

**S190805**

No. S \_\_\_\_\_

IN THE  
**SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA**

VILLA VICENZA HOMEOWNERS  
ASSOCIATION,

Cross-Complainant and Respondent,

v.

NOBEL COURT DEVELOPMENT, LLC,

Cross-Defendant and Appellant.

SUPREME COURT  
**FILED**

FEB 23 2011

Frederick K. Onirich Clerk



Deputy

After a Decision of the Fourth Appellate District, Division One, D054550  
On Appeal from an Order Denying a Petition To Compel Arbitration  
Of the Superior Court, County of San Diego, No. GIC871604  
Hon. Ronald Styn, Judge

---

**PETITION FOR REVIEW**

---

Valentine S. Hoy, State Bar No. 121766  
Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP  
501 West Broadway, 15th Floor,  
San Diego, California 92101-3541  
(619) 233-1155

Charles A. Bird, State Bar No. 056566  
Luce, Forward, Hamilton & Scripps LLP  
600 West Broadway, Suite 2600  
San Diego, California 92101-3372  
619.236.1414

Attorneys for Nobel Court Development, LLC

No. S \_\_\_\_\_

**IN THE  
SUPREME COURT OF CALIFORNIA**

VILLA VICENZA HOMEOWNERS  
ASSOCIATION,

Cross-Complainant and Respondent,

v.

NOBEL COURT DEVELOPMENT, LLC,

Cross-Defendant and Appellant.

After a Decision of the Fourth Appellate District, Division One, D054550  
On Appeal from an Order Denying a Petition To Compel Arbitration  
Of the Superior Court, County of San Diego, No. GIC871604  
Hon. Ronald Styn, Judge

---

**PETITION FOR REVIEW**

---

Valentine S. Hoy, State Bar No. 121766  
Allen Matkins Leck Gamble Mallory & Natsis LLP  
501 West Broadway, 15th Floor,  
San Diego, California 92101-3541  
(619) 233-1155

Charles A. Bird, State Bar No. 056566  
Luce, Forward, Hamilton & Scripps LLP  
600 West Broadway, Suite 2600  
San Diego, California 92101-3372  
619.236.1414

Attorneys for Nobel Court Development, LLC

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PETITION.....	1
ISSUES PRESENTED.....	1
REASONS REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED .....	1
A.    Grant and Hold: Identical Issues in Granted Case.....	1
B.    Reaffirming Worthiness for Review .....	2
STATEMENT .....	5
A.    The Project and Project CC&R's.....	5
B.    Proceedings in Superior Court.....	8
CONCLUSION .....	10
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	11

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Page

### CASES

<i>Allied-Bruce Terminix Cos. v. Dobson</i> (1995) 513 U.S. 265 .....	4
<i>B.C.E. Development, Inc. v. Smith</i> (1989) 215 Cal.App.3d 1142 .....	4
<i>Broughton v. Cigna Healthplans</i> (1999) 21 Cal.4th 1066 .....	4
<i>Crowley Maritime Corp. v. Boston Old Colony Ins. Co.</i> (2008) 158 Cal.App.4th 1061 .....	5
<i>Discover Bank v. Superior Court</i> (2005) 36 Cal.4th 148 .....	4
<i>Doctor's Associates, Inc. v. Casarotto</i> (1996) 517 U.S. 681 .....	3
<i>Kelly v. Tri-Cities Broadcasting, Inc.</i> (1983) 147 Cal.App.3d 666 .....	5
<i>Manning v. Fox</i> (1984) 151 Cal.App.3d 531 .....	3
<i>Matthau v. Superior Court</i> (2007) 151 Cal.App.4th 593 .....	5
<i>Miller &amp; Lux, Inc. v. San Joaquin Agr. Co.</i> (1922) 58 Cal.App. 753 .....	5
<i>Perry v. Thomas</i> (1987) 482 U.S. 483 .....	3, 4
<i>Sacramento Suburban Fruit Lands Co. v. Whaley</i> (1920) 50 Cal.App. 125 .....	5
<i>Souza v. Westlands Water Dist.</i> (2006) 135 Cal.App.4th 879 .....	5

<i>Treo@Kettner Homeowners Assn. v. Superior Court</i> (2008) 166 Cal.App.4th 1055 .....	4, 9
---	------

<i>Villa Milano Homeowners Assn. v. Il Davorge</i> (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 819 .....	2
---	---

**STATUTES**

9 U.S.C. § 2 .....	3
Business and Professions Code section 11010 .....	3
Business and Professions Code section 11018.2 .....	3
Business and Professions Code section 11018.5 .....	3
California Arbitration Act, Code of Civil Procedure section 1280, et seq. ....	9
Code of Civil Procedure section 1294 .....	10
Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. § 1 et seq. ....	1, 9

**RULES**

10 California Code of Regulations section 2791.8 .....	3
California Rules of Court, rule 8.500.....	3

## PETITION

Nobel Court Development, LLC (Nobel Court) petitions for review of the published decision of the Court of Appeal in *Villa Vicenza Homeowners Assn. v. Nobel Court Development, LLC* (2011) 191 Cal.App.4th 963 (Final Opinion).

### ISSUES PRESENTED

1. Do recorded covenants, conditions and restrictions (CC&R's) for common interest developments constitute contractual agreements that bind the homeowners association (HOA) responsible to manage the development?
2. When a dispute is subject to the Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. § 1 et seq. (FAA), may a California court apply state law to treat a contractual arbitration provision textually applicable to the dispute differently from other provisions in the same agreement?

### REASONS REVIEW SHOULD BE GRANTED

#### A. Grant and Hold: Identical Issues in Granted Case

In the Final Opinion, the Court of Appeal held "CC&Rs are not an effective means of obtaining an agreement to arbitrate a homeowners association's construction defect claims against a developer." (Final Opinion, p. 2.) In a footnote, the Court of Appeal recognized that the identical "issue is currently pending before our Supreme Court. (See e.g.,

*Pinnacle Museum Tower Assn. v. Pinnacle Market Development (US), LLC*, review granted November 10, 2010, No. S186149.)” (*Id.* at p. 2, fn. 1.) The court also recognized that the FAA governs the dispute between Nobel Court and the Villa Vicenza Homeowners Association (Association) about a development in interstate commerce (the Project). (*Id.* at pp. 8-9.)

The Court of Appeal correctly stated that the issues of this case are identical to those presented in *Pinnacle Museum Tower Assn. v. Pinnacle Marketing Development (US), LLC*, No. S186149 (*Pinnacle*). (See *Pinnacle* (Sept. 9, 2010) [Petn. for Review]; *id.* (Dec. 12, 2010) [Opening Brief on the Merits].) Indeed, this is actually the first case in which a panel of Division One of the Fourth Appellate District held CC&R’s do not require HOA’s to arbitrate claims with developers, but because the court granted rehearing from its first decision, *Pinnacle* was the first to reach the California Supreme Court. (See *Villa Vicenza Homeowners Assn. v. Nobel Court Development, LLC* (May 27, 2010, D054550) [typed opn.] [110 Cal.Rptr.3d 149]; *id.* (June 25, 2010, D054550) [order granting rehng].)

This is a classic grant and hold matter. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.512(d)(2).)

**B. Reaffirming Worthiness for Review**

In *Villa Milano Homeowners Assn. v. Il Davorge* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 819, 825-826, the Court of Appeal held that a homeowners association is bound by an arbitration provision in recorded CC&R’s.

Here, the Court of Appeal expressly chose to create a conflict with *Villa Milano*. (Final Opn., p. 8.) That alone justifies review. (Cal. Rules of Court, rule 8.500(b)(1).) Review of the conflict is particularly important because, as amici in *Pinnacle* have pointed out, thousands of recorded CC&R's in California contain arbitration clauses, approved by the California Department of Real Estate. (10 Cal. Code Regs., § 2791.8; see Bus. & Prof. Code, § 11018.5; see also *id.*, §§ 11010, 11018.2.) The Court of Appeal thus claimed superiority over the public agency created to protect the interests of home buyers. (See *Manning v. Fox* (1984) 151 Cal.App.3d 531, 541-542.)

In *Perry v. Thomas* (1987) 482 U.S. 483, the United States Supreme Court held: “[S]tate law, whether of legislative or judicial origin, is applicable *if* that law arose to govern issues concerning the validity, revocability, and enforceability of contracts generally. A state-law principle that takes its meaning precisely from the fact that a contract to arbitrate is at issue does not comport with this requirement of § 2 [of the Federal Arbitration Act, 9 U.S.C. § 2].” (*Perry*, 482 U.S. at pp. 492-493, fn. 9, italics original; see *Doctor's Associates, Inc. v. Casarotto* (1996) 517 U.S. 681, 685.) “A court may not, then, in assessing the rights of litigants to enforce an arbitration agreement, construe that agreement in a manner different from that in which it otherwise construes nonarbitration agreements under state law.” (*Perry*, 482 U.S. at p. 492-493, fn. 9; see

*Broughton v. Cigna Healthplans* (1999) 21 Cal.4th 1066, 1075.) “Nor may a court rely on the uniqueness of an agreement to arbitrate as a basis for a state-law holding that enforcement would be unconscionable, for this would enable the court to effect what we hold today the state legislature cannot.” (*Perry*, 482 U.S. at p. 492-493, fn. 9; see *Discover Bank v. Superior Court* (2005) 36 Cal.4th 148, 165.)

In the Final Opinion, the Court of Appeal relied on *Treo@Kettner Homeowners Assn. v. Superior Court* (2008) 166 Cal.App.4th 1055, for the rationale making arbitration provisions in CC&R’s inapplicable to HOA’s. (Final Opinion, pp. 6-9.) In *Treo@Kettner*, the Court of Appeal held that a homeowners association is not bound by a judicial reference provision in recorded CC&R’s because CC&R’s lack sufficient dignity to effect a waiver of the state constitutional right to jury trial. (*Treo@Kettner*, 166 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1066-1067.)

Although the Court of Appeal attempted to explain away its clash with the United States Supreme Court (Final Opinion, pp. 12-17), at best it achieved only conflicts with other California cases (see *B.C.E. Development, Inc. v. Smith* (1989) 215 Cal.App.3d 1142, 1147), emphasizing that CC&R’s constitute contracts for some purposes but not for waiver of the state constitutional right to jury trial. The core conflict is with *Allied-Bruce Terminix Cos. v. Dobson* (1995) 513 U.S. 265, 281,

holding that states may not treat arbitration provisions differently from other provisions in the same agreement.

Nobel Court also observes that despite its consistent arguments, including in its petition for rehearing, the Court of Appeal refused to address whether the Association is bound by the CC&R's as a third party beneficiary of the purchase agreement between Nobel Court and the first closing home buyer (See, e.g., *Crowley Maritime Corp. v. Boston Old Colony Ins. Co.* (2008) 158 Cal.App.4th 1061, 1069-1070; *Matthau v. Superior Court* (2007) 151 Cal.App.4th 593, 600; *Souza v. Westlands Water Dist.* (2006) 135 Cal.App.4th 879, 895) or under the doctrine of equitable servitudes (see, e.g., *Kelly v. Tri-Cities Broadcasting, Inc.* (1983) 147 Cal.App.3d 666, 679; *Sacramento Suburban Fruit Lands Co. v. Whaley* (1920) 50 Cal.App. 125, 130-131; *Miller & Lux, Inc. v. San Joaquin Agr. Co.* (1922) 58 Cal.App. 753, 755).

## STATEMENT

### A. The Project and Project CC&R's

The Association is a corporation composed of owners of 418 condominium units and common area in the Project. (AA 2-4.) It owns a portion of the Project. (AA 2, 45-46.) The Association manages the common area and its own property. (AA 4-5.)

Nobel Court developed the Project as a conversion of previously leased units. (AA 5, 159, 200.) It recorded a Declaration of Covenants,

Conditions and Restrictions for the development (Project CC&R's). (AA 35, 43.) The Project CC&R's explicitly declare that all their "limitations, restrictions, easements, covenants, conditions, liens and charges shall run with the land. . . ." (AA 44.) Further, those provisions "shall be binding on and inure to the benefit of all parties having or acquiring any right, title or interest in the Property, [and] shall be enforceable equitable servitudes. . . ." (AA 44.)

Under the Project CC&R's, the Association is a California nonprofit mutual benefit association. (AA 58.) The Association gained the powers described in the Project CC&R's and assumed its duties when Nobel Court conveyed the first condominium unit to a buyer. (AA 58.) The Association has broad powers to manage the Project. (AA 58-60.) With those powers go extensive management duties. (AA 61-62, 88-89.) Article 17 of the Project CC&R's covers the subject of enforcing the Project CC&R's. (AA 114.)

Section 17.4 of the Project CC&R's provides for "an expedited means of resolving any claims, disputes and disagreements which may arise between . . . Association and [Nobel Court] after the close of escrow or other conveyance of any portion of the Property. . . ." (AA 115.) The scope of dispute resolution includes any matter "concerning the Property. . . ." (AA 115.) The decisive form of dispute resolution is arbitration, as described in succeeding subsections. (AA 115.) The section

ends with a bold, all-capitals notice that arbitration involves waiver of the right to a jury trial. (AA 115.) Continuing in bold, all-capitals, the text states that Nobel Court, each unit owner, and the Association “agree to be bound by the provisions of this section.” (AA 115.)

Subsection 17.4.3(a) expressly makes an agreement to arbitrate. (AA 116.) It provides: “The Association, each Owner and [Nobel Court] shall resolve any Dispute not resolved as provided above [cure, then mediation] exclusively through binding arbitration in the county in which the Property is located.” (AA 116.) Then subsection 17.4.3(b) acknowledges that arbitration has the effect of waiving trial by either a judge or a jury. (AA 116.) Subsection 17.4.3(c) provides that the arbitration will be conducted by Judicial Arbitration and Mediation Services (JAMS). (AA 116.) Subsection 17.4.5 opts to apply the Federal Arbitration Act to the Project CC&R’s because of interstate commerce involvement in development of the Project. (AA 118.) The entirety of subsection 17.4.6A is in bold, all-capitals type. (AA 118.) It restates the consequences of agreeing to arbitration, including waiver of court trial, waiver of jury trial, waiver of appeal, and the power of a court to compel arbitration if a party refuses to proceed. (AA 118.)

Condominium owners bought units in the Project pursuant to a standard purchase contract. (AA 135-218 [two exemplars].) The contract explicitly anticipates creation of the Association. (AA 136 [¶ 1], 147

[¶ 15.A.(v)], 150-151, 158, 160, 179, 191, 194-194, 199, 201.) It contains a disclosure that the Project CC&R's provide for mandatory alternative resolution of disputes between Nobel Court and the Association, specifically consisting of mediation followed by arbitration if mediation is unsuccessful. (AA 162 [¶ 23], 203.) Each buyer acknowledged receipt of the Project CC&R's. (AA 177, 217.)

Paragraph 14 of the standard purchase contract, if separately initialed, provides for resolution of disputes arising after close of escrow, as set forth in Addendum 3. (AA 147, 151, 190, 194.) Section 2.1 of that addendum contains an arbitration agreement identical to the arbitration agreement in subsection 17.4.3(a) of the Project CC&R's. (AA 171, 212.) Section 2.2 acknowledges, as does subsection 17.4.3(b) of the Project CC&R's, that a party who agrees to arbitrate waives the right to a decision by either a judge or a jury. (AA 171, 212.) Section 2.3, like subsection 17.4.3(c) of the Project CC&R's, provides for arbitration by JAMS. (AA 171, 212.) Subsection 2.6.1, in bold and all-capitals type, contains the same notice of the consequences of arbitration given by subsection 17.4.6A of the Project CC&R's. (AA 172, 212.) It must be separately initialed. (AA 172, 212.) Then the parties separately sign the addendum. (AA 173, 214.)

#### **B. Proceedings in Superior Court**

Three condominium owners sued Nobel Court for damages for alleged construction defects. (AA 14-16.) The owners impleaded the

Association by a derivative action. (*Ibid.*) In April 2007, the superior court granted Nobel Court's petition to compel arbitration of the three owners' nonderivative claims. (AA 235-236.)

The Association cross-complained against Nobel Court, seeking "recovery for damages to the Common Area and damages to the [unit owners'] separate interests which are integrally related" (AA 5). By including its own property in the definition of "Subject Property" (AA 2), the Association swept in damages to its own property. (AA 6-8, 10.) The Association's theories of action include breach of implied warranty (AA 2, 5-7); strict liability (AA 7-8); negligence (AA 8-11, 14); as a third-party beneficiary, breach of express and implied warranties in documents including owners' purchase agreements and sales materials (AA 11-12); as a third-party beneficiary, breach of construction contracts (AA 12-14).

Nobel Court petitioned to compel arbitration. (AA 20.) It relied on the FAA and the California Arbitration Act, Code of Civil Procedure section 1280, et seq. (CAA). (AA 21.) Nobel Court requested judicial notice of the Project CC&R's (AA 24), which the court granted (AA 280). The Association opposed the motion without filing any evidence. (AA 263-270.) It relied solely on an argument that under *Treo@Kettner, supra*, 166 Cal.App.4th 1055, the Project CC&R's are not binding on the Association as an agreement to arbitrate disputes with Nobel Court. (AA 263-270.)

On January 16, 2009, the superior court denied Nobel Court's petition, except as to the Association's cause of action for breach of express warranties. (AA 278-280; 282-283.) Nobel Court gave notice of entry the same day. (AA 282-283.) On January 28, 2009, Nobel Court timely filed its notice of appeal and designated a record. (AA 284-288.)

The order is appealable to the extent it denies Nobel Court's petition to compel arbitration. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1294.)

### **CONCLUSION**

The petition for review should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,



LUCE, FORWARD, HAMILTON & SCRIPPS, LLP  
By Charles A. Bird  
Attorneys for Nobel Court Development, LLC

## CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I, Charles A. Bird, appellate counsel to Nobel Court Development, LLC, certify that the foregoing petition for review is prepared in proportionally spaced Times New Roman 13 point type and, based on the word count of the word processing system used to prepare the petition, the petition is 2,104 words long.



---

Charles A. Bird



CERTIFIED FOR PUBLICATION

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

VILLA VICENZA HOMEOWNERS  
ASSOCIATION,

Defendant, Cross-Complainant and  
Respondent,

v.

NOBEL COURT DEVELOPMENT, LLC,

Defendant, Cross-Defendant and  
Appellant.

D054550

(Super. Ct. No. GIC871604)

Court of Appeal Fourth District  
**FILED**

MAY 27 2010

Stephen M. Kelly, Clerk  
**DEPUTY**

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Ronald Styn,  
Judge. Affirmed.

Luce, Forward, Hamilton & Scripps and Charles A. Bird; Allen Matkins Leck  
Gamble Mallory & Natsis and Valentine S. Hoy VIII for Defendant, Cross-Defendant  
and Appellant.

Epsten Grinnell & Howell, Jon H. Epsten, Douglas W. Grinnell and Anne L.  
Rauch for Defendant, Cross-Complainant and Respondent.

In this case the developer of a condominium project recorded a declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions (CC&R's) which required a homeowners association arbitrate any construction defect claim the association might have against the developer. As we explain more fully below, we find CC&R's are not an effective means of obtaining an agreement to arbitrate a homeowners association's construction defect claims against a developer.

Although both federal and state law favor the enforcement of arbitration *agreements*, neither federal nor state law countenance imposition of arbitration where no agreement to waive judicial remedies exists. Admittedly, in other circumstances our cases and Civil Code section 1354 treat CC&R's as equitable servitudes which bind homeowners and homeowners associations with respect to claims they may have against each other. This treatment of CC&R's is not based on any determination the parties bound by them are in privity of contract with either their co-owners or a homeowners association. Rather, CC&R's are made binding in disputes between homeowners or between homeowners and a homeowners association because of their shared and continuing interest in the equitable and efficient operation of common interest developments. Here, the recorded CC&R's, standing alone, are not a contract between the developer and the homeowners association, which only came into existence after the CC&R's were recorded. Thus here there has been no showing the association entered into a binding arbitration agreement. Accordingly, the trial court did not err in denying the developers' motion to compel arbitration.

## FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Nobel Court Development, LLC (Nobel), purchased the 418 apartments, common areas, and common facilities which make up the Villa Vicenza project in 2004 and converted the apartments to condominiums in 2005. In the course of making the property a condominium project, Nobel recorded CC&R's under which the Villa Vicenza Homeowners Association (the Association) came into existence upon the sale of the first condominium. By deed Nobel also transferred ownership of the common areas and common facilities to the Association. No consideration was provided by the Association to Nobel and the Association did not execute any documents in favor of Nobel in connection with the deed transferring the common areas and common facilities to the Association. In pertinent part, the CC&R's require both condominium owners and the Association arbitrate any claims they have against the developer.

Because following the first sale Nobel controlled the board of directors of the Association and because the initial condominium buyers noticed defects in common areas and common facilities and did not believe Nobel had provided a reserve fund sufficient to repair the defects, the condominium owners brought a derivative action on behalf of the Association against Nobel.<sup>1</sup> Later, an independent litigation committee of the Association was appointed and filed a cross-complaint against Nobel. The committee alleged claims for breach of implied warranty, strict liability, negligence and as the third-

---

<sup>1</sup> The individual condominium buyers also brought claims on their own behalf and by way of a prior order, which is not the subject of this appeal, the trial court ordered those individual claims be arbitrated.

party beneficiary of express and implied warranties Nobel made to individual homeowners. Following unsuccessful efforts to mediate the Association's claims, Nobel filed a motion to compel arbitration under the provisions of the CC&R's. The trial court denied the motion with respect to the bulk of the Association's claims, but compelled arbitration of the express warranty claims. Nobel filed a timely notice of appeal. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1294, subd. (a).)

## DISCUSSION

### I

Because the trial court did not consider any disputed extrinsic evidence or otherwise resolve any disputed factual issues, we review its order on Nobel's motion to compel arbitration de novo. (*Giuliano v. Inland Empire Personnel, Inc.* (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 1276, 1284.)

### II

Both the Federal Arbitration Act (9 U.S. Code § 1 et seq. (FAA)) and its California counterpart, the California Arbitration Act (Code Civ. Proc., § 1280 et seq. (CAA)), make arbitration agreements enforceable and indeed favor them. (See *Moses H. Cone Memorial Hosp. v. Mercury Const.* (1983) 460 U.S. 1, 24 [103 S.Ct. 927]; *Broughton v. Cigna Healthplans* (1999) 21 Cal.4th 1066, 1074-1075.) However, under both the FAA and the CAA, the question of whether a party has in fact entered into an arbitration agreement is determined by reference to state-law principles governing the formation of contracts. (See *First Options of Chicago, Inc. v. Kaplan* (1995) 514 U.S. 938, 942 [115 S.Ct. 1920], and *Marsch v. Williams* (1994) 23 Cal.App.4th 250, 254-255.)

Here, we do not believe the CC&R's Nobel recorded represent a binding agreement on the part of the Association to arbitrate its construction defect claims against Nobel. In reaching this conclusion we consider our recent holding in *Treo @ Kettner Homeowners Assn. v. Superior Court* (2008) 166 Cal.App.4th 1055, 1066-1067 (*Treo*), and the provisions of Civil Code section 1354. Although as we explain the holding in *Treo* is not directly applicable to the arbitration provisions of the CC&R's, the principles it discusses informs our analysis of the separate question of whether an agreement to arbitrate exists.

1. *Treo*

In *Treo* the developer of condominium project recorded CC&R's which made all disputes between the developer and the homeowners association subject to a judicial reference under Code of Civil Procedure section 638. The homeowners association sued the developer for construction defects and the developer moved to have the matter determined by a referee under Code of Civil Procedure section 638. The trial court granted the developer's motion and the homeowners association filed a petition for a writ of mandate. We issued the writ.

Because a reference under Code of Civil Procedure section 638 effectively waives a party's constitutional right to a jury trial, we found that under *Grafton Partners v. Superior Court* (2005) 36 Cal.4th 944, 950-952 (*Grafton*), no agreement to such a reference can be found absent actual notice to the party to be bound and meaningful reflection. (*Treo, supra*, 166 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1066-1067.) In *Grafton* the plaintiff had retained an accounting firm. The firm's engagement letter required that, in the event of a

dispute, the parties would waive their right to a jury. The Supreme Court found this agreement was not enforceable because the Legislature has not expressly authorized such a pre-litigation waiver of the "inviolable right" to a jury trial as required by article I, section 16 of the California Constitution. (*Grafton, supra*, 36 Cal.4th at p. 951.) The court found this constitutional limitation on permissible jury waivers exists because the right to a trial by jury is "too sacred in its character to be frittered away or committed to the uncontrolled caprice of every judge or magistrate in the State." (*Id.* at p. 956.) Moreover, the court noted that even where a statute permits a jury waiver, the right to a jury is "considered so fundamental that ambiguity in the statute permitting such waivers must be resolved in favor of according to a litigant a jury trial." (*Ibid.*) Importantly, the court in *Grafton* noted that the states which have permitted a contractual jury waiver, have imposed a number of procedural safeguards not typical in commercial law, including requirements which place on the party seeking enforcement of a waiver the burden of proving "the waiver clause was entered into knowingly and voluntarily." (*Id.* at p. 965.)

Having found that under *Grafton* a jury waiver requires actual notice and meaningful reflection, in *Treo* we found the constructive notice provided by the CC&R's did not meet those standards: "The difficulty here is the manner in which the 'contract' between [the developer] and [the homeowners association] waiving the right to trial by jury came about. As we have noted, an association, with its obligations and restrictions as defined in the CC&R's, essentially springs into existence when there is a conveyance

by the developer of a separate interest coupled with an interest in the common area or membership in the association.

"It is at least arguable that there is some meeting of the minds between the developer and the party to whom the first conveyance is made. The problem, however, is that later purchasers and their successors, who will make up almost all association members, effectively have no choice but to accept the CC&R's prepared by the developer, including in this case the waiver of the right to trial by jury.

"We conclude this is not the situation the legislature contemplated when it enacted section 638 to allow parties to waive by contract the 'inviolable' constitutional right to trial by jury. As *Grafton* suggests, Legislatures when providing for the contractual waiver of that right are particularly concerned with the formalities of the process and the actual existence of a mutual agreement to waive the right. [Citation.]

"Treating CC&R's as a contract such that they are sufficient to waive the right to trial by jury does not comport with the importance of the right waived. CC&R's are notoriously lengthy, are adhesive in nature, are written by developers perhaps years before many owners buy, and often, as here with regard to the waiver of trial by jury, cannot be modified by the association. Further, the document is not signed by the parties." (*Treo, supra*, 166 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1066-1067.)

In finding CC&R's were not a permissible means of obtaining a jury waiver, we recognized that in *Villa Milano Homeowners Assn. v. IL Davorge* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th

819, 828-835 (*Villa Milano*),<sup>2</sup> the court reached a contrary conclusion and found that because in other contexts the CC&R's had been treated as binding upon purchasers of interests in common interest developments, the CC&R's could be used to obtain agreements to arbitrate. (*Treo, supra*, 166 Cal.App. 4th at p. 1065.) We declined to follow that aspect of *Villa Milano*. We noted that *Villa Milano* was decided before *Grafton* and further that: "Treating CC&R's as equitable servitudes makes possible the existence of common interest communities because they allow the continued governance of the community when multiple parties own the property and when such ownership changes over time. The very nature, however, of the creation of CC&R's creates a distance in time and control between the parties that are bound by them. While it may be

---

<sup>2</sup> Although the court in *Villa Milano* found CC&R's are an adequate means of creating an arbitration agreement, as we have noted, the court nonetheless found an arbitration agreement set forth in the CC&R's was unconscionable as against a homeowners association which had construction defect claims against the developer of a condominium project.

Applying the well-established two-prong test for unconscionability, the court found that use of the CC&R's was procedurally suspect because it provided no opportunity for negotiation and because the arbitration provision was buried near the end of the 70-page declaration of the CC&R's. (*Villa Milano, supra*, 84 Cal.App.4th at pp. 828-829.) The court found that the use of the arbitration provision as a means of defeating the right to sue for construction defects was substantively unconscionable because it conflicted with the policy manifested in Code of Civil Procedure section 1298 et seq., which governs arbitration provisions in agreements to convey real property. As the court in *Villa Milano* noted, Code of Civil Procedure section 1298 sets forth the manner by which the parties to a real estate contract must be given notice of arbitration provisions and Code of Civil Procedure section 1298.7 prevents any such provision from defeating the right to sue for personal injuries or construction and design defects: "Our review of the applicable statutory and regulatory provisions convinces us public policy disfavors the binding arbitration clause in the context of the case before use. With respect to construction and design defect claims, the clause is substantively unconscionable as an attempt to evade the statutory protections of Code of Civil Procedure sections 1298 through 1298.8." (*Id.* at p. 833.)

reasonable under such circumstances to bind owners and the association concerning the governance of the community and the placement of restrictions on the use of property, we conclude the Legislature did not intend that CC&R's be sufficient to effectively and permanently waive the constitutional right to trial by jury." (*Treo, supra*, 166 Cal.App.4th at p. 1067.)

## 2. *Arbitration Agreement*

As Nobel points out, where an arbitration agreement is covered by the FAA, the FAA preempts any conflicting state law. (*Shepard v. Edward Mackay Enterprises, Inc.* (2007) 148 Cal.App.4th 1092, 1097-1099.) Thus Nobel argues the jury waiver provisions in the California Constitution we relied on in *Treo* cannot be used to adversely impact its right to compel arbitration under the FAA.

We agree with Nobel that any purported agreement between it and the Association would be covered by the FAA and that where the FAA applies, the California Constitution cannot be used to treat arbitration agreements differently than other types of agreements. However, the FAA, like the CAA, only imposes arbitration on parties which have *agreed* to forego resort to judicial remedies. In this regard, while it is true in *Treo* we found that CC&R's do not meet the particular requirements of the California Constitution, our analysis in *Treo* of the manner in which CC&R's operate, as well as our further consideration of Civil Code section 1354, persuade us a developer may not obtain any contractual rights, including the right to arbitration, by the simple expedient of recording CC&R's. Neither the circumstances by which CC&R's are recorded nor their controlling impact on disputes between those with an ownership interest in or

responsibility for the operation of a common interest development give rise to any sort of binding agreement between developers who have recorded the CC&R's and those who might in the future be burdened by them.

a. *FAA Pre-Emption*

Nobel notes that by their terms the CC&R's state: "Because many of the materials and products incorporated into the home are manufactured in other states, the development and conveyance of the Property evidences a transaction involving interstate commerce and the Federal Arbitration Act (9 U.S.C. § 1, et seq.) now in effect and as it may be hereafter amended will govern the interpretation and enforcement of the arbitration provisions of this Declaration." The facts set forth in the CC&R's are hardly matters subject to serious dispute. Nobel's condominium project was a substantial multi-family housing development composed of literally hundreds of dwelling units, the construction of which no doubt necessitated myriad contacts with and impacts on interstate commerce. Moreover, it can hardly be a matter of controversy interstate commerce was involved in financing the purchase of hundreds of individual condominiums from Nobel. Thus, the connection between the project and interstate commerce is manifest here and more than sufficient to support application of the FAA.

In this regard the United States Supreme Court's opinion in *Citizens Bank v. Alafabco, Inc.* (2003) 539 U.S. 52, 55-58 [123 S.Ct. 2037], is controlling. In *Citizens Bank v. Alafabco, Inc.*, an Alabama borrower entered into a series of debt-restructuring agreements with an Alabama bank. Each of the restructuring agreements contained arbitration provisions. Because the borrower believed the bank had reneged on an

agreement to provide the borrower with working capital, the borrower sued the bank, which then moved to compel arbitration.

In finding a connection with interstate commerce sufficient to support application of the FAA, the court found application of the FAA was not "defeated because the individual debt-restructuring transactions, taken alone, did not have a 'substantial effect on interstate commerce.' [Citation.] Congress' Commerce Clause power 'may be exercised in individual cases without showing any specific effect upon interstate commerce' if in the aggregate the economic activity in question would represent 'a general practice . . . subject to federal control.' [Citations.] Only that general practice need bear on interstate commerce in a substantial way. [Citations.]" (*Citizens Bank v. Alafabco, Inc.*, *supra*, 539 U.S. at pp. 56-57.)

The court found the debt-restructuring agreements not only involved interstate commerce because of the borrower's substantial interstate business, but also because the restructured debt was secured by all of the debtor's business assets, "including its inventory of goods assembled from out-of-state parts and raw materials. If the Commerce Clause gives Congress the power to regulate local business establishments purchasing substantial quantities of goods that have moved in interstate commerce, *Katzenbach v. McClung*, 379 U.S. 294, 304-305, 85 S.Ct. 377, 132 L.Ed.2d 290 (1964), it necessarily reaches substantial commercial loan transactions secured by such goods." (*Citizens Bank v. Alafabco, Inc.*, *supra*, 539 U.S. at p. 58.) The court further found that "were there any residual doubt about the magnitude of the impact on interstate commerce caused by the particular economic transactions in which the parties were engaged, that

doubt would dissipate upon consideration of the 'general practice' those transactions represent. [Citation.] No elaborate explanation is needed to make evident the broad impact of commercial lending on the national economy or Congress' power to regulate that activity pursuant to the Commerce Clause." (*Id.* at pp.58-59.)

Similarly, here it can hardly be disputed Congress has the power to regulate the sale and financing of a large residential development. The financing alone implicates the use of federally regulated and chartered financial institutions with well-recognized impacts on interstate commerce and thus supports application of the FAA under *Citizens Bank v. Alfabaco, Inc.* In this regard we note that under Civil Code section 1351, subdivisions (a), (j) and (k), creation of the Association and its ownership of common areas and facilities was an integral part of the creation of the condominium project.

Application of the FAA to the transfer of property to the Association prevents us from enforcing restrictions on the use of arbitration in construction defect cases which the Legislature enacted as Code of Civil Procedure section 1298 et seq. (See *Shepard v. Edward Mackay Enterprises, Inc., supra*, 148 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1097-1101.) "States may regulate contracts, including arbitration clauses, under general contract law principles and they may invalidate an arbitration clause 'upon such grounds as exist at law or in equity for the revocation of *any* contract.' [Citation.] What States may not do is decide that a contract is fair enough to enforce all its basic terms (price, service, credit), but not fair enough to enforce its arbitration clause. The Act makes any such state policy unlawful . . . ." (*Allied-Bruce Terminix Companies, Inc. v. Dobson* (1995) 513 U.S. 265, 281 [115 S.Ct. 834].) The FAA also prevents us from relying on the jury waiver

provisions of the California Constitution to invalidate an arbitration agreement. Those provisions of our Constitution would improperly discriminate against arbitration because they would not necessarily invalidate other portions of an agreement which, although lacking actual notice and meaningful reflection, do not purport to waive the right to a jury.

b. *Contract Formation*

However, as we have noted, state law does govern the question of whether an agreement to arbitrate has been made. (See *First Options of Chicago, Inc. v. Kaplan, supra*, 514 U.S. at p. 942, and *Marsch v. Williams, supra*, 23 Cal.App.4th at pp. 254-255.) In this regard we do not believe the Legislature intended CC&R's could be used as a means of creating any continuing contractual rights between the developer of common-interest development and either a homeowners association or individual homeowners.<sup>3</sup>

The express provisions of Civil Code section 1354 state: "(a) The covenants and restrictions in the declaration shall be enforceable equitable servitudes, unless unreasonable, and shall inure to the benefit of and bind all owners of separate interests in the development. Unless the declaration states otherwise, these servitudes may be enforced by any owner of a separate interest or by the association or by both.

"(b) A governing document other than the declaration may be enforced by the association against an owner of a separate interest or by an owner of a separate interest against the association."

---

<sup>3</sup> We express no opinion with respect to parties with whom a developer has a contractual relationship.

Our review of the CC&R's Nobel recorded reveals they are consistent with Civil Code section 1354 and state an intent to benefit only the owners of separate units and provide a right of enforcement only to owners and the Association. Thus neither Civil Code section 1354 nor the terms of the Association's CC&R's express any intent to benefit Nobel in its capacity as developer of the project or provide it with any general right to enforce the CC&R's, other than as the owner of unsold units.

The apparent exclusion of non-owners from the benefits of CC&R's is entirely consistent with the cases which have used contract principles to interpret and enforce CC&R's. (See e.g. *Citizens for Covenant Compliance v. Anderson* (1995) 12 Cal.4th 345, 349 [CC&R's need not be referenced nor repeated in each succeeding deed to be enforceable by other owners]; *Frances T. v. Village Green Owners Assn.* (1986) 42 Cal.3d 490, 512-513 [CC&R's as contract between homeowner and homeowners association with respect to installation of common area lighting]; *Barrett v. Dawson* (1998) 61 Cal.App.4th 1048, 1054 [CC&R's as contract between neighboring property owners prohibiting use of residential property for business activities]; and *Franklin v. Marie Antoinette Condominium Owners Assn.* (1993) 19 Cal.App.4th 824, 828, 833-834.) Each of those cases involved disputes either between homeowners or between homeowners and a homeowners association.

One rationale for excluding non-owners from the benefits of CC&R's can be found in the reasons we were unwilling in *Treo* to find that CC&R's may be used as a means of waiving the right to a jury. CC&R's are generally, as here, adhesive and unilateral and those bound by their terms may only have constructive notice of those terms and no

contractual relationship with the developer who drafted the CC&R's. While, notwithstanding these considerable procedural shortcomings, CC&R's may be a practical and necessary means of nonetheless governing the ongoing relationship between owners of common interest developments or adjoining property (see *Citizens for Covenant Compliance v. Anderson, supra*, 12 Cal.4th at pp. 360-369), no such practicality or necessity exists with respect to the rights or obligations of developers or other third parties.


A related rationale can be found in historic limitations on the enforceability of covenants running with the land. In that regard, our holding in *Kelly v. Tri-Cities Broadcasting, Inc.* (1983) 147 Cal.App.3d 666, 678-679 (*Kelly*), is instructive. In *Kelly* we held a rental arbitration provision in a lease only bound an assignee of the initial lessee while the assignee was a tenant. We found the agreement to arbitrate in the lease was a covenant which ran with the land because it concerned rent and therefore was a covenant which " ' touches and concerns' " the land." (*Id.* at p. 679.) However, we further noted the inherent limitation on the enforceability of covenants running with the land: "This rule is based upon privity of estate, not privity of contract. When the privity of estate no longer exists, those covenants running with the land, based upon that privity, are no longer enforceable. Thus the covenant to arbitrate is binding upon a nonassuming assignee only as to matters arising during the term or period that the assignee was bound by privity of estate. No authorities predict an agreement to arbitrate could be stretched to require arbitration of a claim for rent due after the premises had been abandoned, after the privity of the estate has been broken." (*Ibid.*)

The requirement that only those in privity of estate may enforce a covenant running with the land is of course related to the requirement that such covenants "be for the direct benefit of the property." (Civ. Code, § 1462.) "A covenant made for the direct benefit of the land is one which is intended to restore to the covenantee or the owner of the land some right with respect thereto which he parted with . . . for a special purpose. It is, in other words, a covenant for the direct benefit of the estate or interest of the covenantee in the land . . . ." (*Sacramento S.F.L. v. Whaley* (1920) 50 Cal.App. 125, 130.) Suffice it to say it is difficult to view a covenant which protects Nobel's ability to defend itself against future claims as one which protects Nobel's interest in land, especially here, where Nobel no longer has any interest in the common areas it deeded to the Association.

Also undermining any treatment of CC&R's as creating binding rights in favor of a non-owner such as Nobel is the power to amend the CC&R's found both in Civil Code sections 1355 through 1357 and section 15.4 of the Association's CC&R's. Section 15.4 of the CC&R's expressly provides that the arbitration provisions of the CC&R's, among other provisions, may be amended unilaterally by the homeowners. While the right of homeowners to make amendments which serve their collective interests and in which they have the exclusive right to participate is desirable from the perspective of efficiently maintaining a common-interest development (see *Fourth La Costa Condominium Owners Assn. v. Seith* (2008) 159 Cal.App.4th 563, 569-570), the right to unilaterally amend is somewhat at odds with the notion CC&R's create contractual obligations in favor of non-owners.

In light of the foregoing, we do not believe that in providing in Civil Code section 1354 that CC&R's be treated as equitable servitudes, the Legislature intended that CC&R's would be used to provide continuing and irrevocable contractual benefits to non-owners such as Nobel. Thus the trial court did not err in denying Nobel's motion to compel arbitration.

Order affirmed.



BENKE, Acting P. J.


WE CONCUR:



NARES, J.



McINTYRE, J.







COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Court of Appeal Fourth District

**FILED**

JUN 25 2010

Stephen M. Kelly, Clerk

DEPUTY

VILLA VICENZA HOMEOWNERS  
ASSOCIATION,

Defendant, Cross-Complainant and  
Respondent,

v.

NOBEL COURT DEVELOPMENT, LLC,

Defendant, Cross-Defendant and  
Appellant.

D054550


(Super. Ct. No. GIC871604)

THE COURT:

The petition for rehearing is granted.

By way of simultaneous letter briefs to be filed within 30 days of the date of this order, the parties are directed to respond to the following questions:


The record indicates that under section 15.4 of the covenants, conditions and restrictions (CC&R's), the arbitration provisions at issue in this case may be amended unilaterally by respondent Villa Vicenza Homeowners Association (the Association), upon the written consent of 90 percent of the voting members of the Association and 90 percent of the mortgagees. However, nothing in the record indicates the Association has




attempted to relieve itself of those provisions either with respect to claims against appellant Nobel Court Development, LLC (Nobel), or more generally.

1. Does Nobel dispute the Association has the right under section 15.4 to unilaterally eliminate the arbitration provisions at issue in this case?
2. Has the Association amended the CC&R's with respect to the arbitration provisions at issue in this case?
3. If the arbitration provisions have been altered or eliminated by such an amendment, what impact does the amendment have on Nobel's claims?
4. If the arbitration provisions have not been altered or eliminated by such an amendment, has the Association, by implication, acquiesced in Nobel's contention that the Association's claims are subject to arbitration?

The parties' briefing is limited to the questions raised in this order. No additional briefing will be accepted other than by further order of the court.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
NARES, Acting P. J.

Copies to: All parties







OPINION ON REHEARING  
CERTIFIED FOR PUBLICATION

Court of Appeal Fourth District  
**FILED**

JAN 11 2011

COURT OF APPEAL, FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

Stephen M. Kelly, Clerk

DEPUTY

DIVISION ONE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

VILLA VICENZA HOMEOWNERS  
ASSOCIATION,

Defendant, Cross-Complainant and  
Respondent,

v.

NOBEL COURT DEVELOPMENT, LLC,

Defendant, Cross-Defendant and  
Appellant.

D054550

(Super. Ct. No. GIC871604)

APPEAL from an order of the Superior Court of San Diego County, Ronald Styn,

Judge. Affirmed.

Luce, Forward, Hamilton & Scripps and Charles A. Bird; Allen Matkins Leck  
Gamble Mallory & Natsis and Valentine S. Hoy VIII for Defendant, Cross-Defendant  
and Appellant.

Epsten Grinnell & Howell, Jon H. Epsten, Douglas W. Grinnell and Anne L.

Rauch for Defendant, Cross-Complainant and Respondent.

In this case the developer of a condominium project recorded a declaration of covenants, conditions and restrictions (CC&R's) which required that a homeowners association arbitrate any construction defect claim the association might have against the developer. As we explain more fully below, we find CC&R's are not an effective means of obtaining an agreement to arbitrate a homeowners association's construction defect claims against a developer.<sup>1</sup>

Although both federal and state law favor the enforcement of arbitration *agreements*, neither federal nor state law countenance imposition of arbitration where no agreement to waive judicial remedies exists. Admittedly, in other circumstances our cases and Civil Code section 1354 treat CC&R's as equitable servitudes which bind homeowners and homeowners associations with respect to claims they may have against each other. This treatment of CC&R's is not based on any determination the parties bound by them are in privity of contract with either their co-owners or a homeowners association. Rather, CC&R's are made binding in disputes between homeowners or between homeowners and a homeowners association because of their shared and continuing interest in the equitable and efficient operation of common interest

---

<sup>1</sup> We recognize this issue is currently pending before our Supreme Court. (See e.g., *Pinnacle Museum Tower Assn. v. Pinnacle Market Development (US), LLC*, review granted November 10, 2010, No. S186149.)

developments. Here, the recorded CC&R's, standing alone, are not a contract between the developer and the homeowners association, which only came into existence after the CC&R's were recorded. Thus here there has been no showing the association entered into a binding arbitration agreement. Accordingly, the trial court did not err in denying the developers' motion to compel arbitration.

#### FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

Nobel Court Development, LLC (Nobel), purchased the 418 apartments, common areas, and common facilities which make up the Villa Vicenza project in 2004 and converted the apartments to condominiums in 2005. In the course of making the property a condominium project, Nobel recorded CC&R's under which the Villa Vicenza Homeowners Association (the Association) came into existence upon the sale of the first condominium. By deed Nobel also transferred ownership of the common areas and common facilities to the Association. No consideration was provided by the Association to Nobel and the Association did not execute any documents in favor of Nobel in connection with the deed transferring the common areas and common facilities to the Association. In pertinent part, the CC&R's require that both condominium owners and the Association arbitrate any claims they have against the developer.

Because following the first sale Nobel controlled the board of directors of the Association and because the initial condominium buyers noticed defects in common areas and common facilities and did not believe Nobel had provided a reserve fund sufficient to repair the defects, the condominium owners brought a derivative action on behalf of the

Association against Nobel.<sup>2</sup> Later, an independent litigation committee of the Association was appointed and filed a cross-complaint against Nobel. The committee alleged claims for breach of implied warranty, strict liability, negligence and as the third-party beneficiary of express and implied warranties Nobel made to individual homeowners. Following unsuccessful efforts to mediate the Association's claims, Nobel filed a motion to compel arbitration under the provisions of the CC&R's. The trial court denied the motion with respect to the bulk of the Association's claims, but compelled arbitration of the express warranty claims. Nobel filed a timely notice of appeal. (Code Civ. Proc., § 1294, subd. (a).)

## DISCUSSION

### I

Because the trial court did not consider any disputed extrinsic evidence or otherwise resolve any disputed factual issues, we review its order on Nobel's motion to compel arbitration de novo. (*Giuliano v. Inland Empire Personnel, Inc.* (2007) 149 Cal.App.4th 1276, 1284.)

### II

Both the Federal Arbitration Act (9 U.S. Code § 1 et seq. (FAA)) and its California counterpart, the California Arbitration Act (Code Civ. Proc., § 1280 et seq. (CAA)), make arbitration agreements enforceable and indeed favor them. (See *Moses H.*

---

<sup>2</sup> The individual condominium buyers also brought claims on their own behalf and by way of a prior order, which is not the subject of this appeal, the trial court ordered those individual claims be arbitrated.

*Cone Memorial Hosp. v. Mercury Const.* (1983) 460 U.S. 1, 24 [103 S.Ct. 927];  
*Broughton v. Cigna Healthplans* (1999) 21 Cal.4th 1066, 1074-1075.) However, under both the FAA and the CAA, the question of whether a party has in fact entered into an arbitration agreement is determined by reference to state-law principles governing the formation of contracts. (See *First Options of Chicago, Inc. v. Kaplan* (1995) 514 U.S. 938, 942 [115 S.Ct. 1920], and *Marsch v. Williams* (1994) 23 Cal.App.4th 250, 254-255.)

Here, we do not believe the CC&R's Nobel recorded represent a binding agreement on the part of the Association to arbitrate its construction defect claims against Nobel. In reaching this conclusion we rely on our recent holding in *Treo @ Kettner Homeowners Assn. v. Superior Court* (2008) 166 Cal.App.4th 1055, 1066-1067 (*Treo*), and the provisions of Civil Code section 1354. Although as we explain the holding in *Treo* is not directly applicable to the arbitration provisions of the CC&R's, the principles it discusses are helpful in determining whether an agreement to arbitrate exists.

1. *Treo*

In *Treo* the developer of condominium project recorded CC&R's which made all disputes between the developer and the homeowners association subject to a judicial reference under Code of Civil Procedure section 638. The homeowners association sued the developer for construction defects and the developer moved to have the matter determined by a referee under Code of Civil Procedure section 638. The trial court granted the developer's motion and the homeowners association filed a petition for a writ of mandate. We issued the writ.

Because a reference under Code of Civil Procedure section 638 effectively waives a party's constitutional right to a jury trial, we found that under *Grafton Partners v. Superior Court* (2005) 36 Cal.4th 944, 950-952 (*Grafton*), no agreement to such a reference can be found absent actual notice to the party to be bound and meaningful reflection. (*Treo, supra*, 166 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1066-1067.) In *Grafton* the plaintiff had retained an accounting firm. The firm's engagement letter required that, in the event of a dispute, the parties would waive their right to a jury. The Supreme Court found this agreement was not enforceable because the Legislature has not expressly authorized such a pre-litigation waiver of the "inviolable right" to a jury trial as required by article I, section 16 of the California Constitution. (*Grafton, supra*, 36 Cal.4th at p. 951.) The court found this constitutional limitation on permissible jury waivers exists because the right to a trial by jury is "too sacred in its character to be frittered away or committed to the uncontrolled caprice of every judge or magistrate in the State." (*Id.* at p. 956.) Moreover, the court noted that even where a statute permits a jury waiver, the right to a jury is "considered so fundamental that ambiguity in the statute permitting such waivers must be resolved in favor of according to a litigant a jury trial." (*Ibid.*) Importantly, the court in *Grafton* noted that the states which have permitted a contractual jury waiver, have imposed a number of procedural safeguards not typical in commercial law, including requirements which place on the party seeking enforcement of a waiver the burden of proving "the waiver clause was entered into knowingly and voluntarily." (*Id.* at p. 956.)

Having found that under *Grafton* a jury waiver requires actual notice and meaningful reflection, in *Treo* we found the constructive notice provided by the CC&R's did not meet those standards: "The difficulty here is the manner in which the 'contract' between [the developer] and [the homeowners association] waiving the right to trial by jury came about. As we have noted, an association, with its obligations and restrictions as defined in the CC&R's, essentially springs into existence when there is a conveyance by the developer of a separate interest coupled with an interest in the common area or membership in the association.

"It is at least arguable that there is some meeting of the minds between the developer and the party to whom the first conveyance is made. The problem, however, is that later purchasers and their successors, who will make up almost all association members, effectively have no choice but to accept the CC&R's prepared by the developer, including in this case the waiver of the right to trial by jury.

"We conclude this is not the situation the legislature contemplated when it enacted section 638 to allow parties to waive by contract the 'inviolable' constitutional right to trial by jury. As *Grafton* suggests, Legislatures when providing for the contractual waiver of that right are particularly concerned with the formalities of the process and the actual existence of a mutual agreement to waive the right. [Citation.]

"Treating CC&R's as a contract such that they are sufficient to waive the right to trial by jury does not comport with the importance of the right waived. CC&R's are notoriously lengthy, are adhesive in nature, are written by developers perhaps years before many owners buy, and often, as here with regard to the waiver of trial by jury,

cannot be modified by the association. Further, the document is not signed by the parties." (*Treo, supra*, 166 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1066-1067.)

In finding CC&R's were not a permissible means of obtaining a jury waiver, we recognized that in *Villa Milano Homeowners Assn. v. IL Davorge* (2000) 84 Cal.App.4th 819, 828-835 (*Villa Milano*), the court reached a contrary conclusion and found that because in other contexts the CC&R's had been treated as binding upon purchasers of interests in common interest developments, the CC&R's could be used to obtain agreements to arbitrate. (*Treo, supra*, 166 Cal.App. 4th at p. 1065.) We declined to follow that aspect of *Villa Milano*. We noted that *Villa Milano* was decided before *Grafton* and further that: "Treating CC&R's as equitable servitudes makes possible the existence of common interest communities because they allow the continued governance of the community when multiple parties own the property and when such ownership changes over time. The very nature, however, of the creation of CC&R's creates a distance in time and control between the parties that are bound by them. While it may be reasonable under such circumstances to bind owners and the association concerning the governance of the community and the placement of restrictions on the use of property, we conclude the Legislature did not intend that CC&R's be sufficient to effectively and permanently waive the constitutional right to trial by jury." (*Treo, supra*, 166 Cal.App.4th at p. 1067.)

## 2. Arbitration Agreement

As Nobel points out, where an arbitration agreement is covered by the FAA, the FAA preempts any conflicting state law. (*Shepard v. Edward Mackay Enterprises, Inc.*

(2007) 148 Cal.App.4th 1092, 1097-1099.) Thus Nobel argues the jury waiver provisions in the California Constitution we relied on in *Treo* cannot be used to adversely impact its right to compel arbitration under the FAA.

We agree with Nobel that any purported agreement between it and the Association would be covered by the FAA and that where the FAA applies, the California Constitution cannot be used to treat arbitration agreements differently than other types of agreements. However, the FAA, like the CAA, only imposes arbitration on parties which have *agreed* to forego resort to judicial remedies. In this regard, while it is true in *Treo* we found that the CC&R's do not meet the particular requirements of the California Constitution, our analysis in *Treo* of the manner in which the CC&R's operate, as well as our further consideration of Civil Code section 1354, persuade us a developer may not obtain any contractual rights, including the right to arbitration, by the simple expedient of recording the CC&R's. Neither the circumstances by which the CC&R's are recorded nor their controlling impact on disputes between those with an ownership interest in or responsibility for the operation of a common interest development give rise to any sort of binding agreement between developers who have recorded the CC&R's and those who might in the future be burdened by them.

a. *FAA Pre-Emption*

Nobel notes that by their terms the CC&R's state: "Because many of the materials and products incorporated into the home are manufactured in other states, the development and conveyance of the Property evidences a transaction involving interstate commerce and the Federal Arbitration Act (9 U.S.C. § 1, et seq.) now in effect and as it

may be hereafter amended will govern the interpretation and enforcement of the arbitration provisions of this Declaration." The facts set forth in the CC&R's are hardly matters subject to serious dispute. Nobel's condominium project was a substantial multi-family housing development composed of literally hundreds of dwelling units, the construction of which no doubt necessitated myriad contacts with and impacts on interstate commerce. Moreover, it can hardly be a matter of controversy interstate commerce was involved in financing the purchase of hundreds of individual condominiums from Nobel. Thus, the connection between the project and interstate commerce is manifest here and more than sufficient to support application of the FAA.

In this regard the United States Supreme Court's opinion in *Citizens Bank v. Alafabco, Inc.* (2003) 539 U.S. 52, 55-58 [123 S.Ct. 2037], is controlling. In *Citizens Bank v. Alafabco, Inc.*, an Alabama borrower entered into a series of debt-restructuring agreements with an Alabama bank. Each of the restructuring agreements contained arbitration provisions. Because the borrower believed the bank had reneged on an agreement to provide the borrower with working capital, the borrower sued the bank, which then moved to compel arbitration.

In finding a connection with interstate commerce sufficient to support application of the FAA, the court found application of the FAA was not "defeated because the individual debt-restructuring transactions, taken alone, did not have a 'substantial effect on interstate commerce.' [Citation.] Congress' Commerce Clause power 'may be exercised in individual cases without showing any specific effect upon interstate commerce' if in the aggregate the economic activity in question would represent 'a

general practice . . . subject to federal control.' [Citations.] Only that general practice need bear on interstate commerce in a substantial way. [Citations.]" (*Citizens Bank v. Alafabco, Inc., supra*, 539 U.S. at pp. 56-57.)

The court found the debt-restructuring agreements not only involved interstate commerce because of the borrower's substantial interstate business, but also because the restructured debt was secured by all of the debtor's business assets, "including its inventory of goods assembled from out-of-state parts and raw materials. If the Commerce Clause gives Congress the power to regulate local business establishments purchasing substantial quantities of goods that have moved in interstate commerce, *Katzenbach v. McClung*, 379 U.S. 294, 304-305, 85 S.Ct. 377, 132 L.Ed.2d 290 (1964), it necessarily reaches substantial commercial loan transactions secured by such goods." (*Citizens Bank v. Alafabco, Inc., supra*, 539 U.S. at p. 58.) The court further found that "were there any residual doubt about the magnitude of the impact on interstate commerce caused by the particular economic transactions in which the parties were engaged, that doubt would dissipate upon consideration of the 'general practice' those transactions represent. [Citation.] No elaborate explanation is needed to make evident the broad impact of commercial lending on the national economy or Congress' power to regulate that activity pursuant to the Commerce Clause." (*Id.* at pp. 58-59.)

Similarly, here it can hardly be disputed Congress has the power to regulate the sale and financing of a large residential development. The financing alone, implicates the use of federally regulated and chartered financial institutions with well-recognized impacts on interstate commerce, and thus supports application of the FAA under *Citizens*

*Bank v. Alfabaco, Inc.* In this regard we note that under the Civil Code section 1351, subdivisions (a), (j) and (k), creation of the Association and its ownership of common areas and facilities was an integral part of the creation of the condominium project.

Application of the FAA to the transfer of property to the Association, prevents us from enforcing restrictions on the use of arbitration in construction defect cases which the Legislature enacted as Code of Civil Procedure section 1298 et seq. (See *Shepard v. Edward Mackay Enterprises, Inc.*, *supra*, 148 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1097-1101.) "States may regulate contracts, including arbitration clauses, under general contract law principles and they may invalidate an arbitration clause 'upon such grounds as exist at law or in equity for the revocation of *any* contract.' [Citation.] What States may not do is decide that a contract is fair enough to enforce all its basic terms (price, service, credit), but not fair enough to enforce its arbitration clause. The Act makes any such state policy unlawful . . . ." (*Allied-Bruce Terminix Companies, Inc. v. Dobson* (1995) 513 U.S. 265, 281 [115 S.Ct. 834].) The FAA also prevents us from relying on the jury waiver provisions of the California Constitution to invalidate an arbitration agreement. Those provisions of our Constitution would improperly discriminate against arbitration because they would not necessarily invalidate other portions of an agreement which, although lacking actual notice and meaningful reflection, do not purport to waive the right to a jury.

b. *Contract Formation*

However, as we have noted, state law does govern the question of whether an agreement to arbitrate has been made. (See *First Options of Chicago, Inc. v. Kaplan*,

*supra*, 514 U.S. at p. 942, and *Marsch v. Williams, supra*, 23 Cal.App.4th at pp. 254-255.) In this regard we do not believe the Legislature intended that the CC&R's by themselves could be used as a means of creating any continuing contractual rights between the developer of common-interest development and either a homeowners association or individual homeowners with whom a developer has no contractual relationship.<sup>3</sup>

The express provisions of Civil Code section 1354 state: "(a) The covenants and restrictions in the declaration shall be enforceable equitable servitudes, unless unreasonable, and shall inure to the benefit of and bind all owners of separate interests in the development. Unless the declaration states otherwise, these servitudes may be *enforced by any owner of a separate interest or by the association or by both.* (Italics added.)

"(b) A governing document other than the declaration may be enforced *by the association against an owner of a separate interest or by an owner of a separate interest against the association.*" (Italics added.)

Our review of the CC&R's Nobel recorded reveals they are consistent with Civil Code section 1354 and state an intent to benefit only the owners of separate units and provide a right of enforcement only to owners and the Association. Thus neither Civil Code section 1354 nor the terms of the Association's CC&R's express any intent to

---

<sup>3</sup> We express no opinion with respect to parties with whom a developer has a contractual relationship.

benefit Nobel in its capacity as developer of the project or provide it with any general right to enforce the CC&R's, other than as the owner of unsold units.

Limiting enforcement of CC&R's to owners and associations which act on behalf of owners is entirely consistent with the cases which have used contract principles to interpret and enforce CC&R's. (See e.g. *Citizens for Covenant Compliance v. Anderson* (1995) 12 Cal.4th 345, 349 [CC&R's need not be referenced nor repeated in each succeeding deed to be enforceable by other owners]; *Frances T. v. Village Green Owners Assn.* (1986) 42 Cal.3d 490, 512-513 [CC&R's as contract between homeowner and homeowners association with respect to installation of common area lighting]; *Barrett v. Dawson* (1998) 61 Cal.App.4th 1048, 1054 [CC&R's as contract between neighboring property owners prohibiting use of residential property for business activities]; and *Franklin v. Marie Antoinette Condominium Owners Assn.* (1993) 19 Cal.App.4th 824, 828, 833-834.) Each of those cases involved disputes either between homeowners or between homeowners and a homeowners association. As we noted in *B.C.E. Development, Inc. v. Smith* (1989) 215 Cal.App.3d 1142, 1149 (*B.C.E.*): "Recent times have seen increased development of multi-residential units which are interrelated. Condominium construction introduced the concept of common space dividers, both vertical and horizontal. Open as well as communal space reserved for the common use of tract residents became a typical benefit of developments, both in the form of condominiums and separated dwelling unit tracts. Private internal roads and gated entrances gave rise to the necessity of guards and maintenance personnel for the service of all residents of the development. Regulation of the rights, *inter se*, of the residents

could be achieved, and assured, only by the adoption of highly detailed and specific regulations, imposed on initial buyers and successors in interest alike by the use of recorded mutual agreements . . . . [¶] . . . . Typically, the interest in enforcing restrictions will be common to most, if not all, members of the community. Requiring individual landowners to shoulder the burden of enforcement litigation would be unreasonable. The administration of the common areas in the development is typically allocated to a homeowners association, or to some other entity constituted to represent all of the owners. Often at the inception of the development the enforcement entity is created and controlled by the developer of the project. It is highly reasonable in these circumstances that the representative association or other central agency undertake, on behalf of all homeowners, such litigation as may be required to enforce the CC&Rs."<sup>4</sup>

The rationale for limiting the enforcement of CC&R's to owners and representative associations can be found in the reasons we were unwilling in *Treo* to find that CC&R's may be used as a means of waiving the right to a jury. CC&R's are

---

<sup>4</sup> In *B.C.E.* we held that a developer, as the declarant which recorded CC&R's, could reserve the power to enforce the CC&R's, notwithstanding the fact the developer no longer had any interest in the development. However the CC&R's we considered in *B.C.E.* were recorded in 1968 and concerned a subdivision of separate parcels. The *B.C.E.* CC&R's were not subject to the current version of section 1354 or its statutory predecessor. (See Stats. 1963, ch. 860.) Importantly, in finding that the developer could enforce the CC&R's, we found the developer, which was attempting to enforce architectural restrictions, was acting not in its own interest, but as the only logical representative of all the property owners in the development. (*B.C.E.*, *supra*, 215 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1149-1150.) Here, Nobel is acting solely in its own pecuniary interest and not as the representative of anyone with any existing interest in the development. In this case the enforcement role we endorsed in *B.C.E.* is being filled by the Association under the terms of section 1354.

generally, as here, adhesive and unilateral and those bound by their terms may only have constructive notice of those terms and no contractual relationship with the developer who drafted the CC&R's. While, notwithstanding these considerable procedural shortcomings, CC&R's may be a practical and necessary means of nonetheless governing the ongoing relationship between owners of common interest developments or adjoining property (see *Citizens for Covenant Compliance v. Anderson, supra*, 12 Cal.4th at pp. 360-369), no such practicality or necessity exists with respect to the rights or obligations of developers or other third parties.

A related rationale can be found in historic limitations on the enforceability of covenants running with the land. In that regard, our holding in *Kelly v. Tri-Cities Broadcasting, Inc.* (1983) 147 Cal.App.3d 666, 678-679 (*Kelly*), is instructive. In *Kelly* we held a rental arbitration provision in a lease only bound an assignee of the initial lessee while the assignee was a tenant. We found the agreement to arbitrate in the lease was a covenant which ran with the land because it concerned rent and therefore was a covenant which " ' touches and concerns' the land." (*Id.* at p. 679.) However, we further noted the inherent limitation on the enforceability of covenants running with the land: "This rule is based upon privity of estate, not privity of contract. When the privity of estate no longer exists, those covenants running with the land, based upon that privity, are no longer enforceable. Thus the covenant to arbitrate is binding upon a nonassuming assignee only as to matters arising during the term or period that the assignee was bound by privity of estate. No authorities predict an agreement to arbitrate could be stretched to require arbitration of a claim for rent due after the premises had been abandoned, after the

privity of the estate has been broken." (*Ibid.*; see also *Melchor Investment Co. v. Rolm Systems* (1992) 3 Cal.App.4th 587, 592-593.)

The use of CC&R's as a means of providing contractual rights to parties with no interest in or responsibility for a common interest development is also problematic from the standpoint of determining what if any consideration would support such third-party agreements. By their terms the CC&R's bind all successors, even those with whom a third party such as Nobel has never had any contractual relationship and to whom Nobel has not provided any consideration.<sup>5</sup>

In light of the foregoing, we do not believe that in providing in Civil Code section 1354 that CC&R's be treated as equitable servitudes, the Legislature intended that CC&R's would be used to provide continuing and irrevocable contractual benefits to entities such as Nobel, which have no continuing interest in a development or role as a representative of the owners of the development. Thus the trial court did not err in denying Nobel's motion to compel arbitration.

---

<sup>5</sup> We note that under sections 1355 through 1357 and the terms of the Association's CC&R's, the Association has the power to amend the CC&R's. Because it appears from the record that Nobel controlled the Association until after these proceedings were initiated, we draw no inference from the Association's failure to amend the CC&R's.

Order affirmed.

*Benke*

BENKE, Acting P. J.

WE CONCUR:

*Nares*

NARES, J.

*McIntyre*

McINTYRE, J.

**PROOF OF SERVICE**

***NOBEL COURT DEVELOPMENT v. VILLA VICENZA HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION***

Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division One, Case No. D054550  
San Diego Superior Court, Case No. GIC871604

I, the undersigned, certify and declare that I am a resident of the United States, over 18 years of age and am not a party to the within action. My business address is 600 West Broadway, Suite 2600, San Diego, CA 92101.

On February 22, 2011, I served the foregoing document described as:

**PETITION FOR REVIEW**

by providing a true and correct copy of the aforementioned document(s) on the interested parties in this action identified as follows and by the means designated below:

Anne L. Rauch, Esq.  
Jon H. Epsten, Esq.  
Epsten Grinnell & Howell  
9980 Carroll Canyon Road, 2nd Floor  
San Diego, CA 92131  
Tele: (858) 527-0111  
Fax: (858) 527-1531

*Attorneys for Respondent*  
Villa Vicenza Homeowners Association


Clerk of the Court  
Court of Appeal  
Fourth District, Division One  
750 B Street, Suite 300  
San Diego, CA 92101

(1 copy)

**BY MAIL** – By placing a true and correct copy of the aforementioned document(s) in a sealed envelope, correctly addressed to the recipient(s) with postage thereon fully prepaid at San Diego, California, in the ordinary course of business. I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on February 22, 2011 at San Diego, California.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Maria E. Valentino