

Wendel, Rosen, Black & Dean, LLP
1111 Broadway, 24th Floor
Oakland, California 94604-2047

1 Daniel Rapaport (Bar No. 67217)
2 **WENDEL, ROSEN, BLACK & DEAN, LLP**
3 1111 Broadway, 24th Floor
4 Oakland, California 94607-4036
5 Telephone: (510) 834-6600
6 Fax: (510) 834-1928

7 Alan E. Walcher (Bar No. 089717)
8 **EPSTEIN, BECKER & GREEN, P.C.**
9 1875 Century Park East, Suite 500
10 Los Angeles, California 90067-2506
11 Telephone: (310) 556-8861

12 Attorneys for Defendants
13 **PACIFICA FOUNDATION, et al.**

14 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
15 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

16 THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF)
17 CALIFORNIA, ex rel. CAROL SPOONER,)
18 KURT GUERDRUM, ARTURO GRIFFITHS,)
19 AMBURN R. HAGUE, LEIGH HAUTER,)
20 PATRICIA HEFFLEY, BARBARA)
21 MacQUIDDY, RICK POTHOFF, CHARLES)
22 P.H. SCURICH, RONALD SWART,)
23 individually and on behalf of PACIFICA)
24 FOUNDATION,)

25 Plaintiffs,)

26 vs.)

27 PACIFICA FOUNDATION, a California non-)
28 profit public benefit corporation and charitable)
trust, MARY FRANCES BERRY, JUNE)
MAKELA, FRANK MILLSPAUGH, ANDREA)
CISCO, KEN FORD, ROB ROBINSON,)
DAVID ACOSTA, MICHAEL PALMER,)
ROBERT FARRELL, AARON KRIEGEL,)
PETER BRAMSON, KAROLYN VAN)
PUTTEN, TOMAS MORAN, WENDELL)
JOHNS, LESLIE CAGAN, VALRIE)
CHAMBERS, BERTRAM LEE, BETH)
LYONS, JOHN MURDOCK, LYNN)
CHADWICK, and DOES 1-100, inclusive,)

Defendants.)

Case No. C 00 3815 WHA

**MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND
AUTHORITIES IN SUPPORT OF
FOUNDATION'S MOTION TO
DISMISS**

Date: November 30, 2000
Time: 8:00 a.m.
Dept: 9
Judge: Hon. William H. Alsup

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

- I. INTRODUCTION..... 1
- II. THE STANDARD FOR A MOTION TO DISMISS.....2
- III. THE PLAINTIFFS’ CLAIMS ARE PREEMPTED BY FEDERAL LAW.....3
 - A. Plaintiffs Seek to Change the Substance and Style of the Programming Aired by the Foundation’s Stations and to Thereby Achieve De Facto Control of the Foundation’s Broadcast Licenses..... 3
 - B. Review of Programming and Determinations Regarding Who Should Control Broadcasting Licenses are the Function of the FCC..... 5
 - C. Because the Plaintiffs’ State Law Claims Seek to Address Issues Solely within the Purview of the FCC, they Are Preempted by Federal Law..... 8
 - D. Plaintiffs’ Claims That Seek to Give the Local Advisory Boards Control over the Foundation Are Preempted by the Public Broadcasting Act (“PBA”), and, Under the Provisions of the PBA, Lack Any Merit..... 11
- IV. PLAINTIFFS LACK STANDING TO BRING THIS ACTION AS RELATORS..... 12
 - A. The Complaint Before this Court is Void as it is Substantially Different From the Complaint Approved by the Attorney General..... 12
 - B. Counts Two Through Ten Must Be Dismissed Because the Attorney General Lacks Authority to Grant Relator Status for These Causes of Action..... 15
- V. PLAINTIFFS’ CLAIMS AGAINST THE FOUNDATION DEFENDANT DIRECTORS MUST BE DISMISSED BECAUSE THE CONDUCT ALLEGED IS PROTECTED BY THE BUSINESS JUDGMENT RULE..... 17
- VI. THE PLAINTIFFS’ CLAIMS AGAINST THE INDIVIDUAL FOUNDATION DEFENDANTS MUST BE DISMISSED AS THE PLAINTIFFS DID NOT, PRIOR TO BRINGING THIS ACTION, FILE A VERIFIED PETITION SEEKING JUDICIAL LEAVE TO PROCEED AGAINST THOSE DEFENDANTS..... 20
- VII. THE CLAIM FOR AN ACCOUNTING (COUNT SIX) MUST BE DISMISSED BECAUSE PLAINTIFFS: (1) LACK STANDING AND (2) DO NOT ALLEGE THAT THEY MADE THE REQUISITE DEMAND FOR AN ACCOUNTING ON THE FOUNDATION..... 21
 - A. Because They are Neither Corporate Members nor Directors of the Foundation, the Plaintiffs Lack Standing to Seek an Accounting..... 21
 - B. Plaintiffs Do Not Allege that they Made a Demand for an Accounting to the Foundation..... 22

Wendel, Rosen, Black & Dean, LLP
1111 Broadway, 24th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-4036

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

VIII. ESTABLISHED AUTHORITY UNDERCUTS THE PLAINTIFFS' CLAIMS
THAT "LISTENER-SPONSORS" HAVE A LEGAL RIGHT TO PLAY A ROLE
IN THE SELECTION OF LAB REPRESENTATIVES AND IN THE
NOMINATION OR ELECTION OF DIRECTORS OF THE FOUNDATION.....24

IX. CONCLUSION24

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

FEDERAL CASES

Associated Gen. Contractors of America v. Metropolitan Water Dist. of S. California,
159 F.3d 1178 (9th Cir. 1998)..... 3

Branch v. Tunnell,
14 F.3d 449, 453 (9th Cir. 1994)..... 3

Citizens Comm. to Save WEFM v. FCC,
506 F.2d 246, 273 (D.C. Cir. 1974) 7

Cooper v. Pickett,
137 F.3d 616 (9th Cir. 1997)..... 3

Cox v. Shalala,
112 F.3d 151, 153 (4th Cir. 1997)..... 8

Emrich v. Touche Ross & Co.,
846 F.2d 1190, 1198 (9th Cir. 1988)..... 3

Enesco Corp. v. Price/Costco Inc.,
146 F.3d 1083, 1085 (9th Cir. 1998)..... 3

FCC v. League of Women Voters of California,
468 U.S. 364, 369-70 (1984)..... 11

Fecht v. The Price Co.,
70 F.3d 1078, 1080 n.1 (9th Cir. 1995)..... 3

Fidelity Fed. Sav. & Loan Ass'n v. De la Cuesta,
458 U.S. 141, 153 (1982) 8

In re Silicon Graphics Inc. v. McCracken,
183 F.3d 970, 990 (9th Cir. 1999)..... 17, 18

In re Stac Elecs. Sec. Litig.,
89 F.3d 1399, 1405 n.4 (9th Cir. 1996)..... 3

Johnson v. Knowles,
113 F.3d 1114, 1117 (9th Cir. 1997)..... 3

Jones v. Rath Packing Co.,
430 U.S. 519, 525 (1977) 8

M.B. Schnapper v. Foley,
667 F.2d 102, 116-17 (D.C. Cir. 1981)..... 8

Mack v. South Bay Beer Distrib., Inc.,
798 F.2d 1279, 1282 (9th Cir. 1986)..... 3

Wendel, Rosen, Black & Dean, LLP
1111 Broadway, 24th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-4036

1	<i>Massachusetts Universalist Convention v. Hildreth & Rogers Co.</i> , 183 F.2d 497, 500 (1st Cir. 1950)	8
2		
3	<i>Mercedes v. FCC</i> , 539 F.2d 732 (D.C. Cir. 1976)	7
4	<i>Mishler v. Clift</i> , 191 F.3d 998 (9th Cir. 1999).....	3
5		
6	<i>National Ass'n for Advancement of Psychoanalysis v. California Bd. of Psychology</i> , No. 99-15243, 2000 WL 1434626, *3 (9th Cir. Sept. 29, 2000)	3
7	<i>National Broadcasting Company v. United States</i> , 319 U.S. 190, 217 (1943).....	6
8		
9	<i>Office of Communication of the United Church of Christ v. FCC</i> , 359 F.2d 994 (D.C. Cir. 1966)	7
10	<i>Oscar v. University Students Co-op. Assoc.</i> , 965 F.2d 783, 785 (9th Cir. 1992).....	3
11		
12	<i>Pacific Gas & Elec. Co. v. State Energy Resources Conservation & Dev. Comm'n</i> , 461 U.S. 190, 204 (1983)	8
13	<i>Radio Station WOW, Inc. v. Johnson</i> , 326 U.S. 120 (1945)	9
14		
15	<i>Regents of University System of Georgia</i> , 338 U.S. 586 (1950)	9, 10
16	<i>Simmons v. FCC</i> , 169 F.2d 670 (D.C. Cir. 1948)	6
17		
18	<i>Warshaw v. Xoma Corp.</i> , 74 F.3d 955, 957 (9th Cir. 1996).....	2
19		
20	STATE CASES	
21	<i>Aronson v. Lewis</i> , 473 A.2d 805, 812 (Del. 1984).....	18
22	<i>Barnes v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.</i> , 20 Cal. Rptr. 2d 87, 95 (1993)	17
23	<i>Blackburn v. Doubleday Broadcasting Co., Inc.</i> , 353 N.W.2d 550 (Minn. 1984).....	10
24		
25	<i>Brehm v. Eisner</i> , 746 A.2d 244, 253 (Del. 2000).....	18
26	<i>City of Fresno v. People ex rel. Fresno Firefighters, IAFF Local 753</i> , 83 Cal. Rptr. 2d 603, 609 (1999)	15
27		
28		

