

IN THE CIRCUIT COURT FOR THE
FIFTEENTH JUDICIAL CIRCUIT IN
AND FOR PALM BEACH COUNTY,
FLORIDA

CASE NO.: 502011CA017953XXXXMB
DIVISION: AO

TOWN OF GULF STREAM, VILLAGE OF
TEQUESTA, CITY OF RIVIERA BEACH, TOWN
OF JUPITER, CITY OF DELRAY BEACH,
TOWN OF PALM BEACH SHORES, TOWN OF
MANALAPAN, TOWN OF MANGONIA PARK,
CITY OF PALM BEACH GARDENS, TOWN OF
HIGHLAND BEACH, TOWN OF LAKE PARK,
CITY OF WEST PALM BEACH, TOWN OF
OCEAN RIDGE, and CITY OF BOCA RATON,
municipal corporations of the State of Florida,
Plaintiffs,

vs.

PALM BEACH COUNTY, a political subdivision,

Defendant.

SHARON R. BOCK, in her Official Capacity as the
Clerk & Comptroller of Palm Beach County, Florida,

Intervenor.

COUNTER-DEFENDANTS' MOTION TO DISMISS AMENDED COUNTERCLAIM

Counter-Defendants, TOWN OF GULF STREAM, et al., ("Municipalities"), by and through undersigned counsel, pursuant to Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.140 (b)(6), and by the filing of this Motion to Dismiss, move this Court for entry of an Order dismissing Amended Counterclaim. Counter-Plaintiff, PALM BEACH COUNTY ("County") has failed to state a claim against Municipalities upon which relief can be granted. As grounds in support of this Motion, Municipalities state as follows:

MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT

INTRODUCTION

County brings a two count Amended Counterclaim against Municipalities, seeking damages for an alleged violation of its Inspector General Ordinance. Count I is an action for breach of County Ordinance No. 2011-009 and Count II is an action for breach of contract implied in law or quasi-contract based on County Ordinance No. 2011-009. Dismissal is warranted as to all counts because County is not entitled to enforce its ordinance by requesting an award of damages. Dismissal further is warranted as to Count II because 1) the action is barred by sovereign immunity; and 2) the County's claim for future damages under a contract implied in law or quasi-contract theory is not ripe for review.

STANDARD FOR DISMISSAL

A motion to dismiss "tests whether a plaintiff has alleged a good cause of action in his or her complaint." *Visor v. Buhl*, 760 So. 2d 274, 275 (Fla. 4th DCA 2000); see also Fla. R. Civ. P. 1.140 (b)(6). The Fourth District Court of Appeal in *Rubenstein v. Primedica Healthcare, Inc.*, 755 So. 2d 746, 748 (Fla. 4th DCA 2000) explained, "[w]hen ruling on a motion to dismiss for failure to state a cause of action, the trial court must accept the allegations of a complaint as true and in the light most favorable to the plaintiffs." This court is confined to a consideration of the allegations found within the four corners of the complaint. *Bell v. Indian River Mem. Hosp.*, 778 So. 2d 1030, 1032 (Fla. 4th DCA 2001). The court must assume that all allegations in the complaint are true and decide whether the plaintiff would be entitled to relief. *Id.* Here, the allegations contained in the counts against City demonstrate with certainty that Plaintiff is not entitled to relief under any set of facts which could be proved in support of each claim.

ARGUMENT

Dismissal as to Count I of the Amended Counterclaim is warranted because the County ordinance cannot be enforced by awarding damages. Dismissal as to Count II of the Amended Counterclaim also is warranted because: (1) under Florida law, sovereign immunity bars such claim; and (2) the County's claim for future damages under a contract implied in law or quasi-contract theory is not ripe for review. As such, judgment should be granted in favor of Municipalities on all counts, as a matter of law.

ORDINANCE CANNOT BE ENFORCED BY AWARDING DAMAGES

In paragraph 10, Count I and paragraph 19, Count II of the Amended Counterclaim, the County alleges that Article XII, Sec. 2-431, provides that Ordinance No. 2011-009 is *enforceable* by all means provided by law, including injunctive relief in this Court. (Emphasis added). In its prayer for relief, however, rather than seeking *enforcement*, the County seeks damages for the breach of the Ordinance or for the value or cost of the benefit conferred by the OIG oversight of the Municipalities. There are no set of facts that the County can allege which would entitle it to *enforce* its ordinance by demanding an award of damages. *See generally* Art. VIII, §1, Fla. Const.; §125.01, *et seq.*, Fla. Stat. Therefore, this Court should dismiss Counts I and II of the County's Amended Counterclaim.

COUNT II IS BARRED BY SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY

The doctrine of sovereign immunity which provides that a sovereign cannot be sued without its own permission was part of the common law and has been adopted and codified by the Florida Legislature. *American Home Assurance Company v. National Railroad Passenger Corporation*, 908 So. 2d 459, 471 (Fla. 2005). The Florida Supreme Court has identified three policy considerations that underpin the doctrine of sovereign immunity: 1) the preservation of the constitutional principal of separation of powers; 2) protection of the public treasury; and 3)

maintenance of the orderly administration of government. *Id.* However, the Florida Constitution permits the Legislature to abrogate the state's sovereign immunity. *Id.* Any such waiver of sovereign immunity must be clear and unequivocal. *Id.* at 472. In 1973, the Legislature authorized a limited waiver of state sovereign immunity in tort for personal injury, wrongful death, and loss or injury to property by enactment of section 768.28. *Id.* In addition to tort actions, the Florida Supreme Court held that sovereign immunity from contractual suits is waived for suits based on express written contracts to which the state and agency had the authority to enter. *Pan-Am Tobacco Corp. v. Department of Corrections*, 471 So. 2d 4, 6 (Fla. 1984). In *Pan-Am*, the Florida Supreme Court specifically limited its holding to written contracts stating, "[w]e would also emphasize that our holding here is applicable only to suits on express, written contracts which the state agency has statutory authority to enter." *Id.* The waiver recognized in *Pan-Am* is inapplicable to actions brought for oral or implied contracts. *County of Brevard v. Miorelli Engineering*, 703 So. 2d 1049, 1051 (Fla. 1997) (finding the doctrine of sovereign immunity precluded recovery for cost of extra work performed without a written change order); *City of Key West v. Florida Keys Community College*, 81 So. 3d 494, 497 (Fla. 3d DCA 2012) (finding College protected by sovereign immunity against an action by City to collect stormwater utility fees where no agreement existed between College and City obligating College to pay City's stormwater utility fees).

In *Key West*, the City enacted an ordinance creating a stormwater utility system and establishing stormwater utility fees to fund the system. *Id.* at 496. There is no written contract or agreement between the City and the College obligating the College to pay the City's stormwater fees. *Id.* at 496. Nevertheless, the City billed the college for stormwater services. *Id.* The College filed an action seeking a declaration that it enjoyed sovereign immunity, the trial

court granted summary judgment for the college and the Third District Court of Appeals affirmed. *Id.* at 496-97.

The City adopted its ordinance pursuant to the authority granted by 403.0893, Florida Statutes, which states in pertinent part:

In addition to any other funding mechanism legally available to local government to construct, operate, or maintain stormwater systems, a county or municipality may:

- (1) Create one or more stormwater utilities and adopt stormwater utility fees sufficient to plan, construct, operate, and maintain stormwater management systems set out in the local program required pursuant to section 403.0891(3). *Id.* at 497.

The court pointed out that 'sovereign immunity is the rule, rather than the exception,' citing *Pan-Am Tobacco Corp. v. Dep't of Corrs.*, 471 So. 2d 4, 5, (Fla. 1984). The court stressed that the State enjoys sovereign immunity unless immunity is expressly waived. *Id.* at 498.¹ The court held that because Chapter 403 relating to stormwater fees, does not expressly waive sovereign immunity, it is clear that the State has not waived sovereign immunity. *Id.*

In this case, the County seeks to recover costs for its Inspector General Program through filing a claim based on a contract implied in law or quasi-contract. The County, however, has failed to state how sovereign immunity has been waived. Without an express waiver, the County's claim for breach of an implied contract is barred by the doctrine of sovereign immunity. See *County of Brevard v. Miorelli Engineering*, 703 So. 2d 1049, 1051 (Fla. 1997); *City of Key West v. Florida Keys Community College*, 81 So. 3d 494, 497 (Fla. 3d DCA 2012). Therefore, this Court should dismiss Count II of the Amended Counterclaim.

¹ The sovereign immunity granted to the State has been interpreted to extend to municipalities. *Commercial Carrier Corp. v. Indian River County*, 371 So. 2d 1010, 1016 (Fla. 1979).

COUNT II'S DEMAND FOR FUTURE DAMAGES IS NOT RIPE FOR REVIEW

Count II of the Amended Counterclaim alleges a claim for contract implied in law or quasi-contract. In this Count, County demands that Municipalities pay for the Inspector General's oversight "in the future," including, but not limited to payments for the "benefit conferred" on Municipalities through "Fiscal Year 2013." See paragraphs 14, 16, and 18 of Amended Counterclaim. In essence, County demands that Municipalities pay for the Inspector General Program in perpetuity based on alleged future benefits conferred. Florida law is clear, however, that a claim for implied contract or quasi-contract only allows the County to recover benefits actually conferred on Municipalities, if any. See e.g., *Swafford v. Schweitzer*, 906 So. 2d 1194, 1195 (Fla. 4th DCA 2005) (claim does not accrue until benefits conferred). Alleged benefits for "future years," by their very nature, have not yet been conferred on Municipalities. It would be impossible to do so. This includes any alleged benefits conferred on Municipalities for Fiscal Year 2013, which has not yet begun. For these reasons, the County cannot state a cause of action for a contract implied in law or quasi-contract based on alleged future benefits conferred. Such claim is not ripe for review and should be dismissed.

CONCLUSION

Based on the legal and factual scenario set forth within the four corners of the Amended Counterclaim it is legally impossible to cure the fatal defects in County's pleading against the Municipalities. There is no legal authority to enforce an ordinance by awarding damages. There has been no waiver of sovereign immunity to allow County's claim for implied or quasi-contract to stand. County's claim for future damages based on future benefits conferred under an implied or quasi-contract theory also is not ripe for review.

WHEREFORE, the Municipalities request that this Court enter an Order Dismissing the County's Amended Counterclaim.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that a true and correct copy of the foregoing has been furnished by facsimile and U.S. Mail to: Andrew J. McMahon, Esq., Chief Assistant County Attorney, P.O. Box 1989, West Palm Beach, Florida 33402, Martin Alexander, Esq., Holland & Knight, LLP, 222 Lakeview Avenue, Suite 1000, West Palm Beach, Florida 33401, and Nathan A. Adams, IV, Esq., Post Office Drawer 810, Tallahassee, Florida 32302, this 13th day of August, 2012.

Claudia M. McKenna, City Attorney
CITY OF WEST PALM BEACH
P.O. Box 3366
West Palm Beach, FL 33402
(561) 822-1350
(561) 822-1373 (facsimile)

By: Kimberly D. Roedel
Douglas N. Yeargin, Assistant City Attorney
Florida Bar No. 777560
dyeargin@wpb.org
Attorney for Plaintiff City of West Palm Beach

And

/s/
John C. Randolph, Esquire
Florida Bar No. 12900
Jones, Foster, Johnson & Stubbs, P.A.
P.O. Box 3475
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3475
Phone (561)659-3000/fax (561)832-1454
jrandolph@jones-foster.com
Attorney for Plaintiff Town of Gulf Stream

And

/s/
Keith W. Davis, Esquire
Florida Bar No. 957577
Corbett and White, P.A.
1111 Hypoluxo Road, Suite 207
Lantana, Florida 33462-4271
Phone (561)586-7116/ fax (561)586-9611
keith@corbettandwhite.com
Attorney for Plaintiffs Village of Tequesta,
Town of Palm Beach Shores, and
Town of Mangonia Park
And

/s/

Pamala Hanna Ryan, City Attorney
 Florida Bar No. 996432
 City of Rivera Beach Attorney's Office
 600 W. Blue Heron Boulevard
 Riviera Beach, Florida 33404-4311
 Phone (561)845-4069/fax (561)845-4017
pryan@rivierabch.com
 Attorney for Plaintiff City of Riviera Beach

And

/s/

Thomas Jay Baird, Esquire
 Florida Bar No. 475114
 Jones, Foster, Johnson & Stubbs, P.A.
 801 Mapelwood Drive, Suite 22A
 Jupiter, Florida 33458-8821
 Phone (561)650-8233/fax (561)746-6933
tbaird@jones-foster.com
 Attorney for Plaintiffs Town of Jupiter
 and Town of Lake Park

And

/s/

Roger Brian Shutt, City Attorney
 Florida Bar No. 0009611
 City of Delray Beach
 200 NW 1st Avenue
 Delray Beach, Florida 33444-2768
 Phone (561)243-7091/fax (561)278-4755
shutt@ci.delray-beach.fl.us
 Attorney for Plaintiff City of Delray Beach

And

/s/

Trela J. White, Esquire
 Florida Bar No. 0323764
 Corbett and White, P.A.
 1111 Hypoluxo Road, Suite 207
 Lantana, Florida 33462-4271
 Phone (561) 586-7116/ fax (561)586-9611
trela@corbettandwhite.com
 Attorney for Plaintiff Town of Manalapan

And

/s/

Max R. Lohman, Esquire
Florida Bar No. 0715451
Corbett and White, P.A.
1111 Hypoluxo Road, Suite 207
Lantana, Florida 33462-4271
Phone (561)586-7116/ fax (561)586-9611
max@corbettandwhite.com
Attorney for Plaintiff City of Palm Beach Gardens

And

/s/

Glen J. Torcivia, Esquire
Florida Bar No. 343374
Torcivia & Associates, P.A.
Northpoint Corporate Center
701 Northpoint Pkwy, Suite 209
West Palm Beach, Florida 33407
Phone (561)686-8700/ fax (561)686-8764
glen@torcivialaw.com
Attorney for Plaintiff Town of Highland Beach

And

/s/

Kenneth G. Spillias, Esquire
Florida Bar No. 253480
Lewis Longman & Walker
515 N. Flagler Drive, Suite 1500
West Palm Beach, Florida 33401-4327
Phone (561)640-0820/ fax (561)640-8202
kspillias@llw-law.com
Attorney for Town of Ocean Ridge

And

/s/

Diana Grub Frieser, City Attorney
Florida Bar No. 837921
City of Boca Raton
201 W. Palmetto Park Road
Boca Raton, Florida 33432-3730
Phone 561-393-7716 Fax 561-393-7780
dgfrieser@ci.boca-raton.fl.us
Attorney for Plaintiff City of Boca Raton