1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	rcastro-silva@counsel.lacounty.gov LAUREN M. BLACK (SBN 192302), Assistant County Counsel ANA WAI-KWAN LAI (State Bar No. 257931), Senior Deputy County Counsel 500 West Temple Street, Suite 468 Los Angeles, California 90012 Tel.: (213) 974-1830 Fax: (213) 626-7446 BYRON J. MCLAIN (SBN 257191) bmclain@foley.com FOLEY & LARDNER, LLP 555 South Flower Street, Suite 3300 Los Angeles, California 90071 Tel.: (310) 972-4500 Fax: (213) 486-0065	
9 10 11 12 13	LOUIS R. MILLER (SBN 54141) smiller@millerbarondess.com MIRA HASHMALL (SBN 216842) MILLER BARONDESS, LLP 1999 Avenue of the Stars, Suite 1000 Los Angeles, California 90067 Tel.: (310) 552-4400 Fax: (310) 552-8400	
14 15	Attorneys for Defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES	
16 17 18	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, WESTERN DIVISION	
19 20 21	LA ALLIANCE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, et al., Plaintiffs,	CASE NO. 2:20-cv-02291 DOC-KES DEFENDANT COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES' NOTICE OF
22	V.	MOTION AND MOTION TO DISMISS FIRST AMENDED COMPLAINT
23 24 25	CITY OF LOS ANGELES, et al., Defendants.	Date: January 24, 2022 Time: 8:30 a.m. Place: Courtroom 9D
25		Trace. Cournoum 3D

542564.3

26

27

28

Case No. 2:20-cv-02291 DOC-KES

Assigned to the Hon. David O. Carter and Magistrate Judge Karen E. Scott

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, pursuant to Rules 12(b)(1) and 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Defendant Los Angeles County ("County") hereby moves to dismiss all claims asserted by Plaintiffs in the First Amended Complaint against the County for lack of subject matter jurisdiction and for failure to state a claim. This Motion is set for hearing on January 24, 2022, at 8:30 a.m., before the Honorable David O. Carter in the United States District Court, Central District of California, Western Division, located at 411 West Fourth Street, Courtroom 9D, Santa Ana, California 92701-4516.

The Motion is well-taken. Under Rule 12(b)(1), dismissal for lack of subject matter jurisdiction should be granted because Plaintiffs have not sufficiently alleged Article III standing to assert their claims against the County. Plaintiffs have not alleged cognizable injuries that are "fairly traceable" to the alleged conduct of the County. Plaintiffs' claims are also not redressable because the broad and unmanageable injunction that they seek cannot be issued by this Court, as doing so would violate the separation of powers. The Court's Article III power does not permit intrusive intervention into legislative prerogatives about how to spend limited resources to serve the public. Plaintiffs raise generalized grievances, not an injury sufficient to confer standing.

In addition, under Rule 12(b)(6), Plaintiffs have not stated any of their federal or state law claims against the County. Plaintiffs assert federal claims against the County under 42 U.S.C. section 1983 and allege violations of the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution. But these claims fail because Plaintiffs have not alleged that (1) the County discriminated against Plaintiffs with deliberate indifference, (2) the County infringed on any constitutionally cognizable right of Plaintiffs without adequate process, (3) the County affirmatively placed any Plaintiff in imminent risk of bodily harm, or had a special relationship with them, or (4) the County could be liable, even if any of the above had been alleged, because 542564.3 Case No. 2:20-cv-02291 DOC-KES

the harm was caused by an official County policy, practice or custom under Monell.

Plaintiffs have added the County to their disability discrimination claims under the California Disabled Persons Act, the Americans with Disabilities Act, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act, all stemming from sidewalk blockages by homeless encampments that allegedly impeded Plaintiffs Van Scoy's and Suarez's free passage by wheelchair. But the FAC alleges no new facts showing that any of the challenged sidewalk obstruction occurred on County property. And Plaintiffs do not—and cannot—allege that the obstructed City sidewalks constitute a County "program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance," as required to state a Section 504 claim. The federal disability claims also fail for the independent reason that Plaintiffs Van Scoy and Suarez have not alleged that they were prevented from using sidewalks "by reason of their disabilities."

Plaintiffs' state law claims fail as well. Plaintiffs cannot invoke state statutes that grant the County *discretion* over how to spend funds and provide services to combat homelessness, and they have failed to plead the essential elements of their claims in any event. The negligence claim fails because Plaintiffs do not allege any breach of a statutory duty by the County. The nuisance claim fails because Plaintiffs do not allege any nuisance that was created by the County. Indeed, Plaintiffs admit the County has made significant efforts to abate the issues where it has authority to do so. Further, the common law claims fail for an additional reason—the County and its policy-making officials are immune from suit under the California Government Code.

This Motion is made following the conference of counsel pursuant to L.R. 7-3 that took place on November 23, 2021. (Declaration of Mira Hashmall ¶ 37 & Ex. 36.) This Motion is based on this Notice, the accompanying Memorandum of Points and Authorities, the Declaration of Mira Hashmall and exhibits attached thereto, the Request for Judicial Notice, the pleadings and records on file in this action, and any further evidence or argument received by the Court in connection with the Motion.

S42564.3

Case No. 2:20-cv-02291 DOC-KES

DATED: December 3, 2021 MILLER BARONDESS, LLP By: /s/ Mira Hashmall MIRA HASHMALL Attorneys for Defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES Attorneys at Law 1999 Avenue of The Stars, Suite 1000 Los Angeles, California 90067 MILLER BARONDESS, LLP Tel: (310) 552-4400 FAX: (310) 552-8400 542564.3 Case No. 2:20-cv-02291 DOC-KES