COUNTY
OF SAN FRANCISCO,

Respondents.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

BRIEF *AMICI CURIAE* OF EVANDRO S. SANTINI
AND SANTINI HOMES, INC.
OF VERNON, CONNECTICUT,
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONERS
SAN REMO HOTEL, L.P., *ET AL.*

EVERETT E. NEWTON
MURTHA CULLINA LLP
CityPlace I
185 Asylum Street
Hartford, Connecticut
06103-3469
(860) 240-6000
*Counsel for Amici Curiae,
Evandro S. Santini and
Santini Homes, Inc.*

January 24, 2005

(i)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Interest Of Evandro S. Santini And Santini
Homes, Inc.....1

Argument:
This Court Should Overrule The *Williamson*
County State Court Requirement Or, In The
Alternative, Clarify That Required State Court
Litigation Does Not Extinguish, Preclude, Or
Limit A Subsequent Federal Claim9

Conclusion14

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Federal Cases:

Agin v. Tiburon, 447 U.S. 255 (1980).....8

Armstrong v. U.S., 364 U.S. 40 (1960).....10

City of Monterey v. Del Monte Dunes, 526 U.S.
687 (1999) 9

Dodd v. Hood River County, 59 F.3d 852 (9th
Cir. 1995) 7

Dolan v. City of Tigard, 512 U.S. 374 (1994)..... 5

*First English Evangelical Lutheran Church of
Glendale v. Los Angeles County*, 482 U.S.
304 (1987) 4, 6, 8

Hughes v. Washington, 389 U.S. 290 (1967).....10

Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council, 505
U.S. 1003 (1992) *passim*

Mills v. Rogers, 457 U.S. 291 (1982)..... 3

Palazzolo v. Rhode Island, 533 U.S. 606 (2001).....12

(ii)

<i>Federal Cases, continued:</i>	<u>Page</u>
<i>Penn Central Transport Co. v. New York City</i> , 438 U.S. 104 (1978).....	<i>passim</i>
<i>Prune Yard Shopping Ctr. v. Robins</i> , 447 U.S. 74 (1980).....	3
<i>Santini v. Connecticut Hazardous Waste Manage- ment Service</i> , slip op. No. 3:01 cv 563 (WWE), Aug. 27, 2002, (D. Conn.), <i>affirmed on other grounds</i> , 342 F.3d 118 (2d Cir. 2003), <i>cert. denied</i> , 73 U.S.L.W. 3211 (2004).....	1, 2, 6, 8
<i>Snider v. Excelsior Springs</i> , 154 F.3d 809 (8th Cir. 1998).....	13
<i>Williamson County Regional Planning Commis- sion v. Hamilton Bank</i> , 473 U.S. 172 (1985)...	<i>passim</i>
 <i>State Cases:</i>	
<i>Melillo v. New Haven</i> , 732 A.2d 133 (1999).....	3, 9
<i>Santini v. Connecticut Hazardous Waste Manage- ment Service</i> , 739 A.2d 680 (Conn. 1999), <i>cert. denied</i> , 530 U.S. 1225 (2000).....	1, 4
 <i>State Constitutional Provision:</i>	
Connecticut Constitution, Article I, § 11	3

BRIEF OF EVANDRO S. SANTINI AND
SANTINI HOMES, INC. AS *AMICI CURIAE*
IN SUPPORT OF PETITIONERS
SAN REMO HOTEL, L.P., *ET AL.*

Evandro S. Santini and Santini Homes, Inc. of Vernon, Connecticut, have received the parties' consent to file this brief as *amici curiae* through blanket letters of consent filed with the Clerk of the Court.

INTEREST OF EVANDRO S. SANTINI
AND SANTINI HOMES, INC.¹

Evandro Santini has built homes and apartments for 37 years in the suburbs of Hartford, Connecticut. After immigrating to the U.S. in 1957 at age 17, he served several apprenticeships in the building trades. He founded Santini Homes, Inc. in 1970, and has been its president ever since.

From 1994 through 2004, Mr. Santini and his company (hereinafter "Santini") litigated through the Connecticut courts and then the federal courts a temporary taking case that vividly illustrates what commentators and courts have referred to as the *Williamson County* "conundrum" and its jurisdictional "Catch 22." *Santini v. Connecticut Hazardous Waste Management Service*, 251 Conn. 661, 739 A.2d 680 (1999), *cert. denied*, 530 U.S. 1225 (2000); slip op., No. 3:01 CV 563 (WWE), August 27, 2002 (D. Conn.), *affirmed on other grounds*,

¹Pursuant to Rule 37.6 of this Court, the *amici* state that no counsel for any party authored any part of this brief, or paid for it. No one other than the *amici* or their counsel have made a monetary contribution to its preparation.

