By: Tammy Tolman Filed: 5/2/2024 3:46 PM

REPORTER'S RECORD 1 VOLUME 1 OF 1 VOLUMES 2 3 TRIAL COURT CAUSE NO. 2023-62583 4 5 AZAEL SEPULVEDA IN THE DISTRICT COURT 6 VS. HARRIS COUNTY, TEXAS 7 CITY OF PASADENA, TEXAS, ET.) 190TH JUDICIAL DISTRICT 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 HEARING 15 16 17 18 19 20 On the 29th day of April, 2024, the following 21 proceedings came on to be held in the above-titled and 22 numbered cause before the HONORABLE BEAU ALAN MILLER, 23 Judge Presiding, held in Houston, Harris County, 24 Texas. Proceedings reported by computerized stenotype 25 machine.

```
1
                      APPEARANCES
 2
     Ms. Diana Simpson
 3
     INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE
     901 North Glebe Road, Suite 900
     Arlington, VA 22203
 4
     Telephone: (703) 682-9320
 5
     E-mail: diana.simpson@ij.org
     Attorney for Plaintiff
 6
 7
     Mr. Arif Panju
     SBOT NO. 24070380
 8
     INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE
     816 Congress Avenue, Suite 970
 9
     Austin, TX 78701
     Telephone: (512) 480-5936
10
     E-mail: apanju@ij.org
     Attorney for Plaintiff
11
12
     Mr. Justin Pearson
     INSTITUTE FOR JUSTICE
13
     2 South Biscayne Blvd., Suite 3180
     Miami, FL 33131
14
     Telephone: (305) 721-1600
     E-mail: jpearson@ij.org
     Attorney for Plaintiff
15
16
     Mr. William S. Helfand
17
     SBOT NO. 09388250
     Mr. Justin Pfeiffer
18
     LEWIS BRISBOIS BISGAARD & SMITH, LLP
19
     24 Greenway Plaza, Suite 1400
     Houston, TX 77046
20
     Telephone: (713) 659-6767
     E-mail: bill.helfand@lewisbrisbois.com
21
     Attorney for Defendant
22
23
     Mr. Jay Dale
     CITY OF PASADENA
24
     Telephone: (713) 475-5515
25
```

1	INDEX - HEARING	
2	April 29, 2024	
3	VOLUME 1 OF 1 VOLUMES	
4		
5		
6	PAGE	
7		
8	PROCEEDINGS 4	
9		
10	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE	
11		
12	*****	
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: Okay. Let's go on the record in Cause No. 2023-62583, Sepulveda versus City 3 of Pasadena. 4 Counsel, make your appearances. 5 6 MS. SIMPSON: Diana Simpson on behalf of 7 Azael Sepulveda, along with Arif Panju and Justin 8 Pearson. MR. HELFAND: Bill Helfand and Justin 9 10 Pfeiffer, along with the city attorney, Jay Dale. 11 THE COURT: Okay. We're back here on a 12 plea to the jurisdiction, but sort of a status updated 13 as far as immediate settlement agreement and what 14 actions are being taken to -- to resolve this issue so that we can just move past this. 15 16 And I've asked the city attorney to --17 to make his presence, which is great. Thank you, welcome. 18 19 And we're going through, there's a 20 letter that was given to me. I guess it's filed, too? 21 MR. HELFAND: It's not filed, 22 Your Honor. We -- we sent it in accordance with 23 Your Honor's instructions that we confer in advance of 24 coming back here. 25 THE COURT: Now that I've seen it, it

```
needs to get filed on the record.
1
 2
                   MR. HELFAND: I'll file it, Judge.
                    THE COURT: And matching that was also
 3
     the mediated settlement agreement in Case
 4
     No. 2021-80180.
 5
                          So we were talking about the
 6
 7
     various requirements of the mediated settlement
 8
     agreement and those articulated in the letter that's
 9
     yet to be filed.
                   So specifically No. 1, which is the
10
11
     engineering drawings that provide for seven parking
12
     spaces. I would assume that they -- he still has to
13
     comply with the local ordinances as well?
14
                   MS. SIMPSON:
                                  So Your Honor, it's --
15
     it's the city council approved the settlement
16
     agreement. And the settlement agreement --
                               I know, which is why they
17
                    THE COURT:
     filed a plea to the jurisdiction, and that's why I'm
18
19
     looking at the city attorney and saying, I don't think
20
     if you file a mediated settlement agreement, it gets
21
     you out of responsibility for follow -- following
22
     through with the agreement. I think it'd be really
23
     bad public policy for a city or whatever entity to
24
     enter into a settlement agreement to get out of a case
25
     and then turn back around and say, We're not going to
```

```
do it because we're immune.
1
                   So on those basis, you agree with me,
 2
     right?
 3
                   MR. DALE: Yes, sir.
 4
 5
                    THE COURT: I mean, I think that any
 6
     agreement that the City of Pasadena would enter into
 7
     making this argument in this court would be -- cause
 8
     great reluctance on anybody else to enter into an
 9
     agreement in the future, right?
10
                   MR. DALE: Sure.
11
                    THE COURT: So I'm going to deny this
12
     plea jurisdiction.
                   Are you going to withdraw this plea to
13
14
     the jurisdiction. Are you going to withdraw the plea
15
     to the jurisdiction?
16
                   MR. HELFAND:
                                  I'm not going to withdraw
17
     it, Your Honor, but do appreciate the Court were to
18
     enter an order denying it.
19
                    THE COURT:
                               I'm going to deny it because
20
     I think you are in agreement that it's a bad public
21
     policy as well --
22
                   MR. DALE: Well --
23
                    THE COURT: -- so...
24
                   MR. DALE: I just would qualify that
25
     slightly, Your Honor. It's just an issue of following
```

```
the ordinance of the City.
1
 2
                   THE COURT: Well, no, that's -- but
     we're back to that now, right? So the plea to the
 3
     jurisdiction was that the Court has no jurisdiction
 4
 5
     because the City is immune from certain agreements, I
 6
     guess. And what -- what they are saying is that in
 7
     this case, a mediated settlement agreement by --
 8
     entered into by the City of Pasadena, that y'all
 9
     weren't going to honor because you're immune from
10
     that.
11
                   MR. HELFAND:
                                 That's not our position.
12
     Our position is the City intends to honor it as
13
     written, but the Plaintiff hasn't complied with his
14
     obligations under the agreement.
15
                               That's what you're telling
                   THE COURT:
16
              It wasn't what I was told last time.
17
     why I'm denying the plea to the jurisdiction because
18
     you -- the Court has jurisdiction because you-all
19
     entered in an agreement.
20
                   MR. HELFAND: I understand the Court's
21
     ruling. Thank you, Judge.
22
                   THE COURT: Okay. So let's move
23
     forward.
24
                   MS. SIMPSON:
                                 So Your Honor, the -- our
25
     client submitted a site plan application. And under
```

the City Code, that is the first step in a certificate of occupancy application. And the reason that he submitted that is to get the City's approval before he goes out and spends the money to pave all of this property and add the bollards, which they're all considerable expenses, and he's a -- he's an entrepreneur. He's trying to make ends meet while having to pay for a mortgage and a lease to -- to basically operate at -- at two places while this dispute has been pending.

And so he -- he submitted the site plan application, including engineering -- engineering drawings, the whole nine yards. He then gets a response from the City that says, We're going to deny this for reasons that are already included in the settlement agreement that we would actually grant it for, right? So -- so you can't have those seven spots because they conflict with our drive aisle width and our setback requirements.

And we reached a settlement agreement that said we could have seven spots. And so if the City was concerned about drive aisle width and setback requirements, then it shouldn't have put that in the settlement agreement to begin with. It shouldn't have then later tried to shoehorn in these extra

requirements through the certificate of occupancy application.

He's just going through the -- the -the provisions of the code that say, first step, site
plan application. If the site plan application hasn't
been approved, he can't submit a certificate of
occupancy application. That's under Section 28-66 of
the City Code. And so he's done the first step.

The City has said no. And the City has said no for reasons that conflict with the settlement agreement. There was quite a bit of back and forth between us before we came back and -- and filed a petition asking the Court for relief under this breach and for the -- the new constitutional claims.

THE COURT: My understanding of this is -- we've had this hearing, like, a week or two ago, and I've had a lot of cases since then. Was that he originally wanted 10 spots, right? And he -- he reduced it down to seven; is that right?

MS. SIMPSON: So originally -- this property had been used as an auto -- an auto machine shop for about 30 years. A long amount of time. Give or take on those years. And it had just five spots, and there -- this was not a problem for all of those years. He then buys the property, and the City says,

Actually, you need to add 23 more spots in order to comply with our parking requirements.

Well, 23 spots doesn't physically fit.

It is -- it is actually impossible to comply with.

And so there was quite a bit of back and forth with the City at that point. The City then stopped responding to his -- his attorney's e-mails, and that wasn't -- that wasn't us at the time. But he -- he then filed a case bringing due course of the law, equal protection and a procedural due process claim saying, Look, I'm just trying to open. The City won't let me.

We then won that case and reached the settlement agreement that said you can open with seven spots. And seven spots, he's willing to do that. You know, it's still more than was fine for -- for many, many years. It's more than he needs for his own business, but he's willing to -- to do that because he just wants to open. He doesn't want to continue fighting with the City about, you know, exactly how many spots are there. He just wants to open and - and operate his auto machine -- or his -- his auto repair shop at an auto machine shop's previous location.

THE COURT: But I don't read in this

```
mediated settlement agreement, it doesn't seem like
1
 2
     that would -- just paragraph (a) of 1 doesn't get him
 3
     out of the other requirements of the ordinances.
     if you're going to -- if you're going to make these
 4
 5
     spots, then it has to apply to the other parts of the
 6
     ordinances, right? It doesn't except the ordinances
     out there. It's -- it's -- I think it's 7 versus 23
 7
 8
     versus 5. Is there a problem with -- with complying
 9
     with the city ordinance?
                   MS. SIMPSON:
10
                                 They're physically
11
     impossible to do. It is not possible to have the
12
     parking spots and the drive aisle width that the City
     is demanding and the setback. In addition, the
13
14
     setback requirement, which is also part of the City
15
     Code, conflicts with the settlement agreement because
16
     the settlement agreement says it has to be paved from
17
     property line to the shed. You can't have it be paved
18
     from the property line to the shed and also have
19
     setback.
20
                   THE COURT:
                               So there's an impossibility
                 Does that make sense --
21
     situation.
22
                   MR. HELFAND: No, Judge --
23
                   THE COURT: -- to you-all?
24
                   MR. HELFAND: -- we're kind of venturing
25
     into an area here where you're hearing allegations,
```

not evidence. And I -- I -- I --1 2 THE COURT: Right. MR. HELFAND: -- want to be clear that 3 that's good advocacy, but it's not accurate. 4 5 Let me start with the fact that one --6 one says that the agreement is, the City will issue a 7 certificate of occupancy upon completion of the following conditions. And I think if we've 8 9 established anything, Plaintiff's counsel has admitted, none of those conditions have been completed 10 11 as required under the agreement. 12 If -- if the argument now is it's impossible to do something, but to the extent the 13 14 agreement's enforceable against the City, it's 15 enforceable against the Plaintiff, and he made that 16 agreement. First of all, it's not impossible. 17 it's not -- it's not something that the Plaintiff can 18 now say, Well, I made an agreement, but I knew all 19 along I couldn't do it. 20 In fact, the requirement to pave the 21 property is -- it does not create an issue of 22 impossibility. He can go pave it. But he hasn't even 23 created the seven parking spots. He hasn't created a 24 situation in which cars parked on the property are not 25 backing out into the right-of-way, which is obviously

an ordinance that's important to safety. He's not paved -- he's not paved the -- the floor of the shed with concrete that I'm aware of. And he hasn't put any bollards out there. That's just number one.

I mean, here's what I want to be clear,

Judge, and to the extent that the Court finds reason
to deny the plea based upon the existence of the
agreement, I won't quarrel with Your Honor's ruling.

That's Your Honor's ruling. I respect that. I may
disagree with it, but I may -- I certainly respect

Your Honor's authority to make the ruling.

But this agreement was written to track the ordinances that are required to open this property; in other words, the reason the city council approved it was because it was represented to council. I know that this is not going to require any significant deviation from the same ordinances that apply to everyone else.

And so what Mr. Sepulveda is saying is,
I agreed to comply with the City's ordinances. But
now as counsel's saying, I haven't done that yet. But
I still want to sue over that.

THE COURT: I think she's saying it's impossible to do it, and that the mediated settlement agreement takes them out of the ordinances. What's --

```
what's required to pass a city ordinance?
1
 2
                   MR. HELFAND: Well, it depends on which
 3
     ordinance we're talking about, Judge, but 1(a)
     through (d) are required under the ordinance.
 4
 5
     landscaping ordinance is under No. 2.
 6
                   THE COURT:
                               No, just generally speaking,
 7
     what's the legislative process for passing the
     ordinance?
 8
 9
                   MR. HELFAND:
                                 Oh, well, I'm sorry.
                                                        So
10
     an individual complies with the requirements of the
11
     ordinance, and then they ask for an inspection from --
12
                   THE COURT: No, no, no. Even more
13
     basic. I want to pass Ordinance No. 1 that says X.
14
                   MR. HELFAND:
                                 Right.
15
                               Right? How does -- how do
                   THE COURT:
16
     you pass that ordinance?
17
                   MR. HELFAND: Oh, you mean to enact the
18
     ordinance? Oh, right. It's presented to council.
19
     it's -- there's a public posting of the intent to
20
     consider passing an ordinance. It's presented to
21
     council. It requires generally two readings, except
22
     in the case of an emergency, and none of these are an
23
     emergency. And council considers that, obviously, and
24
     then must vote in open session by majority twice to
25
     enact the ordinance. That's under the City's Charter.
```

```
Not all cities require a two-reading.
1
 2
                    THE COURT: Okay. Okay. That's for my
           I mean, I've got whatever, but -- so how do
 3
     they -- I assume that process wasn't followed when
 4
 5
     they adopted the agreement?
 6
                   MR. HELFAND: Yes, the agreement
 7
     required the same thing.
 8
                    THE COURT: The same thing?
 9
                   MR. HELFAND: Yes, Judge. And it had to
10
     be posted.
                 It had to be read.
11
                   Were there two readings for the
     ordinance?
12
                         I mean, everything City Council
13
14
     Pasadena does under the charter with the exception of
15
     an emergency requires two readings and two votes.
16
                    THE COURT:
                               So then there is no
     impossibility, then, in this argument because -- I
17
18
     don't know. I'm making arguments for you-all, but I'm
19
     trying to get my head around how...
20
                   MS. SIMPSON: So can I respond on the
21
     impossibility point, Your Honor?
22
                    THE COURT:
                               Yeah.
23
                   MS. SIMPSON: So it's not that the
24
     settlement agreement is impossible to comply with.
25
     It's that the City's new gloss on the settlement
```

agreement is impossible to comply with. He can add these seven parking spots. They physically fit. It's possible. It's more than enough that he needs for his business, and it's more than enough that existed before. It's that the City is now requiring new things on top of the settlement agreement that then make it impossible.

And so I -- I -- my friend here just said that -- that there's something about the landscaping requirements that are impossible, and I admit that I don't fully understand what -- what is impossible with those. But it's not that the settlement agreement is impossible, it's that the City's new interpretations are.

And the reason that we haven't -- he hasn't physically paved this property yet is because he wanted to get the site plan approved first and then the certificate of occupancy approved because that is the order of things in the City so that he could do those things before he spends tens of thousands of dollars paving the property for the City to then turn around and say, as they're doing now, There's not enough drive aisle. You can't do this.

THE COURT: I hear you.

MR. HELFAND: May I respond, Judge?

1 THE COURT: Yes.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. HELFAND: First of all, counsel must have misheard me. I didn't say there's any impossibility under this agreement at all. And if Mr. Sepulveda would do the things that he contracted to do, the City says and they stand by their willingness to grant a certificate of occupancy. Plaintiff's counsel raised impossibility under 1(b). I said that's not impossible. I -- I said -- when I misunderstood the Court's question in terms of what Mr. Sepulveda does -- must do, one of those things is also, not -- not violate the landscaping requirement. Let -- let me make one thing very clear, though, right now. Counsel is 100 percent incorrect about the order of things. Whether it's in the city of Houston, the city of Pasadena, West University Place, Southside Place, Hedwig Village, the certificate of occupancy is the last thing that is granted. One must do the work that's authorized under the permits, the engineering drawings and the construction permits. They get permission to do the They do the work. And then only when they've completed the work do they call an inspector out and say, Look, it's all done. Grant me a certificate of occupancy.

THE COURT: But isn't there another thing that comes before that, like a conditional granting of the -- of the occupancies, right?

MR. HELFAND: There's no certificate of occupancy, but there are preliminary inspections. So in other words, if somebody's putting in a foundation, like a slab foundation, somebody has to come out and approve the plumbing and electrical that runs under the foundation before the foundation can be poured. So there are preliminary determinations that this is in accordance with the plumbing plan and the City's Code for plumbing.

That's less than an issue here. But what Mr. Sepulveda's counsel just said was, he wants a certificate of occupancy, then he'll go do this work. Nobody gets that. And that's not what he agreed to. It actually said, he gets a certificate of occupancy upon completion of the following conditions.

THE COURT: So now that I've ruled on the plea, there's nothing before me, mechanism to do anything. So this becomes more of a mediation kind of thing. Is there anything that we can do to resolve this without spending more money by the City and by him and effectuate the settlement agreement in the spirit of getting thing -- getting things done?

Well, I will take anything 1 MR. HELFAND: But I 2 that Mr. Sepulveda proposes back to council. 3 anticipate, just to be completely transparent, that council is going to say, We at least want compliance 4 5 with what we both agreed to. 6 But if -- if Mr. Sepulveda has a new 7 proposal, all he has to do is send it along to me. 8 I'm happy to take it to council. 9 THE COURT: Can we -- can we round up 10 the -- the people who have to approve it all, and 11 you-all go out one time and just see what would work? 12 MR. HELFAND: Well, they can come to a 13 council meeting, but all council meetings -- any time 14 there's a quorum, council will have to be in a public 15 session. 16 THE COURT: No, but, I mean, like the 17 engineers and the folks that have to sign off on the certificates. 18 19 MR. HELFAND: Oh, well, that -- so 20 that's all private. The code inspection people can 21 sit with engineers and say, That looks right if -- if 22 you decide to do it. 23 Again, if it doesn't require a change 24 from the current agreement, then we don't have to get 25 council involved.

MS. SIMPSON: The challenge is that the City's requirements are a change from the -- from the settlement agreement. And this is a perfect issue for resolution and discovery because one of the City's officials who is kind of driving a lot of this, she's a named Defendant in the case. She was described at the temporary injunction hearing in the last case as not credible.

And this is -- this is frustrating. Oz doesn't want to just fight with the City for years and years and years. He just wants to open. And the fact is, we have a settlement agreement that says that he can open if he completes these four conditions. And so we submitted the site plan to make sure that the City would agree to these four conditions before he spends the money. And now the City is saying, We won't agree to these four conditions. There are actually additional ones. And there's all these other extra things.

And so to the extent that this fight is continuing over allegations and over fact issues, it's a perfect issue for discovery. You know, I -- I would like to kind of reraise the -- the points we made at the last hearing that instead of issuing an order denying the plea to the jurisdiction today, we would

```
appreciate if the Court would hold onto that decision
1
     until summary judgment is filed because the City, last
 2
 3
     time they -- they appealed. They took an
     interlocutory appeal and then sat on it for
 4
 5
     nine months and that harmed Oz. And I suspect that
 6
     something similar will happen this time.
 7
                   THE COURT: Well, on the record, you
 8
     have the city attorney saying that they should honor
 9
     the agreement no matter what. And --
                   MS. SIMPSON: We have a settlement
10
11
     agreement that's signed by the City.
12
                   THE COURT: I understand, but it takes
     him out of the plea to the jurisdiction.
13
14
                   MR. HELFAND: Well, Judge, just so we're
15
     clear.
             I don't think the city attorney said that
16
     they'll honor the agreement no matter what.
17
                   THE COURT: Well, no matter what, but
18
     that -- but the plea to the jurisdiction would not be
19
     pursued because the City should not be in a position
20
     where it's not going to honor --
21
                   MR. HELFAND: Well, no, the City is not
22
     committed to not pursuing the plea to the
23
     jurisdiction, Your Honor. The City is going to
24
     plea -- pursue a plea to the jurisdiction. And with
25
     all due respect to counsel's suggestion, the Court
```

```
doesn't have discretion to hold the plea to the
 1
 2
     jurisdiction.
                                Do you know why courts don't
 3
                    THE COURT:
     rule on things for a long time?
 4
 5
                   MR. HELFAND: I -- I do, Judge, but the
 6
     Court can't authorize --
 7
                    THE COURT: Do you know how many courts
 8
     wait months to rule on things all the time?
                                 If the Court chooses to do
 9
                   MR. HELFAND:
10
     that, I understand, Your Honor. That'll be the
11
     Court's decision. But Judge, the Court is not
12
     authorized to engage in the exercise of jurisdiction
     while a plea to the jurisdiction is pending.
13
14
                   MS. SIMPSON: Respectfully, Patel and
15
     Bland and several other cases from the Texas Supreme
16
     Court handled cases doing that exact same thing.
                   MR. HELFAND: I'd -- I'd rather not have
17
18
     that fight, but if that's what the Plaintiffs want to
19
     have, then we can do that, Judge.
20
                   But -- but let me suggest this in the
21
     interest of resolution back to the Court's suggestion.
22
      I keep hearing that the City's changed the
23
     conditions. I don't have anything from the Plaintiffs
24
     showing me documents identifying a change in
2.5
     condition. But if Plaintiff's counsel will send those
```

```
to me, I'm happy to look at that because the City
1
 2
     isn't changing the condition. That's one thing I can
     commit to the Court.
 3
                    THE COURT: Well, I think the city
 4
     attorney is on the record of saying that it's going to
 5
 6
     follow through with its agreements. And not
 7
     necessarily that this agreement has changed, but I
 8
     would think that a plea to the jurisdiction by the
 9
     City on this agreement would be really bad public
10
     policy.
11
                                  Understood, Judge.
                   MR. HELFAND:
                    THE COURT: And I think he said it would
12
13
     be, right?
14
                   MR. DALE:
                              Judge, I just have one
15
               Their design, they -- they want to back all
16
     the cars out into the right-of-way. That's how they
17
     want to exit the parking, and that's just unsafe.
18
                   MR. HELFAND: That's just one example of
19
     the --
20
                    THE COURT:
                                Then how did -- so I don't
     have any engineering drawings in front of me.
21
                                                     I don't
22
     have -- I don't have that kind of stuff. But was
23
     there another way that was contemplated in the
24
     mediation settlement agreement -- or in the settlement
25
     that suggests that there could be other ways of
```

```
handling the parking?
 1
 2
                   MR. HELFAND:
                                 It was contemplated,
 3
     Judge. It's in the agreement. It's -- it's that he
     will pave certain portions of the property, and that
 4
 5
     he will create parking that does not -- it
 6
     specifically says, No cars parked on the property will
 7
     be backed into the right-of-way.
 8
                    THE COURT: Well, it is there.
 9
                   MS. SIMPSON: So the right-of-way issue,
10
     Your Honor, I think is an interpretation of the phrase
11
     right-of-way. The settlement agreement does not
12
     define right-of-way. And as I said, for many years,
     this property was used with fewer parking spots than
13
14
     the City is currently requiring and not with extra
15
     land that doesn't currently exist. It was this exact
16
     lot.
                    THE COURT: So I think I can take
17
18
     judicial notice of what right-of-way means.
                   MR. HELFAND: Texas law defines
19
20
     right-of-way, Your Honor.
21
                    THE COURT: And that if you're backing
22
     up into a street that's going this way, then that's a
23
     really bad idea.
24
                   MS. SIMPSON: You don't have to.
25
     to be clear, Your Honor. You don't have to back up
```

```
into the street in order to get off of this property.
1
     There is a -- there's a street, and then there's land,
 2
 3
     and then there's -- you can back up without backing
     out into the street. Again, these are all fact issues
 4
 5
     that are -- that are, I think, great for discovery.
                               Okay. So your position is
 6
                   THE COURT:
 7
     you're going to file an appeal of the plea to the
 8
     jurisdiction, and you're going to stay the case until
     whenever?
 9
                                 Well, I don't stay the
10
                   MR. HELFAND:
11
                   Statute stays the case. But yes, that's
     case. Judge.
12
     my instruction from city council. If the court denies
     the plea, to take an interlocutory appeal.
13
14
                   THE COURT:
                               Okav. That seems like a lot
     of wasted time and money and a bad public policy
15
16
     decision on the City that the city attorney's already
17
     agreed to, but that's your position. I think that's
18
     really unfortunate for everybody involved.
19
                   MR. HELFAND:
                                 I understand, Judge.
20
     of people feel uncomfortable with governmental
21
     immunity, but it is an important tenet in law.
22
                   THE COURT:
                               Well, the real unfortunate
23
     part is that if a governmental immunity -- government
24
     entity enters into an agreement, and then hides behind
25
     maybe to not actually enforce or actually help the
```

```
enforcement of the agreement that it itself entered
1
 2
     into. So --
                   MR. HELFAND:
                                 I understand the Court's
 3
            I would offer this.
 4
     take.
 5
                   THE COURT: That's not the take, that's
 6
     what you're saying.
 7
                   MR. HELFAND: No, Judge. What I'm
 8
     saying is, if that man complied with that agreement,
 9
     he doesn't need a lawsuit. He's filed a lawsuit
     because of exactly what his lawyer said --
10
11
                   THE COURT:
                               I think there -- there are
12
     fact issues involved here as far as how it happens.
13
     And what I'm trying to do is get to a resolution of
14
     that. What you're saying in the plea to the
15
     jurisdiction is you don't have to abide by the
16
     settlement agreement.
17
                   MR. HELFAND: No, Judge. Not saying --
                   THE COURT: Well, that's what your plea
18
19
     to the jurisdiction says. It says, Judge, you have no
20
     right, no jurisdiction in order to enforce an
21
     agreement that we ourselves entered into. In fact, we
22
     made almost a public ordinance out of it because he
23
     complied with the public ordinance's way of doing it.
24
     You have two --
25
                   MR. HELFAND: Well, every -- every
```

```
council action requires the same action.
1
 2
                   THE COURT: Well, I'll -- I'll let that
 3
     be.
                   MR. HELFAND: But I do want to be clear,
 4
 5
     Judge, that the City's position is, Mr. Sepulveda
     doesn't need a lawsuit to effect the settlement
 6
 7
     agreement.
 8
                   THE COURT: Well, I don't know, but they
 9
     filed one here because of disagreements.
                                                This is
10
     where you come to work out disagreements.
                                                 Where else
11
     do you think they should go to work out disagreements?
12
                   MR. HELFAND: He -- he should comply
     with the agreement, and then he can open the business.
13
                   THE COURT: Well, that goes both ways,
14
15
     and I can't rule on that because I don't have that in
     front of me.
16
17
                   MR. HELFAND: I understand.
18
                   THE COURT: But by trying to appeal the
19
     Court's decision on a plea to the jurisdiction, which
20
     I think is interesting, you're going to hold that
21
     resolution. You're going to hold all that up which is
22
     really unfortunate, I think, both for the City and for
23
     the Plaintiff's part. And I think it's really bad
24
     public policy.
25
                   MR. HELFAND: Except, Judge, that I
```

will -- I will offer this. First of all, it's an expedited appeal. Second of all, it was the pendency of that appeal that resulted in this last settlement agreement. So that doesn't mean we can't resolve this issue.

THE COURT: Whether it's expedited or not doesn't mean it's bad public policy or not.

MR. HELFAND: I respect the Court's opinion.

THE COURT: And if -- if people get out there hearing that the City of Pasadena is not willing to actually let its agreements be litigated in court and have immunity behind that, then I think there may be an issue with somebody entering an agreement with the City to do anything. But that's up to you-all. You make those decisions. And I hope that wiser minds come out ahead, but I really hope you-all can figure this out.

But I don't think -- I think both parties have to probably give way here and get a resolution which is why I think that you get the people that have to sign off on the permits and the lawyers out there and figure out the best way to do this. I don't think anyone can stand here and be too bullyish on where the positions are. I mean, this is

not the first time this has -- this has been done by 1 2 anybody, probably. So why don't -- my recommendation is 3 that you get the people that have to approve off on 4 5 the permits and the city engineer out there. You guys 6 get out there with your own engineer and figure out 7 how to execute a plan. 8 MR. HELFAND: We can do that, Judge. 9 And we can do that while an appeal is pending. 10 MS. SIMPSON: We can also do that if 11 the -- if this Court doesn't issue a decision right 12 away on the plea to the jurisdiction which, as I said, 13 is common. I'm just -- my concern is that the City will do what it did last time, that it'll take 14 15 nine months. Not file anything with the appellate 16 court. Not respond to the appellate court's orders 17 asking for a response. Not file the reporter's 18 record. 19 Meanwhile, Oz is accumulating at least 20 \$1500 a month in damages. And he can't enforce 21 anything, can't do anything in the trial court that --22 that has jurisdiction. 23 MR. HELFAND: Well, Judge, just to be 24 clear because that's an inappropriate, pejorative

The City didn't pursue the appeal because

25

statement.

```
the parties reached an agreement.
1
                    THE COURT: I remember that.
 2
 3
                   We're going to do -- do you agree to a
     court order requiring your engineers to be out there
 4
 5
     with her engineer or his engineer?
 6
                   MR. HELFAND:
                                  I -- I can't agree to that
 7
     without council's approval, Your Honor.
 8
                    THE COURT: Everything takes council's
 9
     approval?
10
                   MR. HELFAND:
                                  No, but something like
11
     that will.
12
                    THE COURT:
                                Really?
13
                   MR. HELFAND:
                                  Yes, Judge.
                   MR. DALE: A resolution like this.
14
15
                                  It's going to require a
                   MR. HELFAND:
16
     resolution of the City.
17
                    THE COURT: To have its own engineer
18
     with the permitting people meet her engineer to
19
     effectuate the mediated settlement agreement, that
20
     takes council approval?
21
                   MR. HELFAND:
                                  We can agree to meet.
                                                          Ι
22
     can't agree to an order requiring that.
23
                    THE COURT: I don't have high hopes in
24
     you-all not doing something without an order.
25
     council has to agree to my order?
```

1	MR. HELFAND: No, the council has to					
2	authorize me to agree to an order. Your Honor can					
3	make an order if you deem it appropriate					
4	THE COURT: What power do you have here?					
5	MR. HELFAND: I have power to represent					
6	my client just like any other entity. I have to I					
7	have to talk to the entity to make a decision. So					
8	does the city attorney.					
9	But Judge, why don't you give us give					
10	us a chance to do that. As I've said, if counsel will					
11	show me what she thinks has changed, I will talk to					
12	the City promptly. If					
13	THE COURT: You you have by Friday at					
14	2 o'clock to propose an agreed order on how to					
15	effectuate this.					
16	MR. HELFAND: Judge, I will not have the					
17	ability to enter into an agreed order by Friday					
18	THE COURT: When when will the powers					
19	that be at the City of Pasadena be able to do that?					
20	MR. HELFAND: We'll need a council					
21	meeting which is next					
22	MR. DALE: First Tuesday. First and					
23	third Tuesday of the month.					
24	THE COURT: So how long do you need?					
25	MR. HELFAND: Well, I'm going I have					

```
a vacation letter on file, Judge. I'm going to be out
 1
 2
     of the country from May 6th to May 18th.
                    THE COURT: And he can't do it?
 3
                   MR. HELFAND: Probably council is going
 4
 5
     to want to hear from me, but I certainly can try it.
 6
                   MR. DALE:
                              We meet before then.
 7
                    THE COURT: What?
 8
                   MR. DALE: We -- we have a meeting that
     week for -- for the 6th.
 9
                                  I'm not here the 6th.
10
                   MR. HELFAND:
11
     mean, the city attorney can appear. If they want to
12
     hear from me, I won't be able to be there.
                    THE COURT: Well, hopefully the city
13
14
     attorney who's the elected attorney for the City will
15
     be able to do what he needs to do and is appointed --
16
                   MR. HELFAND: He's the appointed city
17
     attorney.
18
                    THE COURT: Or their own appointed city
19
     attorney will be able to do that.
20
                   MR. HELFAND: Right. Well, we can
21
     certainly give it a try.
22
                    THE COURT:
                                I hope so.
23
                   Anything else?
24
                   MR. DALE: Judge, I had one comment.
25
     Just to give some context. We had prior litigation,
```

```
and we had the -- the mediated settlement agreement.
1
 2
     And we paid in settlement 10,000. And we assumed --
     we didn't direct it in the mediated settlement
 3
     agreement to be used for parking spaces' development.
 4
 5
     And it -- you know, as far as I know, that money
 6
     hadn't gone towards that endeavor. It's a little
 7
     disappointing.
 8
                   MR. HELFAND: Well, what Mr. Sepulveda
 9
     decided to do with the money obviously is his choice,
10
     but he made agreements to do certain things to the
11
     property that he's acknowledged he hasn't done.
12
                    THE COURT:
                               Yeah, it hasn't gone -- it
13
     didn't go into the settlement agreement how he's
14
     supposed to do or not do something.
15
                   MR. HELFAND:
                                  Right.
16
                    THE COURT:
                               So okay. Well, so May 6th.
17
     So when should I hear from you-all?
18
                   MR. HELFAND: Council meeting is May?
19
                   MR. PFEIFFER:
                                   7th.
20
                   MR. HELFAND:
                                  I'm sorry?
21
                   MR. PFEIFFER: 7th.
22
                   MR. HELFAND:
                                  So the council meeting is
23
     May 7th. If Mr. Dale can get a response, then we'll
24
     process that by the follow -- by the following Friday.
25
     If the answer is you can't get a response because
```

council wants to talk. 1 2 I mean, the -- the thing is, I'm hired because I have expertise in this area. It's not 3 something the city attorney generally deals with. 4 5 council can talk to Mr. Dale, and obviously they can 6 direct Mr. Dale if they choose to. And we'll -- we'll 7 be able to tell you one way or the other by that 8 Friday whether the council wants me to come see them. 9 THE COURT: What day is that? What day 10 is -- the day that you think you can give me a --11 MR. HELFAND: The 6th is a Monday. 12 The 11th, I think? The 10th. MS. SIMPSON: I'd have to check with Oz, 13 14 but I suspect we could at least have an answer. 15 We just -- I just want an THE COURT: 16 agreement of a site inspection in order to figure out what permits and how -- mainly what the drawing needs 17 18 to be in order to effectuate the settlement agreement. 19 MR. HELFAND: Well, Judge, we can do 20 The only way I -- the only way I need council 21 approval is to enter -- to sign off on an agreed 22 order. I'm happy to meet counsel out there with 23 representatives of the City. 24 THE COURT: Why don't I just -- I'm just 25 going to put an order in place requiring you-all to do

```
1
     that.
 2
                   MR. HELFAND: As long as it's not listed
     as an agreed order, Your Honor. I think it exceeds
 3
     the Court's jurisdiction.
 4
 5
                    THE COURT: I'm just going to put an
 6
     order in place requiring you to do that.
 7
                   MR. HELFAND: I think it exceeds the
 8
     Court's -- I want to be clear. It exceeds the Court's
 9
     jurisdiction having denied the plea, but I understand
     the Court's intent.
10
11
                    THE COURT: I may enter the -- the plea
     order after that.
12
                   MR. HELFAND: I understand.
13
14
                   MS. SIMPSON: Your Honor, on the -- on
15
     the topic of disclosure -- or on the topic of
16
     discovery, I suppose, the City has not provided
17
     initial disclosures to us, nor have they responded to
     our discovery requests. They filed a motion for a
18
19
     protective order raising the same arguments that they
20
     did in their -- their plea to the jurisdiction.
21
     like to orally move for a motion to compel.
22
     Alternative, I'd be happy to --
23
                    THE COURT: Well, you've got to comply
24
     with the rule.
25
                   MR. HELFAND: I -- I am in compliance
```

```
with the rule, Your Honor.
 1
 2
                    THE COURT: You've served your
     disclosures?
 3
                   MR. HELFAND:
                                  I'm sorry?
 4
                    THE COURT: You've served disclosures?
 5
                   MR. HELFAND: No, we filed a motion for
 6
 7
     protective order, Your Honor, in light of the City's
 8
     immunity.
 9
                   And -- and with all due respect, Judge,
10
     when the Court starts authorizing discovery -- first
11
     of all, there's no such thing as an oral motion in our
12
     courts. Secondly, when the Court starts denying --
13
     ordering discovery in a case where there's a claim of
14
     immunity, the Court clearly exceeds its jurisdiction.
15
                    THE COURT:
                               There are things called oral
16
     motions.
               And the Court many times grants those
17
     motions, and many times it's done by the parties'
18
     consent. So I'm not sure where you're getting that
19
     from.
20
                   MR. HELFAND:
                                  Well, not in accordance
21
     with the local rules or the district code. But I
22
     understand.
                 The judicial district requires advanced
23
     notice of a hearing.
24
                    THE COURT: Yes, it does. Called due
25
     process, but we do oral orders all the time.
```

1	MR. HELFAND: Oh, I understand oral					
2	THE COURT: Oral					
3	MR. HELFAND: orders, Judge.					
4	THE COURT: and oral oral motions					
5	all the time with counsel present, and usually they're					
6	agreed to when we do it.					
7	Well, there's nothing else I can do					
8	here. I do think it's disappointing that that the					
9	City takes some of its positions it's taking. But					
10	that's not up to me.					
11	MR. HELFAND: I understand					
12	THE COURT: That's very, very sad in					
13	some respects. But anyway, there it is.					
14	So off the record. You're excused.					
15	MR. HELFAND: Thank you, Judge.					
16	(Adjourned)					
17	*****					
18						
19						
20						
21						
22						
23						
24						
25						

1	STATE OF TEXAS				
2	COUNTY OF HARRIS				
3					
4	I, MyThuy Cieslar, Official Court Reporter in				
5	and for the 190th District Court of Harris, State of				
6	Texas, do hereby certify that the above and foregoing				
7	contains a true and correct transcription of all				
8	portions of evidence and other proceedings requested				
9	in writing by counsel for the parties to be included				
L 0	in this volume of the Reporter's Record in the				
L1	above-styled and numbered cause, all of which occurred				
L2	in open court or in chambers and were reported by me.				
L 3	I further certify that this Reporter's Record				
L 4	of the proceedings truly and correctly reflects the				
L 5	exhibits, if any, offered by the respective parties.				
L 6					
L 7					
L 8	<u>/s/MyThuy Cieslar</u> MyThuy Cieslar				
L 9	CSR, RDR, CRC Texas CSR 5763				
20	Official Court Reporter 190th District Court				
21	201 Caroline, Suite 1204 Houston, Texas 77002				
22	Expiration: 10/31/24				
23	mythuy_cieslar@justex.net				
2 4					
25					

Automated Certificate of eService

This automated certificate of service was created by the efiling system. The filer served this document via email generated by the efiling system on the date and to the persons listed below. The rules governing certificates of service have not changed. Filers must still provide a certificate of service that complies with all applicable rules.

Arif Panju on behalf of Arif Panju Bar No. 24070380 apanju@ij.org

Envelope ID: 87326322

Filing Code Description: No Fee Documents

Filing Description: Plea to the Jurisdiction Hearing Transcript - April 15,

2024

Status as of 5/2/2024 3:52 PM CST

Case Contacts

Name	BarNumber	Email	TimestampSubmitted	Status
William Scott Helfand	9388250	bill.helfand@lewisbrisbois.com	5/2/2024 3:46:14 PM	SENT
Justin Pfeiffer	24091473	Justin.Pfeiffer@lewisbrisbois.com	5/2/2024 3:46:14 PM	SENT
Dawn Garrard		Dawn.Garrard@lewisbrisbois.com	5/2/2024 3:46:14 PM	SENT
Arif Panju		apanju@ij.org	5/2/2024 3:46:14 PM	SENT
Diana Simpson		diana.simpson@ij.org	5/2/2024 3:46:14 PM	SENT
Justin Pearson		jpearson@ij.org	5/2/2024 3:46:14 PM	SENT
Rocio Rivera		rocio.rivera@lewisbrisbois.com	5/2/2024 3:46:14 PM	SENT
Molly Hanis		mhanis@ij.org	5/2/2024 3:46:14 PM	SENT
Lou Russell		Irussell@mcfarlandpllc.com	5/2/2024 3:46:14 PM	SENT
Charles McFarland		cmcfarland@mcfarlandpllc.com	5/2/2024 3:46:14 PM	SENT
Marie Harlan		mharlan@mcfarlandpllc.com	5/2/2024 3:46:14 PM	SENT
Emily Connaway		econnaway@mcfarlandpllc.com	5/2/2024 3:46:14 PM	SENT
Lamisa I.Chowdhury		lamisa.chowdhury@lewisbrisbois.com	5/2/2024 3:46:14 PM	SENT
Thazin Htet		thtet@mcfarlandpllc.com	5/2/2024 3:46:14 PM	SENT
Gretchen Embrey		gembrey@ij.org	5/2/2024 3:46:14 PM	SENT