SANTA BARBARA, CALIFORNIA; MONDAY, AUGUST 8, 2011

PM SESSION

DEPARTMENT NO. 6 HON. DENISE de BELLEFEUILLE, JUDGE

(Partial Transcript.)

THE COURT: Okay. I want to, first of all, thank counsel. I so appreciate, respect and admire each and every one of you in your advocacy, your Santa Barbara style. It's very stylish.

For those of you in the audience, if you heard us back meeting privately in my office as we did a few times during the trial, if you heard peels of laughter, it's because that's Santa Barbara style. We get along. We do our work pleasantly. And there were moments at which we each were expressing how much we individually and collectively appreciate The Independent. And I think I speak for all the lawyers in the case in expressing the thought that The Independent is the journalistic jewel of Santa Barbara. I know that I often turn to its pages to find out what's going on right here in the courthouse because we don't have any idea when we're individually doing our work as Judges.

Up here on the bench I keep my copy pocket of the Constitution of the United States. I want you to note how small and compact it is compared to, oh, the Constitution of the State of California. You know, but the First Amendment is a very important and cherished

constitutional right. And The Independent gets credit for its journalistic integrity. And we all very much appreciate the tremendous contribution it makes to the community.

So, Mr. Campbell, I have to compliment you for having the vision to go into the newspaper business and to start something that I'm sure that your mother is now proud of, even though she wanted you to have that degree from UCSB. What you've done is simply tremendous. And I truly understand how attached you are to this creation. It's your baby. You made it from nothing.

And Miss Partridge, you of course as the editorial heart of the paper get the credit for the vision, the fierce independence and the journalistic integrity that Santa Barbarans have come to rely on every week for a source of information that they can trust about their community.

The fact that you've been able to navigate for so many years when you have very different personalities and -- I guess I'll leave it at that. Different personalities that, you're both strong-willed, you both have different ideas. You've made it work.

I enjoyed seeing Mr. Parker and Mr. -- Dr. Parker and Mr. St. Jean. I have to say, they are a couple of characters. Good characters. And it has been a marvelous success.

This isn't a complicated case really when it comes right down to it. It's a simple contract case.

And we can all look back to the first year of law school when we learned offer, acceptance and consideration.

Magic elements for making a contract.

And it's apparent after hearing from everyone, from all sources, that Mr. Campbell made an offer, that he had a reasonable time to leave it hanging out there. He was acting in accordance with his understanding of the buy-sell agreement that bound him, that bound the other shareholders. Whether Miss Partridge had signed it originally or not, she was bound by it as a shareholder.

He made his offer. He thought he had scrutinized its terms. He made the offer. And that offer was not withdrawn before Miss Partridge accepted it in writing pursuant to the terms of the buy-sell. She had the consideration. She put the money in an account. She has won the right to specific performance. I find for her on Count 1 of her Complaint.

Count 2 is that Mr. Campbell refused to deliver the shares. And part of the decision of the case is that a reasonable time period will be set for Mr. Campbell to do just that. That he has an obligation to sell to her his 51 percent of the ownership of The Independent for the sum of \$1,377,000.

I find that the true-up is not applicable. The Southland proposal makes for interesting background information, but it is neither here nor there. There's no way that the shareholders are bound to extend a

contract, keep Mr. Campbell as the publisher. They simply have the opportunity to match the offer for the shares and that's it. That's the end of the story.

On Count 3 of the Complaint I find that there was no breach of fiduciary duty on Mr. Campbell's behalf by insisting on an employment contract for himself. He was just trying to hold on to his dream and to increase his consideration. I don't know what went wrong when Mr. Thurlow left the company and why he didn't get the same package that Mr. Thurlow had, but that's not part of the evidence. It's just past history.

I find against Mr. Campbell on his three counts in his Cross-Complaint. There's no evidence that Miss Partridge engaged in wrongdoing or breached the Buy-Sell Agreement by obtaining funds from an outside source and as secretary of the corporation. Her role as secretary of the corporation is not relevant. Her only role is that of shareholder. She was entitled to buy Mr. Campbell's shares.

This Acquisition of Shares For Own Account language in the buy-sell has no applicability to future purchases of shares in the company by shareholders. There is no -- I find that there is no clause in this contract that prohibits a shareholder from buying -- borrowing money to buy shares. It's illogical. It doesn't make any sense.

And I think, Mr. Hill, you did a good job of tying all the language together. The Acquisition of

Shares For Own Account language is written in the present tense, and it obviously applies to Mr. Campbell and Mr. Grand-Jean in putting the original capital into the company to start the corporation. And it was important at the beginning of the corporation not to borrow money so that you had capital. It couldn't be taken away.

I don't find that she did anything wrong by secretly negotiating with Mr. Cole. I don't find that he, Mr. Cole, violated any duty to Mr. Campbell because he had represented him in the last century on an unrelated business dispute. He's not acting as Miss Partridge's lawyer. There's no fiduciary obligation that was breached there.

On Count 2 of the Cross-Complaint Mr.

Campbell's alleged that Miss Partridge omitted material matters at the meeting and concealed material correspondence between minority shareholders. Both of the experts called in this case agreed that minority shareholders have no fiduciary duty to a majority shareholder. There is no breach.

And number three, that there was a breach on her part of good faith and fair dealing, that he had not made a binding offer, that she tried to buy shares and deceive Mr. Campbell and improperly force him to sell his shares. The written materials prepared by Mr. Campbell say otherwise. His language in Exhibit Number 14 could not have been more clear. "This notice

is of my intent to sell all of my shares in the Santa Barbara Independent to Southland Publishing. I own 1530 shares and will accept \$1,377,000." And then he references the Southland offer sheet.

They had the right of first refusal. Miss Partridge, being resourceful, was able to marshal resources to present her acceptance of that offer in writing appropriately on November 23rd, and then again, I can't remember the date that she gave it to him again, but he couldn't escape the fact that she accepted his offer before he withdrew it. We have a contract. It is enforceable. Specific performance is the remedy.

Now, Mr. Rydell, you've asked me to prepare a Statement of Decision. I wonder if there are any post-trial questions that you wish to pose in writing, either side, that you want me to include in the Statement of Decision. You know what my ruling is. But if there's something that you need in a more detailed manner I need to know that from you now.

MR. RYDELL: Well, here's my suggestion, and it's only that. Since you've shared your reasoning in some considerable detail I would be prepared to agree that that constitutes under the law your tentative decision and that triggers our, both sides' ability to suggest additional items that may be included or may not be included according to what the Court decides.

The ultimate decision is yours. But if we call

this your tentative decision then everything in the Code of Civil Procedure naturally follows that with the time frame specified.

THE COURT: So you want to think about it?

MR. RYDELL: Right. If -- I think if we just follow the code it's the simplest way to do it. I'm not saying we need a written tentative decision, I'm suggesting we use what you've just said as your -- what the code calls your tentative decision in this case.

THE COURT: Okay. It's my ruling. It's not tentative. I've made my mind up. So if you want a Statement of Decision, you asked for one before we started --

MR. RYDELL: Right.

THE COURT: -- the arguments. I'm proposing that if you stand by that, if there are any questions that you want to have answered you ought to prepare a brief with the questions, share it with your colleague. If you have any, it's a ten day time period I think from now.

MR. HILL: Right.

MR. RYDELL: There's specific time limits in the Code of Civil Procedure. And I -- I'm just proposing we follow the code, that's all.

THE COURT: Well, at some point Judgment is going to have to be entered. Then we have to talk about the timing for other things. Do you want me to put this down for a Case Management Conference at the end of the

1 month or beginning of September? What do you want to 2 do? 3 MR. HILL: The end of the month, your Honor, 4 would work. I think the ten day time period allows us to -- to make any suggestions that we believe should be 5 6 considered by the Court to augment its decision, and the 7 Court can then decide on them and we can get that process done in the time period we've got. 8 9 THE COURT: August 25th at 8:30. MR. HILL: That's fine, your Honor. 10 11 That's fine. But are you planning MR. RYDELL: 12 on ruling that day? I mean --13 THE COURT: I'm ruling now. 14 MR. RYDELL: Your Honor, I know you are. 15 THE COURT: I thought I made myself very clear. 16 Offer, acceptance, consideration, contract, specific 17 performance granted. I'm ruling now. 18 MR. RYDELL: Your Honor, I'm not suggesting 19 you're not. I'm just saying that there's a procedure 20 that's specifically called for in the code. 21 THE COURT: You have ten days to request a 22 Statement of Decision. You've requested it. 23 MR. RYDELL: Right. 24 THE COURT: So I will write one. But if you 25 want me to focus any particular attention on any aspect of the case, I'm inviting you to submit written 26 27 questions, further briefing. And I suggested that we 28 set it down as a place card keeper on August 25th.

1	MR. RYDELL: Right.
2	MR. TRAGER: We could have those further
3	questions to you, if there are any, by next Monday.
4	You're gone this week.
5	THE COURT: I'm gone this week. So, sure,
6	Monday works. That's fine.
7	MR. HILL: Both sides.
8	THE COURT: Who's on first, what's on second.
9	MR. RYDELL: Your Honor, I mean, it seems to me
10	that the code provides certain deadlines.
11	THE COURT: So you don't want to meet again?
12	MR. RYDELL: No. I'm happy to meet on that
13	date. But then there's a further suggestion we get the
14	stuff to you by next Monday.
15	THE COURT: I don't think you have to do it by
16	next Monday.
17	MR. RYDELL: Whatever the code requires we're
18	going to comply with.
19	MR. HILL: All right. Well, seems like we
20	don't have a lot of argument on that point. If he
21	insists on the code then we have to follow the code.
22	But I understand the Court's
23	THE COURT: August 25th
24	MR. HILL: August 25th.
25	THE COURT: we'll meet again.
26	MR. HILL: Thank you, your Honor.
27	MR. TRAGER: Thank you, your Honor.
28	(Proceedings concluded.)