1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	TIMOTHY T. TRUJILLO, Esq. SBN19 GARY P. DAMBACHER, Esq. SBN 9 JOSEPH L. WRIGHT, Esq. SBN 2 BRANDON M. KILIAN, Esq. SBN 2 DAMBACHER, TRUJILLO & WRIGHT A PROFESSIONAL LAW CORPORATION 32 North Washington Street Sonora, California 95370 (209) 533-1883 (209) 533-3844 FAX Attorneys for Plaintiff	2141 39838 73846	
10	CUDEDIOD COURT	OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA	
11	COUNTY OF TUOLUMNE		
12	COOK	TI OF TOOLOMINE	
13	ODD FELLOWS SIERRA RECREATION		
14	ASSOCIATION, a California corporation,	Case No.: CV57297	
15	Plaintiff,	JUDGMENT AFTER PROVE-UP HEARING	
16		Dept: 3	
17	VS.	Judge: Hon. Donald Segerstrom Hearing Date: July 13, 2012	
18	ODD FELLOWS SIERRA HOMEOWNER ASSOCIATION, a California non-profit	5, Freating Butter tary 13, 2012	
19	corporation; and DOES 1 through 500, inclu	sive,	
20	Defendants.		
21			
22			
23			
24	This matter came on regularly for a prove-up hearing on July 13, 2012, at 9:30 a.m., before the Honorable Donald Segerstrom, Judge, presiding. Del Wallis, President of Plaintiff ODD FELLOWS		
25			
26 SIERRA RECREATION ASSOCIATION		("Plaintiff"), was personally present with Plaintiff's attorney	
27	Timothy T. Trujillo, Esq. of Dambacher, Tru	nothy T. Trujillo, Esq. of Dambacher, Trujillo & Wright, A Professional Law Corporation. The	
28	Court heard evidence both oral and documentary.		
-			

I. Plaintiff's Complaint

Plaintiff asserted the following causes of action against Defendant ODD FELLOWS SIERRA HOMEOWNERS' ASSOCIATION ("Defendant") in its complaint filed on February 23, 2012:

- 1) Breach of Contact-Water Use Agreement;
- 2) Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing-Water Use Agreement;
- 3) Breach of Contact-License Agreement;
- 4) Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing-License Agreement;
- 5) Breach of Oral Contact-Other Agreements;
- 6) Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing-Other Agreements;
- 7) Common Counts-Account Stated;
- 8) Common Counts-Open Account; and
- 9) Declaratory Relief.

II. Factual Findings by Court

The Court makes the following factual findings:

A. The Park.

- 1) Plaintiff is the legal owner of certain real property within certain subdivisions in Tuolumne County, California 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"), including, without limitation, the real property on which the following improvements are located: (i) roads/streets, (ii) wells for the supply of water; (iii) recreation hall, and (iv) lake, picnic area, baseball field and playground.
- The Park consists of 364 separate lots owned by third parties as set forth in the original maps recorded for I.O.O.F. Odd Fellows Sierra Camp Subdivision No. 1 and I.O.O.F. Odd Fellows Sierra Camp Subdivision No. 2. Plaintiff is also the owner of one lot within the Park. Plaintiff is also the legal owner of certain real property adjacent to the Park.
- 3) Plaintiff owns the wells, water distribution system and water storage system that provide water to the lot owners of the Park.

4) Plaintiff also owns the streets and roads within the Park.

B. The Water Agreement.

- On or around October 12, 1986, Plaintiff and Defendant entered into that certain Water Use Agreement (the "Water Agreement"), pursuant to which, among other things, Plaintiff agreed to provide water to Defendant on a wholesale basis provided that Defendant pay for all expenses associated with the provision of such water.
- 2) The initial annual fee for the provision of water as set forth in the Water Agreement was \$37,500.00.
- 3) After 1986, the annual fee for the provision of water increased from year to year as permitted by the Water Agreement
- 4) The annual fee for the provision of water pursuant to the Water Agreement was to be paid in advance.
- 5) Between October 1986 and May 2011, Defendant paid all fees due pursuant to the Water Agreement.
- Plaintiff did not make any profit on the provision of water to the Defendant pursuant to the Water Agreement.
- 7) The Water Agreement contains an attorneys' fee provision.
- 8) The term of the Water Agreement was set to expire by its own terms on October 11, 2011.

C. The License Agreement.

On or around October 12, 1986, Plaintiff and Defendant also entered into that certain

License Agreement (the "License Agreement"), pursuant to which, among other things,

Plaintiff agreed to permit Defendant to use the streets and roads owned by Plaintiff within
the Park for access purposes and agreed maintain such streets and roads provided that

Defendant pay for all expenses associated therewith as a license fee.

- The license fee pursuant to the License Agreement was initially to be paid in arrears.

 However, in 1986, the License Agreement was subsequently modified by the parties so that Defendant would pay in advance for the estimated cost of the expenses incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to the License Agreement.
- 3) Between October 1986 and May 2011, Defendant paid all fees due pursuant to the License Agreement.
- 4) Plaintiff did not make any profit on the provision of services to the Defendant pursuant to the License Agreement.
- 5) The term of the License Agreement was set to expire by its own terms on October 11, 2011.

D. The Other Agreements.

- 1) Between October 12, 1986 and May 31, 2011, Plaintiff and Defendant also entered into various other agreements pursuant to which, among other things, Plaintiff agreed to provide the following services or improve and provide use of certain areas of the Park: 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 Park; 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"). The Water Agreement, License Agreement and Other Agreements may hereinafter collectively be referred to as the "Subject Agreements".
- Defendant agreed to pay, in advance, for the estimated cost of providing the forgoing pursuant to the Other Agreements at the same time as the annual fee due pursuant to the Water Agreement.
- 3) Between October 1986 and May 2011, Defendant paid all fees due pursuant to the Other Agreements.

- 4) Plaintiff did not make any profit on the provision of services to Defendant pursuant to the Other Agreements.
- The parties agreed that the term of the Other Agreements would expire upon expiration of the Water Agreement and License Agreement.

E. Determination and Payment of Annuals Fees Due Pursuant to Subject Agreements between October 12, 1986 and May 31, 2011.

- During each May between October 12, 1986 and May 31, 2011, Plaintiff, 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 Plaintiff to Defendant pursuant to the Subject Agreements for the upcoming fiscal period of June 1 through May 31 (the "Annual Fee(s)").
- 2) Plaintiff would then promptly inform Defendant of the Annual Fee for the fiscal period of June 1 through May 31. Defendant would then divide such Annual Fee by the number of lots in the Park (based on the subdivision maps originally recorded for the Park) and invoice each lot owner of the Park for their prorata share of such Annual Fee (on a per lot basis).
- 3) Between October 12, 1986 and May 30, 2011, the lot owners of the Park paid no further amounts to Defendant other than their prorata share of the Annual Fees.
- 4) Between October 12, 1986 and May 31, 2011, Defendant promptly paid the Annual Fees due to Plaintiff.
- 5) Between October 12, 1986 and May 31, 2011, the Annual Fees paid by Defendant were less than the expenses incurred by Plaintiff in providing the services to Defendant pursuant to the Subject Agreements.

F. Determination and Partial Payment of Annual Fee Due Pursuant to Subject Agreements between June 1, 2011 and May 31, 2012.

- On May 29, 2011, Plaintiff's shareholders approved a budget of \$302,120.00 for the services to be provided by Plaintiff to Defendant pursuant to the Subject Agreements for the fiscal period of June 1, 2011 to May 31, 2012. The budget approved by Plaintiff for the fiscal period of June 1, 2011 to May 31, 2012 was comparable to Plaintiff's budget for the services provided by Plaintiff to Defendant pursuant to the Subject Agreements for the previous 2010-2011 fiscal year (adjusted for inflation and increased expenses).
- 2) Plaintiff informed Defendant of the Annual Fee due for the fiscal period of June 1, 2011 through May 31, 2012 (the "2011-12 Annual Fee") and thereafter, Defendant invoiced each lot owner of the Park for their prorata share of the 2011-12 Annual Fee (or \$830 per subdivision lot).
- On or about July 31, 2011, Defendant paid Plaintiff \$50,000.00 as a partial payment for the 2011-12 Annual Fee. Defendant made no further payments to Plaintiff for the period of June 1, 2011 to September 15, 2011.
- 4) On September 15, 2011, Plaintiff invoiced Defendant for the services being provided and to be provided to Defendant pursuant to the Subject Agreements between June 1, 2011 and May 31, 2012 (the "Subject Invoice").
- 5) On or about October 4, 2011, Defendant paid Plaintiff \$19,350.00 as a further partial payment for the 2011-12 Annual Fee.
- After October 4, 2011, Defendant indicated to Plaintiff that it would not pay the balance due on the Subject Invoice despite the fact that Defendant had billed each lot owner of the Park (364 lots) an amount designed to collect the total amount due by Defendant to Plaintiff pursuant to the Subject Invoice (\$302,120.00).
- 7) In June 2012, after filing the complaint in this matter, Defendant paid \$19,000.00 to Plaintiff as a further partial payment for the 2011-12 Annual Fee.

II. Legal Findings and Orders by Court

The Court makes the following legal findings and orders:

A. 1st, 3rd and 5th Causes of Action.

As to the first (Breach of Contract-Water Use Agreement), third (Breach of Contract-License Agreement), and fifth (Breach of Contract-Other Agreements) causes of action, the Court finds as follows:

- 1) The Subject Agreements, as modified, were a valid and binding obligation of Plaintiff and Defendant.
- 2) Defendant breached each of the Subject Agreements by failing to pay the amounts due pursuant thereto.
- 3) The aforesaid breaches by Defendant were without justification or excuse.
- 4) Plaintiff has performed all of the covenants and conditions on its part to be performed under the Subject Agreements, express or implied, except for those covenants and conditions excused by Defendant's breaches thereof,
- As a proximate result of Defendant's breaches of the Subject Agreements, Plaintiff has suffered damages in the amount of \$213,770.00.
- The Water Agreement contain an attorneys' fee clause and Plaintiff has been required to retain the services of an attorney to prosecute its complaint and is therefore is awarded its attorneys' fees and costs.

B. 2nd, 4th and 6th Causes of Action.

As to the second (Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing -Water Use Agreement), fourth (Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing -License Agreement), and sixth (Breach of Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing-Other Agreements) causes of action, the Court finds as follows:

1) In entering into the Subject Agreements, Defendant owed Plaintiff a duty of good faith and fair dealing.