

1 ANDREW M. ZACKS (SBN 147794)
2 SCOTT A. FREEDMAN (SBN 240872)
3 ZACKS, FREEDMAN & PATTERSON, PC
4 601 Montgomery Street, Suite 400
5 San Francisco, CA 94111
6 Tel: (415) 956-8100
7 Fax: (415) 288-9755
8 az@zfplaw.com
9 scott@zfplaw.com
10 Attorneys for Petitioners
11 San Francisco Apartment Association
12 Small Property Owners Of San Francisco Institute

FILED
San Francisco County Superior Court

JUL 22 2022

BY: *Kenneth H. ...*

10 SUPERIOR COURT - STATE OF CALIFORNIA
11 COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO - UNLIMITED JURISDICTION

13 SAN FRANCISCO APARTMENT
14 ASSOCIATION, a California non-profit
15 trade association and SMALL PROPERTY
16 OWNERS OF SAN FRANCISCO
17 INSTITUTE, a California non-profit
18 corporation

17 Petitioners,

18 vs.

19 CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN
20 FRANCISCO, a California municipal
21 corporation,

22 Respondent.

Case No.: CPF-22-517718

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING
PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE
IN PART**

Date: May 27, 2022
Time: 9:30 a.m.
Dept: 501
Judge: Hon. Charles F. Haines

24 The petition of Petitioners San Francisco Apartment Association and Small Property
25 Owners of San Francisco Institute came on regularly for hearing in Department 501 of the above-
26 captioned Court at 9:30 a.m. on May 27, 2022. Andrew Zacks appeared for Petitioners, Wayne
27 Snodgrass appeared for Respondent, and the Honorable Charles F. Haines presided. The Court,
28

1 having reviewed the papers in support of the petition, those in opposition and reply, and having
2 heard the arguments of counsel, finds good cause to HEREBY ORDER THAT: the petition is
3 GRANTED IN PART.

4 The Court finds that Petitioners have standing to seek and obtain the relief sought by way
5 of their petition, as they collectively represent the owners and operators of tens of thousands of
6 rental units in the City and County of San Francisco whose rights to collect rents and otherwise
7 enforce rental agreements are each adversely affected by San Francisco Ordinance 18-22. More
8 specifically, the enforcement of Ordinance 18-22 would delay the rights of Petitioners' members
9 to collect rents and otherwise enforce the terms of their rental agreements. Their members would
10 thereby have standing to sue in their own right, the interests advanced by this suit and petition are
11 germane to the purposes for which the Petitioners operate, and there is no compelling reason why
12 the personal participation of Petitioners' members is required.

13 The Court further finds that to the extent it creates a longer period to cure or quit for non-
14 payment of rent, Ordinance 18-22 is in direct conflict with Code of Civil Procedure section 1161,
15 and is thereby preempted by state law as it applies to notices for non-payment of rent only. (Tri
16 County Apt. Ass'n v. City of Mountain View (1987) 196 Cal.App.3d 1283, 1293 (Tri County).

17 Respondent argues that Ordinance 18-22 is permissible, because it regulates the substantive
18 basis for eviction, as opposed to the procedure. The Court finds the argument unpersuasive, for
19 several reasons. First, at its most basic level, the amount of notice to be provided is one of the
20 quintessential aspects of procedure. As Tri County observed, where a local ordinance attempts to
21 serve the same procedural purpose as the statute, but then changes the statewide chronology to suit
22 its own agenda, it is preempted. (*Id.* at 1296) This is precisely the case here: the Ordinance seeks
23 to set a new, longer timeline for the very same notices that are required by Code of Civil Procedure
24 section 1161.

25 Second, viewing Ordinance 18-22 as substantive because it is allegedly a more modest
26 intrusion on timing is equally flawed. Respondent cited no authority for the proposition, and the
27 Court finds it to be without merit. Moreover, as Respondent conceded during oral argument, it
28

601 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111

1 would be beyond a city’s power to extend the relevant notice period to many months, and the Court
2 finds no legal basis to distinguish between the two (a ten-day extension, or a months-long
3 extension) as the State has set the notice period by way of Code of Civil Procedure section 1161(2)
4 at three days.

5 And finally, even were the Court to conclude that Ordinance 18-22 is an attempt to regulate
6 the substantive basis for eviction, Respondent conceded during oral argument (and the Court is
7 persuaded independently) that it would be beyond a city’s power to remove non-payment of rent
8 (at least) as a substantive basis for eviction. Permitting a city to extend the notice period for a non-
9 payment of rent eviction, in particular, would allow it to effectively accomplish that impermissible
10 end via a backdoor approach.

11 Respondent fares no better in its reliance upon San Francisco Apartment Association v.
12 City and County of San Francisco, (2018) 20 Cal.App.5th 510 (“Educators”). The ordinance at
13 issue in Educators did not alter the state law-required notice period for termination of a tenancy,
14 but instead created a particularized class of tenant who could only receive that notice during a
15 specified window of time. The ordinance therefore did not change the procedure to create the
16 protection, but merely had an incidental impact on it. Furthermore, the particular class of tenants
17 in Educators was comprised of teachers and related individuals, who had not failed to perform
18 material obligations of their tenancies. This was significant, insofar as it created a narrow category
19 of faultless individuals and afforded them a substantive and time-limited defense to eviction.
20 Conversely, Ordinance 18-22 provides such a defense to all tenants, and in cases involving even
21 the most fundamental violation of a lease (non-payment of rent). Even the Educators decision
22 itself recognizes that “an ordinance limiting the timing of *all* evictions would appear to be
23 preempted by the unlawful detainer statutes.” (Educators, 20 Cal.App.5th at p. 519.)

24 Respondent’s reliance upon Rental Housing Ass’n of N. Alameda County v. City of
25 Oakland, (2009) 171 Cal.App.4th 741 (“Rental Housing”), is misplaced for similar reasons. The
26 ordinance at issue in Rental Housing did not cover non-payment of rent, which the Court finds is
27 the most fundamental of all aspects of a tenancy: the payment of rent in exchange for the right of
28

1 possession. (Childs v. Eltinge (1973) 29 Cal.App.3d 843, 854) Instead, the “7 day notice” was
2 only directed at material breaches (other than default in rent) and nuisance-type behavior, where
3 “the specified conduct continue[d] after the landlord provides the tenant written notice to cease”.
4 (Rental Housing at 762-3.) While breaches may be cured and nuisances abated by affirmative
5 tenant conduct (e.g., fixing a door is different than not breaking it in the first place), default in the
6 payment of rent can *only* be cured by the payment of rent. It also did not discuss Tri County,
7 which held that local changes to required, state notice periods are preempted if the purposes of two
8 laws are the same. (Tri County at 1296) And finally, insofar as Rental Housing relied upon
9 Birkenfeld v. City of Berkeley, (1976) 17 Cal.3d 129 (“Birkenfeld”), to uphold the ordinance at
10 issue in that matter, the present matter is distinguishable. For one, Birkenfeld held that an intrusion
11 on the unlawful detainer procedure is invalid, irrespective of whether it is ‘minor.’ Ordinance 18-
12 22 creates such an impediment. And two, Birkenfeld addressed terminations of tenancy pursuant
13 to Code of Civil Procedure section 1161(1), those at the completion of a term, for which no notice
14 period is prescribed (or required) by state law. Birkenfeld is not controlling here, insofar as it did
15 not address cases involving fault-based terminations, or the notices they require. (County of San
16 Bernardino v. Superior Court (1994) 30 Cal.App.4th 378, 388; see also Brown v. Kelly
17 Broadcasting Co. (1989) 48 Cal.3d 711, 734–735 [stating that cases must be construed in light of
18 the facts presented].)

19 Finally, as was observed in Educators, the procedural-substantive framework set forth in
20 Birkenfeld was not even necessary to determine the ordinances at issue in Tri County and
21 Channing Properties v. City of Berkeley, (1992) 11 Cal.App.4th 88, were preempted. The
22 conclusions reached in those decisions were equally premised upon principles of implied
23 preemption, which in turn look at the extent to which the “Legislature intended to occupy a
24 particular field...[by looking at] the whole purpose and scope of the legislative scheme.” (In re
25 Lane (1962) 58 Cal.2d 99, 102–103) Petitioners convincingly point to the extensive, state law
26 statutory coverage of the field of notices that a landlord is required to give a tenant in the case of
27 a material breach of one’s tenancy. These include, for example, Code of Civil Procedure sections
28

1 1161(2), 1161(3) and 1161(4), which have been largely unchanged for decades. To the extent
2 there have been changes, i.e. in the recent COVID pandemic, the Legislature has provided for
3 them. (Civ. Proc. Code §§ 1179.01-1179.07) And they have been particularly, and repeatedly,
4 provided for in the case of non-payment of rent. (Civ. Proc. Code 1161(2)(subparagraph 3) and
5 Civ. Proc. Code § 1179.03) These acts sufficiently demonstrate the intent of the Legislature to
6 occupy the field of notice required by a landlord to a tenant, in the case of a material breach of the
7 terms of a tenancy.


8 The Court finds that that there is a split of authority as to the allowable notice periods for
9 notices other than for the non-payment of rent. On the one hand, Tri-County supports the
10 invalidation of any extended notice period involving fault-based evictions. But, the Court in
11 Rental Housing Ass'n, permitted Oakland to interpose an additional, extended notice period for
12 cases involving substantial violation of a material term of the tenancy, disorderly conduct, or
13 refusal to allow the landlord access to the unit. Similarly, a tenant may be evicted for willfully
14 causing substantial damage to the premises only if, after written notice from the landlord, the tenant
15 "has refused to cease damaging the premises or has refused to either make satisfactory correction
16 or to pay the reasonable costs of repairing such damage over a reasonable period of time. Even
17 though the Rental Housing Ass'n court did not consider Tri-County and its implied preemption
18 analysis, this Court finds that it is bound by Rental Housing Ass'n as to Notices that do not involve
19 non-payment of rent. *Auto Equity Sales, Inc. v. Superior Ct. of Santa Clara Cnty.* (1962) 57 Cal.
20 2d 450, 456. For this reason, and because Rental Housing did not involve or otherwise address
21 non-payment notices, the Court limits the issuance of the writ to notices for non-payment of rent.
22 Petitioners will have to look to the higher courts if they wish to resolve the conflict between Tri
23 County and Rental Housing Ass'n.

1 For the foregoing reasons, the Court finds Ordinance 18-22 is both expressly and impliedly
2 preempted by State law to the extent it changes the required notice period before a landlord may
3 file an unlawful detainer case for non-payment of rent only. IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that
4 Ordinance 18-22 is thereby invalid and unenforceable to that extent only. Accordingly,

- 5 • Respondent is enjoined from enforcing Ordinance 18-22 to the extent and per the
6 findings set forth above.
- 7 • A writ of mandate shall issue forthwith enjoining the City from enforcing Ordinance 18-
8 22 to the extent and per the findings set forth above.

9 IT IS SO ORDERED. *The stay on the ten day notice*
10 *requirement is lifted upon entry of writ of*
11 *mandate.*

11 Dated: 7/22/2022

12 
13 _____
14 Hon. Charles F. Haines
15 Judge of the San Francisco Superior Court
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

601 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111

**SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO**

SAN FRANCISCO APARTMENT ASSOCIATION,
a California non-profit trade association and
SMALL PROPERTY OWNERS OF SAN
FRANCISCO INSTITUTE, a California non-profit
corporation

Petitioners

CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO, a
California municipal corporation,

Respondent

Case Number CPF-22-517718

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING
[CCP 1013a (4)]

I, Kenneth Hunt, a Deputy Clerk of the Superior Court of the County of San Francisco, certify that I am not a party to the within action.


On July 22, 2022, I served the foregoing ORDER GRANTING PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDATE IN PART by placing a copy thereof in a sealed envelope, addressed as follows:

ANDREW MAYER ZACKS ZACKS, FREEDMAN & PATTERSON, PC 601 MONTGOMERY ST, SUITE 400 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111	WAYNE KESSLER SNODGRASS DEPUTY CITY ATTORNEY CITY HALL, ROOM 234 1 DR. CARLTON B. GOODLETT PL SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94102-4682
--	--

and I then placed the sealed envelopes in the outgoing mail at 400 McAllister Street, San Francisco, CA 94102 on the date indicated above for collection, attachment of required prepaid postage, and mailing on that date following standard court practices.

Dated: July 22, 2022

MICHAEL T. YUEN, Clerk

By: 
Kenneth Hunt, Deputy Clerk