1		
2		FILED Superior Court of California County of Los Angeles
3		County of Los Angeles 01/23/2019
4		Sherri R. Carter, Executive Officer / Clerk of Court
5		By: Gerald Berni Deputy
6		
7		
8	SUPERIOR COURT OF THI	E STATE OF CALIFORNIA
9	FOR THE COUNTY	OF LOS ANGELES
10		
11	SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA SCHOOL OF)	Case No.: KC068691
12	THEOLOGY, a California corporation, dba) CLAREMONT SCHOOL OF	Assigned to Hon. Dan Thomas Oki
13	THEOLOGY,	
14	Plaintiff,	[PROPOSE D] AMENDED FINAL JUDGMENT AND
15	v.)	PERMANENT INJUNCTION
16	CLAREMONT GRADUATE UNIVERSITY, a California corporation;	Complaint Filed: August 31, 2016
17	UNIVERSITY, a California corporation; (CLAREMONT UNIVERSITY) CONSORTIUM; and DOES 1 to 50,	Trial Date: September 24, 2018
18	inclusive,	
19	Defendants.	
20	AND RELATED CROSS-COMPLAINT.	
	AND REENTED CROSS-COMI EMINT.	
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

17

15

25

26

27 28

17313042.1

219014-10013

This matter came on regularly for a court trial on September 24, 2018 in Department J of the above-entitled Court, the Honorable Dan Thomas Oki, Judge of the Superior Court, presiding. Attorneys Charles M. Clark and Kathryn M. Casey appeared for plaintiff and cross-defendant Southern California School of Theology, a California corporation, doing business as Claremont School of Theology ("CST"). Attorneys W. Allan Edmiston and Matthew R. Kugizaki appeared for defendants and cross-complainants Claremont Graduate University, a California corporation ("CGU"), and The Claremont Colleges, Inc., a California corporation, formerly known as Claremont University Consortium ("Consortium").1

Pursuant to the Court's Statement of Decision filed on December 18, 2018, IT IS ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:

On CST's First Amended Complaint:

(1) On the first cause of action for quiet title and the third cause of action for declaratory relief, CST is the owner in fee simple of its approximately 16.4-acre campus property which is the subject of this action (the "Subject Property"). However, the Subject Property is subject to an Educational Use Restriction and a First Right of Refusal, which are enforceable as equitable servitudes. The Educational Use Restriction requires the Subject Property to be used only as a bona fide educational institution of collegiate or postgraduate grade. The First Right of Refusal provides that Consortium and its successors in interest can purchase or acquire the Subject Property (or a portion thereof) for a purchase price and other material economic terms that equal the purchase price and other material economic terms set forth in the offer, and upon other terms and conditions as are

While this litigation was pending, on or about January 1, 2018, Claremont University Consortium changed its name to The Claremont Colleges, Inc. However, because throughout this litigation the parties have used "Consortium" as the entity's shorthand name, this judgment uses "Consortium" in the interest of consistency and to avoid confusion. Claremont University Consortium and The Claremont Colleges, Inc. are one and the same.

substantially similar to the other terms and conditions of the offer. The terms and conditions of the First Right of Refusal are further described on pages 5 through 7 of this Judgment.

- (2) On the second cause of action for quiet title and the fourth cause of action for declaratory relief, CST has failed to establish that the 60-foot strip of land conveyed by the "Grant Deed," recorded on or about December 12, 1972 (the "1972 Deed"), cannot be valued and sold independently of its remaining property. CST is the owner of the strip of land, but Consortium and its successors in interest have a First Right of Refusal, on the terms contained in the 1972 Deed, in the event CST desires to sell it.
- (3) On the fifth cause of action for rescission by mutual mistake of fact, CST shall take nothing and CGU and Consortium shall have judgment.
 - (4) On the sixth cause of action for declaratory relief:
 - a. The "Agreement between Claremont University Consortium and Southern California School of Theology," dated as of March 1, 2001 ("2001 Agreement"), is binding on the parties.
 - b. The power of termination in the "Agreement between Claremont College and Southern California School of Theology," dated June 5, 1957 ("1957 Agreement"), and in the subsequent agreements of the parties expired on January 1, 1988 pursuant to the Marketable Record Title Act ("MRTA").
 - c. The Educational Use Restriction and the Right of First Offer in the 1957 Agreement and subsequent agreements of the parties are equitable servitudes enforceable by injunction.
 - d. The Educational Use Restriction benefits all of the adjoining
 Claremont Colleges, as well as Rancho Santa Ana Botanic Garden.
 The Educational Use Restriction provides that a commercial subdivision or residential development is not allowed on the Subject

Property, as the Court finds that such use would alter the very natur
of this community of educational institutions.

e. The calculation contained in the 2001 Agreement for the repurchase of the Subject Property by Consortium constitutes an unreasonable forfeiture and is unenforceable. The Court instead interprets the Right of First Offer as a First Right of Refusal in the event CST chooses to sell or transfer all or a portion of the Subject Property.

On CGU's and Consortium's Second Amended Cross-Complaint:

- (1) On the first cause of action for breach and enforcement of the "Grant Deed," dated June 5, 1957 (the "1957 Deed"), CGU and Consortium shall take nothing and CST shall have judgment.
- (2) On the second cause of action for breach and enforcement of the1957 Agreement, CGU and Consortium shall take nothing and CST shall have judgment.
- (3) On the third cause of action for breach and enforcement of the2001 Agreement, CGU and Consortium shall take nothing and CST shall have judgment.
- (4) On the fourth cause of action for breach and enforcement of the "Agreement and Grant of Easements" dated as of September 21, 2006 ("2006 Agreement"), CGU and Consortium shall take nothing and CST shall have judgment.
- (5) On the fifth cause of action for reformation of the 1957 Deed and the agreements of the parties, CGU and Consortium shall take nothing and CST shall have judgment.
- (6) On the sixth cause of action for promissory/equitable estoppel, CGU and Consortium shall have judgment: CST is equitably estopped from denying the validity of the Educational Use Restriction and the Right of First Offer.
- (7) On the seventh cause of action for breach and enforcement of the 1972 Deed, CGU and Consortium shall take nothing and CST shall have judgment, except that the First Right of Refusal contained within the 1972 Deed is valid and enforceable.

- (8) On the eighth cause of action for specific performance, CGU and Consortium shall have judgment: CST is ordered to allow Consortium and its successors in interest a First Right of Refusal as described on pages 5 through 7 of this Judgment.
- (9) On the ninth cause of action for restitution to avoid unjust enrichment, CGU and Consortium shall take nothing and CST shall have judgment.
- (10) On the tenth cause of action for declaratory relief: Although the Educational Use Restriction and the Right of First Offer in the 1957 Deed, the 1957 Agreement, and the subsequent agreements of the parties have expired pursuant to the MRTA, the Educational Use Restriction is nonetheless enforceable based upon equitable estoppel and/or as an equitable servitude. Similarly, the Right of First Offer remains enforceable, but only as a First Right of Refusal, based upon principles of equitable estoppel and/or as an equitable servitude.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:

CST and its partners, agents, trustees, officers, representatives, successors, and assigns are permanently enjoined from interfering with CGU's or Consortium's rights in the Educational Use Restriction and First Right of Refusal.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:

For purposes of this Judgment, the First Right of Refusal operates as follows, with the "First Right of Refusal Beneficiary" being Consortium or its successors in interest:

If CST or any successor owner of the Subject Property (other than the First Right of Refusal Beneficiary ("FROR Beneficiary")) (as applicable, the "Owner") shall receive a bona fide written offer (together with any applicable counteroffers from Owner, an "Offer") to purchase or acquire the property, or any portion thereof (subject to compliance with the Subdivision Map Act), from a bona fide educational institution of collegiate or post-graduate grade (the "Offeror"), and the Owner wishes to accept the Offer, the Owner shall deliver written notice of Owner's receipt of the Offer, accompanied by a true and complete copy of the Offer and reasonable documentary evidence that the Offeror is a bona fide educational institution of collegiate or post-graduate grade

1

2

3

4

(collectively, the "Offer Notice"), to the then-current FROR Beneficiary (the "Recipient"). The Recipient shall have thirty (30) days following the receipt of the Offer Notice (the "Response Period") to deliver to the Owner its written offer ("Recipient's Offer") to purchase or acquire the Subject Property (or Subdivision Map Act-compliant portion thereof that is subject to the Offer) for a purchase price and other material economic terms that equal the purchase price and other material economic terms set forth in the Offer, and upon other terms and conditions as are substantially similar to the other terms and conditions of the Offer; provided, however, (a) the Recipient shall have the longer of (i) thirty (30) days after delivery of Recipient's Offer, and (ii) the applicable period specified in the Offer, to close the transaction, and (b) Recipient shall have the right to consummate the transaction on an "all cash" basis, in lieu of any financing terms set forth in the Offer.

If Recipient shall deliver a Recipient's Offer that satisfies the requirements of the immediately-preceding paragraph, Recipient's Offer shall constitute a binding agreement (the "Acquisition Agreement") between Owner and Recipient governing the transaction (and Owner and Recipient shall each promptly execute and deliver to the other the Acquisition Agreement). If Recipient shall fail to deliver a Recipient's Offer that satisfies the requirements of the immediatelypreceding paragraph, then Owner may, following expiration of the Response Period (but not later than the first anniversary of Owner's delivery to Recipient of the Offer Notice) consummate its sale or transfer of the Subject Property (or applicable portion) to the Offeror for not less than the purchase price and other material economic terms set forth in the Offer and upon other terms and conditions as are substantially similar to the other terms and conditions of the Offer. Owner may not consummate the transaction with the Offeror upon terms and conditions that do not satisfy the requirements of the immediately-preceding sentence, unless Owner first delivers to Recipient a new Offer Notice setting forth such updated terms and conditions and following the procedures of the First Right of Refusal with respect to such new Offer Notice.

Any attempted sale or transfer of the Subject Property without first complying with the terms of this First Right of Refusal shall be void and of no force or effect. The First Right of

1	Refusal shall terminate, and be of no further force or effect, as
2	to any portions of the Subject Property upon acquisition by a FROR Beneficiary of fee title to such portion, but not upon
3	acquisition of any leasehold or other interest in which the
4	Owner retains any reversionary interest.
5	IT IS FURTHER ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED:
6	CGU and Consortium are the prevailing parties in this action and shall recover from
7	CST their costs in the sum of \$, to be determined hereafter by
8	appropriate proceedings.
9	Dated: January GH, 2019
10 11	HON. DAN THOMAS OKI Judge of the Superior Court of the State of California
12	State of Camonia
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	Respectfully Submitted:
19	LOEB & LOEB LLP
20	PAUL ROHRER W. ALLAN EDMISTON
21	MATTHEW R. KUGIZAKI
22	Dru May De
23	By: Matthew R. Kugizaki
24	Attorneys for Defendants and Cross-Complainants Claremont Graduate University and
25	The Claremont Colleges, Inc. f/k/a Claremont University Consortium
26	
27	
28	
۷۵	

Loeb & Loeb
A Limited Liability Partnership
Including Professional
Corporations

8