SC-105

Request for Court Order and Answer (Small Claims)

Request

This form is used to ask the court to make an order before or after the trial in a small claims case. The court will notify all plaintiffs and defendants in this case about its decision by mail, at the trial, or at a hearing (depending on when the request is filed).

If you are the person asking the court to make an order, ask the Small Claims Advisor if this is the right form for the kind of order you want. If so, follow these steps:

- Fill out page 1 of this form and file it at the clerk's office.
- If you are making this request before your trial, you must mail (or deliver in person) a copy of this form to all other plaintiffs and defendants in your case. Exception: If the plaintiff's claim has not been served, you do not have to serve this request on the other plaintiffs and defendants in your case
- If you are making this request after the judge has decided your case, the clerk will mail a copy of this form to all other plaintiffs and defendants in your case. The court will give the other plaintiffs and defendants at least 10 days to answer this Request.

Case Number: If you receive this form, read below, then fill out (7) – (10) on page 2. SC18563 The person asking the court to make an order is: Name: Odd Fellows Sierra Recreation Assoc., Inc. Case Name: Varvayanis v. OFSRA Address: P.O. Box 116, Long Barn CA 95335 A defendant in this case A plaintiff in this case Check one: \square Other (explain): **Notice to:** (*List names and addresses of all other defendants and plaintiffs in your case.*) a. Charles Varvayanis Address P.O. Box 395, Long Barn, CA 95335 b. Patricia Jones P.O. Box 395, Long Barn, CA 95335 Check here if you need more space. Use Form MC-031 or a plain sheet of paper. Write "SC-105, Item 2" on top. If your request is made before the trial and after the claim was served, fill out below: I \square mailed \square delivered in person a copy of this form to everyone listed in (2) on (date): 08/02/12I ask the court to make the following order (specify): Dismissal for Lack of Jurisdiction as set forth on SC-103, Items 3 and 4 Check here if you need more space. Use Form MC-031 or a plain sheet of paper. Write "SC-105, Item 3" on top. lask for this order because (explain and give facts of your case here): See Attachment Check here if you need more space. Use Form MC-031 or a plain sheet of paper. Write "SC-105, Item 4" on top. In making its order, I ask the court to consider the information on this form, any records on file, and, if the court holds a hearing, the evidence presented at that hearing. I declare under penalty of perjury under California state law that the information above and on all attachments is

Sign your name

Judicial Council of California, www.courtinfo.ca.gov Request for Court Order and Answer Revised January 1, 2007, Optional Form (Small Claims)

SC-105, Page 1 of 2

Clerk stamps date here when form is filed

Fill in court name and street address:

Tuolumne

41 W. Yaney Ave.

Sonora, CA 95370

Superior Court of California, County of

Fill in your case number and case name below:

Del Wallis, President of Defendant

true and correct. Date: 08/02/12

Type or print your name

SC-105 Request for Court Order (Small Claims)	and Answer	Clerk stamps date here when form is filed.
Answer The person listed in ① on page 1 of this form has asked the coorder in your small claims case.	ourt to make an	
Follow these steps to tell the court what you want to do about to Read page 1 to see what the person in 1 is asking for. Fill out 7-10 below. Mail your completed form to the court right away. Mail a copy of this form to each plaintiff and defendant listed 2 on page 1 of this form. The court will mail its decision to all plaintiffs and defendants will make a decision at a court hearing or trial. If you do nothing, the court may make the order without hearing. The person filing this answer is: Name: Address: Check one: A defendant in this case A plaint Tell the court what you want to do about this (Check all that apply): a. I agree to the order requested in 3. b. I do not agree to the order requested in 3. (Exp	d in 1 and in this case or ag from you. iff in this case s request.	Fill in court name and street address: Superior Court of California, County of Tuolumne 41 W. Yaney Ave. Sonora, CA 95370 Fill in your case number and case name below. Case Number: SC18563 Case Name: Varvayanis v. OFSRA
Check here if you need more space. Use Form MC-031 or c.	natter.	n (date):
true and correct. Date:	•	
Type or print your name Need help? For free help, contact your county's Small Claims Advisor:	— Cl	on page 1 was made after the hearing, the clerk fills out below. lerk's Certificate of Mailing — a not involved in this case and (check one):
Or, go to "County-Specific Court Information" at www.courtinfo.ca.gov/selfhelp/smallclaims	☐ A Certificate of ☐ The Request for mailed first cla addresses liste	of Mailing is attached. For Court Order and Answer was The ass, postage paid, to all parties at the
		, California
	Clerk, by	. Deputy

SC 105, Items 3 and 4

I. Statement of the Facts

A. <u>Plaintiffs' Claims.</u>

Plaintiffs CHARLES VARVAYANIS and PATRICIA JONES allege that they are entitled to a credit for annual assessments and late fees regarding two parcels that Plaintiffs allege do not exist.

Plaintiffs allege damages in the sum of \$2,048.00. Plaintiffs also ask the court to order Defendant to adjust the "account(s) to a total of two parcels." This is one of three (3) small claims actions filed by Plaintiffs against Defendant that are set for trial on August 23, 2012 in Dept. 5 of this court.

B. **Defendant and the HOA.**

Defendant is a California corporation with its principal place of business in Tuolumne County, California. Defendant was incorporated on January 19, 1949. Defendant is in good standing with the California Secretary of State.

ODD FELLOWS SIERRA HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION ("HOA") is a California non-profit corporation with its principal place of business in Tuolumne County, California. HOA was incorporated on October 10, 1986.

Upon information and belief, Plaintiffs are members of the HOA and Plaintiff Charles Varvayanis is a former member of the board of directors and former assistant to the President of the HOA.

C. The Park and the Subject Property.

There currently exist in Tuolumne County, California certain subdivisions known as I.O.O.F. Odd Fellows Sierra Camp Subdivision No. 1 and I.O.O.F. Odd Fellows Sierra Camp Subdivision No. 2 (collectively, the "Park"). The Park consists of approximately 364 subdivision lots. Upon information and belief, Plaintiffs own four (4) subdivision lots.

At all times referenced herein, Defendant was the legal owner of certain areas within and adjacent to the Park (collectively, the "Subject Property").

Defendant is also the owner of certain improvements to the Subject Property, including, without limitation, gates, streets/roadways, signage, lighting, drainage systems, wells, water storage systems, water supply systems, lake, picnic area, baseball field, playground area, etc. Defendant also owns one (1) lot within the Park that is used for a caretaker's cabin.

Upon information and belief, HOA does not hold legal title to any real property in Tuolumne County, California. However, upon information and belief, certain members of HOA, including Plaintiffs, hold legal title to various lots within the Park.

D. The Subject Agreements.

On or around October 12, 1986, Defendant and HOA entered into that certain Water Use Agreement (the "Water Agreement"), pursuant to which, among other things, Defendant agreed to provide water to HOA on a wholesale basis provided that HOA pay for all expenses associated with the provision of such water. The term of the Water Agreement was set to expire by its own terms on October 11, 2011.

The water that is and was provided by Defendant to HOA is provided from various wells and related water storage system that are located on the Subject Property and through a system of pipes that are also located on the Subject Property. As set forth above, Defendant is the legal owner of the Subject Property and all improvements thereto.

On or around October 12, 1986, Defendant and HOA also entered into that certain License Agreement (the "License Agreement"), pursuant to which, among other things, Defendant agreed to permit HOA to use the streets and roads on the Subject Property for access purposes and maintain such streets and roads provided that HOA pay for all expenses associated therewith. The term of the License Agreement was set to expire by its own terms on October 11, 2011. The License Agreement was subsequently modified by the parties so that HOA would pay in advance for the estimated cost of the expenses incurred by Defendant pursuant to the License Agreement.

Between October 12, 1986 and May 31, 2011, Defendant and HOA also entered into various other agreements pursuant to which, among other things, Defendant agreed to provide the following services or improve and provide use of certain areas of the Subject Property: access gate maintenance and repair; pine needle disposal; improvement and use (and maintenance (and repair as applicable)) of

lake, recreation hall, picnic area, baseball field, playground, and other similar types of areas on the Subject Property; maintenance and repair of vehicles used in connection with the foregoing; services of an onsite caretaker to assist in providing the aforementioned services; and certain other services (the "Other Agreements"). HOA agreed to pay, in advance, for the estimated cost of providing the forgoing pursuant to the Other Agreements. The parties agreed that the term of the Other Agreement would expire upon expiration of the Water Use Agreement and License Agreement. The Water Agreement, License Agreement and Other Agreements may hereinafter be collectively referred to as the "Subject Agreements".

E. <u>Determination and Payment of Amounts Due Pursuant to Subject Agreements.</u>

During each May between October 12, 1986 and May 31, 2011, Defendant, at its annual meeting of shareholders, would determine, based on the previous fiscal year's costs, the estimated cost of the services to be provided by Defendant to HOA pursuant to the Subject Agreements for the upcoming fiscal period of June 1 through May 31 (the "Annual Fee").

Defendant would then promptly inform HOA of the Annual Fee for the fiscal period of June 1 through May 31. HOA would then divide such Annual Fee by the number of lots in the Park and assess each lot owner of the Park for their prorata share of such Annual Fee. From time to time the HOA would also make special assessments. Upon information and belief, HOA's governing documents permit the charging of late fees if annual assessments or special assessments were not promptly paid.

F. Payment of Annual Fees/Judgment Against HOA.

Between October 12, 1986 and May 31, 2011, HOA promptly paid the Annual Fees due. However, HOA failed to pay the entire Annual Fee due for the period beginning on June 1, 2011 and ending on May 31, 2012 (the "2011-12 Annual Fee"). As a result thereof, Defendant filed an action in Tuolumne County Superior Court, Case No. CV57297, against HOA. HOA defaulted in such matter and at a prove-up hearing held on July 13, 2012, the court determined that Defendant was entitled to judgment against HOA in the amount of \$213,770.00 plus attorneys' fees and costs.

G. Plaintiffs' Lots.

As set forth above, Plaintiffs own four (4) separate subdivision lots within the Park. HOA's articles and bylaws and the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions recorded on each of Plaintiff's lots (the "<u>CC&Rs</u>") permit assessments, special assessments and late charges for <u>each</u> lot of the Park (based on the original subdivision maps of the Park).

Upon information and belief, Plaintiffs merged their four (4) lots with the County of Tuolumne so that there are now only two (2) APNs for their four (4) subdivision lots.

II. This Court Does not Have Jurisdiction to Grant Declaratory Relief

A small claims court's jurisdiction is constrained by <u>Code of Civil Procedure¹ Sections 116.220</u> and 116.221. Section 116.220, subdivision (b), allows a small claims court some equitable powers: rescission, restitution, reformation, and specific performance. Sections 116.220 and 116.221 do not permit declaratory relief.

Although it is not entirely clear from Plaintiffs' claim filed in this action, Defendant believes that Plaintiffs are claiming, that, as a result of the merger of their four (4) lots with the County of Tuolumne, Defendant (rather than HOA) should now recognize their four (4) original subdivision lots as two (2) lots under HOA's articles and bylaws and the CC&Rs since the date of merger.²

It would appear that Plaintiffs are further claiming that, as a result of such lot mergers with the County of Tuolumne, <u>Defendant</u> (rather than HOA) owes Plaintiffs for \$2,048.00 for assessments and

¹Further statutory references are to the Code of Civil Procedure unless otherwise noted.

² Plaintiffs do not indicate when such mergers occurred in their claim. Upon information and belief, HOA's articles and bylaws and the CC&Rs do not recognize such merged lots as single lots for assessment purposes. Upon information and belief, HOA has also not made a determination whether or not it will recognize merged lots as single lots for assessment purposes as of the date hereof.

late fees allegedly paid by Plaintiffs to HOA for an unspecified period of time.³

While Plaintiffs' claims and the proper defendant in this matter are less than certain, what is certain is that in order to grant Plaintiffs the relief requested, this court must first determine whether or not by merging lots with the County of Tuolumne, <u>Defendant</u> (not HOA as this action was filed against Defendant only) must recognize Plaintiff's four (4) original subdivision lots as two (2) lots under <u>HOA</u>'s articles and bylaws and the CC&Rs. Plaintiffs are clearly asking for declaratory relief with regard to the foregoing.

Assuming that this court were even able to make the determination set forth above, the court must then determine whether or not the "account(s)" of Defendant must be adjusted "to a total of two parcels". Plaintiffs are clearly again asking for declaratory relief with regard to the foregoing.

Given the constraints of Sections 116.220 and 116.221, this court does not have jurisdiction in this matter to grant the relief requested by Plaintiffs.

III. The Sum of the Three Small Claims Actions filed Against Defendant by Plaintiffs Exceeds Small Claims Jurisdictional Limits

Section 116.221 grants a small claims court jurisdiction over actions brought by natural persons for amounts not more than \$10,000.00. Where a single plaintiff has several small claims against a defendant, the total sum is the test of jurisdiction. (*Emery v. Pacific Employers Ins. Co.* (1937) 8 Cal.2d 663, 666 [67 P.2d 1046]; City and County of San Francisco v. Small Claims Court (1983) 141 Cal.App.3d 470, 477 [190 Cal.Rptr. 340].)

³ It is unclear to Defendant why Plaintiffs brought this action against Defendant instead of HOA as HOA, not Defendant, collected the assessments, special assessments and late fees as set forth above (and then paid such amounts to Defendant as part of the Annual Fees (as referenced above)).

As set forth above, this action is one of three (3) small claims actions filed by Plaintiffs against Defendant that are set for trial on August 23, 2012 in Dept. 5 of this court. Plaintiffs ask for recovery of \$8,460.00 in SC18553. Plaintiffs seek recovery of \$2,048 in this action. In SC18586, Plaintiffs seek recovery of \$270. The total damages requested by Plaintiffs in all three actions are \$10,778.

Thus, even if this court had jurisdiction to grant declaratory relief, Plaintiffs by filing three (3) separate small claims actions against Defendant have exceeded the jurisdictional amount of this court for natural persons.

V. Conclusion

Plaintiffs' case is not appropriate for resolution in small claims court because it asks for declaratory relief, which is not statutorily authorized, and because Plaintiffs have filed three (3) separate small claims actions, the aggregate of which exceeds \$10,000.00. Defendant accordingly asks that Plaintiffs' case be dismissed for lack of jurisdiction.

In addition to the foregoing, Plaintiffs' case should have been brought against the HOA and not Defendant as set forth above.





DAMBACHER, TRUJILLO & WRIGHT

A Professional Law Corporation 32 N. Washington Street Sonora, CA 95370

TO:

Charles Varvayanis P.O. Box 395 Long Barn, CA 95335