	The Law Offices of <b>PHILLIPS &amp; BOR</b> A Professional Corporation 410 West O'Brien Drive, Suite 102 Hagåtña, Guam 96910-504 Tel: (671) 477-ABCD (2223) • Fax: (671) 477-2FAX (2329) "1 Erensia, Lina'Ia', Espiritu-ta" Attorneys for Real-Party-In-Interest	Sublish That a Bat Ed S
5	Automotys for fear raity in increase	32-13-226
3	SUPERIOR COURT OF GUAM	
6		
7	MARIA A. GANGE, JESUS CRUZ	) CIVIL CASE NO. CV1461-10
8	CHARFAUROS, ANA A. CHARGUALAF,	$\left( \frac{1}{10000000000000000000000000000000000$
0	JESUS G. AGUIGUI, for themselves and on	
9	behalf of all others similarly situated,	
10	Plaintiffs,	)
11		REAL-PARTY-IN-INTEREST'S
	VS.	$\frac{1}{2}$ POSITION OF THE ISSUES T
12	GOVERNMENT OF GUAM, GUAM	) COURT ORDERED BRIEFE
13	ANCESTRAL LANDS COMMISSION, by	) ON NOVEMBER 30, $2012\frac{1}{1}$
	and through its individual Commissioners (for injunctive relief only to prevent a	
14	(for injunctive rener only to prevent a transfer) and DOES One (1) through	
15	Three hundred (300). inclusive.	)      <b>26</b>
16	Defendants.	ý př
17		,

Real-Party-In-Interest, Crawford agrees with the Government's position on the first two issues listed by the Government. Crawford's only exception is that in the event the Court finds the existing of a "taking," Plaintiffs' remedy is not an injunction but instead a lawsuit for damages (as with eminent domain and reverse condemnation cases) or possibly (but unlikely) the filing of a government claim. In any case, Plaintiffs do not have a right to enjoin the Government's election to utilize government property and resources in the manner chosen by the Guam Legislature.

26 27

28

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Martin

0226

4:33P

REAL-PARTY-IN-INTEREST'S POSITION ON THE ISSUES THE COURT ORDERED ON NOVEMBER 30, 2012 Civil Case No. CV1461-10 Page 2

If Plaintiffs do in fact have claim to a "stream of income" they do not thereby have a claim to a specific stream of income. Even at the Retirement Fund, defined benefits participants (retirees) cannot dictate to the Government of Guam the manner in which the Government of Guam fulfills similar obligations (funded or unfunded). Crawford takes no position on whether Plaintiffs are entitled to a stream of income funded by the Government of Guam or a specific agency within the Government of Guam.

The Attorney General's office ventures into the province reserved by the Organic Act exclusively for the Guam Legislature. The AG argues that should the Court rule there is a taking, and the taking serves a public purpose, "the taking should be enjoined." This conflicts with case law and is not logical. Under the Organic Act, the Government may "take" if for a "public purpose" and as a result of such taking (not as a condition precedent), claims for "just compensation" may be filed and paid. The AG's Office may not agree with the legislative wisdom or policy but unless such legislative action rises to a level violating the Organic Act of Guam such policy must be honored and enforced.

Respectfully submitted this 1<sup>st</sup> day of February, 2013.

PHILLIPS & BORDALLO, P.C.

By: MICHAEĽ F. PHILLIPS