

20  
07

CALIFORNIA LAWYER ATTORNEYS OF THE YEAR

CLAY

A W A R D S



WE HONOR  
43 ATTORNEYS  
FOR THEIR  
EXTRAORDINARY  
ACHIEVEMENTS  
IN 2006



By the Editors of CALIFORNIA LAWYER

## The California Lawyer Attorneys of the Year Awards

recognize attorneys around the state whose achievements have made a profound impact in 2006 or whose work from December 2005 to December 2006 is expected to have such an effect in the coming years. The awards identify 28 achievements in 17 areas of legal practice that reflect the breadth and depth of the work performed by California lawyers.

The 43 attorneys honored here changed the law, substantially influenced public policy or the profession, or achieved a remarkable victory for a client or for the public. They include government attorneys, public-interest lawyers, sole practitioners, and attorneys from large international firms. Their successes range from winning a \$2.8 billion judgment for a single client to convincing the state Supreme Court to uphold a city's antidiscrimination law. Congratulations to the winners. —*Chuleenan Svetvilas*

### APPELLATE



**CUTTING, LEVY, AND PERROCHET WON A BET-THE-COMPANY** case on behalf of the beleaguered city of San Diego. In early 2001 the city lost a huge inverse-condemnation and breach-of-contract verdict to a local developer, and by the time the case got to the Fourth District Court of Appeals, the interest owed on the judgment

had increased the city's potential liability to about \$150 million. San Diego could ill afford a loss: It has a pension deficit of \$1 billion and has been unable to access bond markets because of investigations into its financial practices.

Levy, who argued the case, and Cutting and Perrochet, who prepared the briefs, successfully maintained that the trial court's ruling was based on insufficient evidence. (*Border Bus. Park v. City of San Diego*, 142 Cal. App. 4th 1538 (2006).)

The developer had argued that San Diego's announced intention to build an airport near the plaintiff's property and reroute local truck traffic harmed its property interests. The court found that it suffered no direct and special injury beyond that sustained by other businesses in the area. In January of this year, the state Supreme Court denied a request for review. San Diego is not completely off the hook, however, as one cause of action in the case—breach of contract—must be retried.