

# Memo

**To:** Mayor Moore and Town Council Members  
**Cc:** Kirk Blouin, Town Manager  
**From:** Joanne M. O'Connor  
**Date:** March 4, 2025  
**Re:** Litigation Status Report – March 2025

This report provides a brief summary of litigation against the Town that is pending as of March 1, 2025 and that concluded in the preceding quarter.

## PENDING LITIGATION

### 1. Paramount Litigation

WEG Paramount LLC has challenged the Town Council's July 15, 2024 Development Order denying its application for Special Exceptions with Site Plan Review by invoking an alternative dispute resolution process available under the Florida Land Use and Environmental Resolution Act, Fla. Stat. 70.51 ("FLUEDRA"), a part of the Bert Harris Act. FLUEDRA has been in effect for 15 years. It operates under the guidance of a special magistrate in a two-stage process by which the special magistrate (1) acts as a mediator charged with facilitating a resolution between the property owner and the government entity and (2) acts more like an administrative law judge who holds a public hearing(s) and then issues recommended findings of fact and conclusions of law that the developer and the Town can ultimately accept, modify or reject. The process may not continue longer than 165 days, unless the parties agree otherwise.

The Division of Administrative Hearings assigned Special Magistrate Francine Ffolkes to this matter. On November 14, 2024, the proceeding was mediated to an impasse.

The FLUEDRA hearing was initially set for February 5. Citing the purpose of the FLUEDRA statute, to encourage property owners and local governments to explore mutually acceptable alternatives to the development order at issue, WEG Paramount, LLC moved to continue the February 5 hearing. The Town did not oppose this continuance, which the Magistrate Judge granted on December 27, 2024.

A status conference is set before the Magistrate Judge on **April 3, 2025**.

FLUEDRA tolls the time for the developer to pursue other litigation against the Town. WEG Paramount LLC filed a "Protective Petition for Certiorari" against the Town appealing the Town Council's decision. That Petition has been stayed by order of the Court and agreement of the parties.

### 2. *Simon Taylor v Town of Palm Beach, et al*, Case No:

502024CA004394XXXXAMB AF (15<sup>th</sup> Jud. Cir. in and for Palm Beach Cnty, Fla.).

At the beginning of August, Mr. Taylor served a Public Records Act lawsuit for records concerning the Royal Poinciana Playhouse. The Town had charged Mr. Taylor a service fee to search for, review and produce responsive records. At the time he filed suit, Mr. Taylor had not paid the fee and the Town therefore had not produced records. The Town **moved to dismiss** the lawsuit; that motion has been set for hearing on **February 24, 2025**. Mr. Taylor has subsequently paid the

fee and the Town produced records, with Mr. Taylor failing to identify any responsive records not produced.

### **3. Form 6 Litigation**

By Resolution 005-2024, the Town Council authorized participation by the Town and any elected officials that wished to participate in lawsuits seeking a declaration that the provisions of Section § 112.144(1)(d), Florida Statutes that require municipal elected officials to file Form 6 financial disclosure forms is unconstitutional and invalid. The Town, Mayor Moore and all the Town Council members have elected to participate. The law firm of Weiss Serota Helfman Cole & Bierman has filed two separate lawsuits against the members of the Florida Commission on Ethics, which is the agency charged with implementing and enforcing the State's financial disclosure laws:

1. **The Federal Form 6 Suit:** *Loper v. Lukis*, Case No. 1:24-cv-20604 (S.D. Fla.). This suit is brought only on behalf of the elected officials, asserting that the Form 6 requirement compels content-based, non-commercial speech in violation of the First Amendment to the United States Constitution.

On June 10, 2024, after an evidentiary hearing in April, U.S. District Judge Melissa Damian preliminarily enjoined the operation of the Form 6 requirement set forth in SB 774 until otherwise ordered. The parties have filed cross motions for summary judgment, which are pending and awaiting a determination from the judge whether she will hold a hearing or rule on the papers.

2. **The State Form 6 Suit:** *Loper v. Lukis*, filed in the Circuit Court of the Second Judicial Circuit in and for Leon County, Fla. This suit is brought on behalf of the municipalities and elected officials, asserting that the Form 6 requirement violates the right to privacy under the Florida Constitution. The case was assigned to a new judge and a motion to dismiss is pending.

### **4. Midtown Beach: Private Property Rights Challenges.**

a. **George A. Cloutier, Tiffany Dawn Cloutier v Town of Palm Beach**, Case No: 502022CA003744XXXXMB AN (15<sup>th</sup> Jud. Cir. in and for Palm Beach Cnty, Fla.).

b. **The Condominium Association of Ocean Towers, Inc. and Warden House Association, Inc. v Town of Palm Beach**, Case No: 502022CA005042XXXXMB AO (15<sup>th</sup> Jud. Cir. in and for Palm Beach Cnty, Fla.)

Residents who own oceanfront property between Sunrise Avenue and Wells Road sued the Town in 2022. These residents own parcels that encompass a portion of the dry sand beach upland of the Erosion Control Line ("ECL") that was recorded on January 7, 2003 (the State holds title to land seaward of the ECL).

Plaintiffs ask the Circuit Court to declare their respective property rights in the beach areas and their ability to post the boundaries of their private beach areas with post and rope and "no trespassing" signs. They have also alleged that the Town's failure to enforce trespass ordinances—including as to persons using their beach areas for traditional beach uses, such as sunbathing and dog walking—constitutes a temporary "taking" of their property without compensation.

The Town has asserted numerous defenses, including that the additional sand added to Plaintiffs' private beach areas upland of the ECL following publicly funded beach renourishments are "subject to a public easement for traditional uses of the sandy beach" pursuant to Florida law. Fla. Stat. § 161.141.

Following a three-hour hearing before Judge Scott Kerner on July 9, Judge Kerner denied Plaintiffs' motions for summary judgment against the Town. The Town's responses to those motions were supported by extensive testimony from current and former residents and from Town staff. The Town sought judgment in its favor on the takings claim, which the Court also denied.

The case is presently set on a non-jury trial docket from March 10, 2025 through May 2, 2025. However, Plaintiffs' have filed several motions directed to our affirmative defenses and sought hearing time on those motions. The Court has no available hearing time and has indicated that the case will not be heard on the current docket.

**5. *State of Florida ex rel. Virginia E. Dadey, Gregory J. Englesbe and Peter Kaupe v Town of Palm Beach***, Case No: 502022CA008479XXXMB Al (15<sup>th</sup> Jud. Cir. in and for Palm Beach Cnty, Fla.). Town residents in the 200 Block of Atlantic Avenue challenge the status of the beach access at the east end of Atlantic Avenue. Certain owners in the 100 Block of Atlantic Avenue asserted a private ownership right to the access point based on a recorded plat. In December 2020, the Town publicly announced that it agreed with this determination. The 100 Block owners have locked the access at Atlantic Avenue.

Plaintiffs bring two-counts: (1) a claim to abate a purported public nuisance (the gate and any other obstructions of the access); and (2) a claim that the Town has violated the Public Records Act. As to the first claim, Plaintiffs rely on a statute that provides for dedication of public roadways to assert that title to the beach access became vested in the Town. The Town has asserted numerous defenses, including that Plaintiffs failed to join the 100 Block owners, who are indispensable parties.

The Town moved for summary judgment on Count I regarding the ownership rights to the Atlantic Avenue beach access and a hearing was held on that motion on January. The Court held a hearing on that motion on **January 24, 2025**. The Court asked the parties to submit proposed orders, which they did by February 15. The motion on Count I is now under advisement and awaiting a ruling.

The case will be determined by the Court, either at summary judgment or a non-jury trial. No trial date has been set.

## **CONCLUDED LITIGATION**

**1. *Robert F. Greenhill v. Town of Palm Beach***, Case No. 502023CA002478 (15<sup>th</sup> Jud. Cir. in and for Palm Beach Cnty., Fla.) (Appellate Division): This appeal filed by Mr. Greenhill challenges the designation of his property at 686 Island Drive as a historic landmark.

On December 11, 2025, the Circuit Court Appellate Division **upheld** the Town's landmarking decision. Mr. Greenhill asked the Appellate Division to issue a written opinion so it might seek review in the Fourth District, but the Appellate Division denied that request.

This matter is now finally concluded in the Town's favor.

**2. *Thomas O. McCarthy v. Town of Palm Beach***, Case No. 502023CA012789 (15<sup>th</sup> Jud. Cir. in and for Palm Beach Cnty., Fla.) (Appellate Division): This is an appeal by neighbors challenging the Town's grant of variances to permit the rehabilitation of a two-story accessory

structure designated as a historically significant building to be raised 16 inches and to increase the first-floor ceiling height from 7 to 8 feet.

On December 11, 2024, the Circuit Court Appellate Division upheld the Town's grant of the variances. Mr. McCarthy attempted to seek further review from the Fourth District Court of Appeals by a second-tier petition for certiorari, which petition was denied on January 13, 2025.

This matter has now been finally concluded in the Town's favor.