

ISABELLE KATZ PINZLER
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division

JOHN L. WODATCH, Chief
RENEE M. WOHLNHAUS, Acting Deputy Chief
MARGARITA M. PRIETO, Attorney
THOMAS M. CONTOIS, Attorney
JEANINE M. WORDEN, Attorney
ROBERTA STINAR KIRKENDALL, Attorney
Disability Rights Section
Civil Rights Division
U.S. Department of Justice
Post Office Box 66738
Washington, D.C. 20035-6738
(202) 514-0196

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	CIV-S-96 260 WBS GGH
)	
DAYS INNS OF AMERICA, INC.,)	DATE: October 20, 1997
HFS, INCORPORATED, DILIP PATEL,)	TIME: 1:30 p.m.
IYER & ASSOCIATES, and)	COURTROOM: 2
R.E. HUFFMAN CORPORATION,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

**UNITED STATES' REPLY MEMORANDUM IN SUPPORT OF ITS
MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ARGUMENT	1
A. DIA Continues to Ignore the Central Flaw in its Argument about the Coverage of Section 303 of the ADA.	1
B. The Undisputed Facts Demonstrate that DIA and HFS have Violated Section 303 of the ADA.	3
C. The United States' Reading of Section 303 Does Not Make the Statute Void for Vagueness.	8
D. DIA's Various Other Objections to the United States' Reading of Section 303 are Equally Baseless.	15
E. DIA has Engaged in a Pattern or Practice of Illegal Discrimination.	20
F. DIA and HFS are Effectively the Same Entity.	26
CONCLUSION	27

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

<u>Cases:</u>	<u>Page</u>
<u>Bank of New York v. Meridien BIAO Bank Tanzania Ltd.,</u> 171 F.R.D. 135 (S.D.N.Y. 1997)	7
<u>Brinson v. Linda Rose Joint Venture,</u> 53 F.3d 1044 (9th Cir. 1995)	4
<u>Chalmers v. City of Los Angeles,</u> 762 F.2d 753 (9th Cir. 1985)	13
<u>Craik v. Minnesota State University Bd.,</u> 731 F.2d 465 (8th Cir. 1984)	21
<u>Grayned v. City of Rockford,</u> 408 U.S. at 104 (1972)	12
<u>International Bhd. Teamsters v. United States,</u> 431 U.S. 324 (1977)	20, 21
<u>Johanson v. Huizenga Holdings, Inc.,</u> 963 F. Supp. 1175 (S.D. Fla. 1997)	3
<u>Johnson v. Hale,</u> 13 F.3d 1351 (9th Cir. 1994)	21
<u>Matsushita Elec. Indus. Corp. v. Zenith Radio Corp.,</u> 475 U.S. 574 (1986)	4
<u>Nevada Power Co. v. Monsanto Co.,</u> 891 F.Supp. 1406 (D.Nev. 1995)	7
<u>Paralyzed Veterans of America v. D.C. Arena L.P.,</u> 117 F.3d 579 (D.C. Cir. 1997)	14
<u>Pinnock v. International House of Pancakes Franchisee,</u> 844 F. Supp. 574 (S.D. Cal. 1993)	13, 14
<u>United States v. Balistrieri,</u> 981 F.2d 916 (7th Cir. 1992)	21
<u>United States v. DiMucci,</u> 879 F.2d 1488 (7th Cir. 1989)	21
<u>United States v. Ellerbe Becket, Inc.,</u> Civil No. 4-96-995 (D. Minn. Oct. 2, 1997)	2, 3
<u>United States v. Powell,</u> 423 U.S. 87 (1975)	12
<u>United States v. Real Estate Development Corp.,</u> 347 F. Supp. 776 (N.D. Miss. 1972)	21
<u>United States v. West Peachtree Tenth Corp.,</u> 437 F.2d 221 (5th Cir. 1971)	21
<u>Village of Hoffman Estates v. Flipside,</u> <u>Hoffman Estates, Inc.,</u> 455 U.S. 489 (1982)	13

Statutes:

42 U.S.C. § 12181(2)	4
42 U.S.C. § 12181(7)	4
42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(1)	4
42 U.S.C. § 12206(a)	14
42 U.S.C. § 12206(b)	14

Regulations:

28 C.F.R. § 36.401	4
28 C.F.R. § 36.406	4
28 C.F.R. Part 36, Appendix A	4
28 C.F.R. Part 36, Appendix B, § 36.401	14

Rules:

Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(e)	10
Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e)	4

Other:

U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, Public Access Section, <u>The Americans with Disabilities Act Title III Technical Assistance Manual, Covering Public Accommodations and Commercial Facilities</u> § III-5.1000 (November 1993)	14
---	----

In opposing the United States' motion for summary judgment, DIA and HFS (collectively, "DIA") continue to ignore the central flaw in their legal argument – that their reading of sections 302 and 303 of the ADA effectively eliminates coverage of commercial facilities from the scope of section 303. In addition, DIA fails to come forward with evidence to contradict the United States' showing that the Willows Days Inn is inaccessible to individuals with disabilities, and that numerous other new Days Inn hotels are inaccessible as well. DIA also fails to come forward with admissible evidence to dispute the various ways in which it had control over, and participated in, the design and construction of the Willows Days Inn and other new Days Inn hotels. Rather, DIA opposes the United States' motion by repeatedly attempting to distort the United States' position – and then calling those distortions vague, unreasonable, and unworkable. In doing so, DIA fails to establish that there is any genuine issue of material fact that precludes judgment as a matter of law.

ARGUMENT

A. DIA Continues to Ignore the Central Flaw in its Argument about the Coverage of Section 303 of the ADA.

Nowhere in its argument – not in its memorandum in support of its motion for summary judgment, and not in its memorandum in opposition to the United States' motion for summary judgment – does DIA address the central flaw in its reading of sections 302 and 303 of the ADA. DIA never explains why section 303, which applies to both public accommodations and commercial facilities, should be limited to parties who own, operate, or lease public accommodations. DIA's reading of the statute would effectively

eliminate commercial facilities from the coverage of section 303. See United States' Memorandum in Support of its Motion for Summary Judgment ("U.S. Memorandum") at 20-25; United States Memorandum in Opposition to Days Inns of America, Inc. and HFS Incorporated's Motion for Summary Judgment ("U.S. Opposition") at 7-10.

DIA's only answer is to call the government's position "hypertechnical." Memorandum of Days Inns of America, Inc. and HFS Incorporated in Opposition to Plaintiff's Motion for Summary Judgment ("DIA Opposition") at 16. Despite DIA's posturing, however, and its repeated insistence that the government's reading of section 303 makes no sense, a second federal court has now concluded that the government's reading of section 303 is correct. In United States v. Ellerbe Becket, Inc., Civil No. 4-96-995 (D. Minn. October 2, 1997) (copy provided as Exhibit A to this memorandum), the United States sued the Ellerbe Becket architectural firm for repeatedly designing new sports stadiums and arenas in violation of the ADA's architectural requirements for new construction. Ellerbe moved to dismiss the action against it, arguing (as DIA does here), that architects are not covered by section 303 because the "plain language" of title III requires that section 303 be limited to parties who own, operate, or lease the facility in question. The court squarely rejected that argument:

Congress clearly intended that commercial facilities be subject to the accessibility standards for new construction. See H.R. Rep. 485, Part 2, 101st Cong., 2d Sess. 116 (1990) ("the use of the term 'commercial facilities' is designed to cover those structures that are not included within the specific definition of 'public accommodation.'"). Statutory language should be construed in a manner that gives effect to all terms so as to avoid

rendering terms useless. *See Moskal v. United States*, 498 U.S. 103, 109-110 (1990). Ellerbe has not explained adequately how its interpretation would not result in an inexplicable gap in coverage of a class of buildings Congress clearly intended to be covered by the accessibility standards for new construction. Ellerbe responds by arguing that the list of entities liable should be imported into § 303(a) from § 302(a), but the phrase "of public accommodations" should be expanded to include "or commercial facilities." This argument undercuts Ellerbe's "plain language" logic.

Slip op. at 10-11. Noting that another federal court had come to the same conclusion, the Ellerbe court concluded that although the Ellerbe firm did not own, operate, or lease any of the facilities in question, it could nonetheless be held liable under section 303 of the ADA, and denied Ellerbe's motion to dismiss. *Id.* at 6, 13. *See also Johanson v. Huizenga Holdings, Inc.*, 963 F. Supp. 1175, 1178 (S.D. Fla. 1997) (same). In sum, far from being "hypertechnical," both the Ellerbe and Johanson courts have concluded that the government's position is firmly grounded in the language and structure of sections 302 and 303.¹

B. The Undisputed Facts Demonstrate that DIA and HFS have Violated Section 303 of the ADA.

Although DIA has responded to many of the facts included in the United States' Statement of Undisputed Facts ("U.S. Facts"), DIA has not contested those facts. Rather than coming forward with evidence to dispute the facts stated by the government, DIA instead advances a variety of legal arguments. DIA has thus

¹The Ellerbe court added that even if it found that the language of sections 302 and 303 were ambiguous, it would reach the same result, because it would defer to the Department of Justice's interpretation of the statute. Ellerbe, slip op. at 11 n.4. *See also* U.S. Opposition at 10-11.

failed to establish that any genuine issue of material fact precludes judgment as a matter of law.²

The undisputed facts demonstrate that the Willows Days Inn is a newly constructed hotel subject to the ADA's architectural accessibility requirements for newly constructed facilities. U.S. Facts ¶¶ 5-8. See also 42 U.S.C. §§ 12181(2), (7), 12183(a)(1); 28 C.F.R. §§ 36.401, 36.406. They further establish that the Willows Days Inn is not accessible to individuals with disabilities, failing in many ways to comply with the ADA's Standards for Accessible Design, 28 C.F.R. Part 36, Appendix A ("the Standards"). U.S. Facts ¶ 85.³ The same is

²In opposing a motion for summary judgment, the non-moving party must come forward with specific facts showing that there is a genuine issue for trial. Fed. R. Civ. P. 56(e); Matsushita Elec. Indus. Co. v. Zenith Radio Corp., 475 U.S. 574, 587 (1986); Brinson v. Linda Rose Joint Venture, 53 F.3d 1044, 1047-48 (9th Cir. 1995).

³DIA asserts that the findings of the United States' expert, Mr. William Hecker, are not admissible. Response of Days Inns of America, Inc. and HFS Incorporated to United States' Statement of Facts ("DIA Fact Response") ¶¶ 85, 86-90. The assertion is baseless. The United States provided Mr. Hecker's expert report to DIA in advance of Mr. Hecker's deposition, and DIA questioned Mr. Hecker about those reports at length. Mr. Hecker testified, under oath, about the methods he used to survey the hotels in question, to determine how accessible (or inaccessible) they were to individuals with disabilities. Deposition of William Hecker ("Hecker Dep."), Exh. 15, at 125-33. He further testified, under oath, that the reports provided to DIA – the reports provided as Exhibits 7, 8, and 9 to the United States' Statement of Undisputed Facts – contained the findings of his surveys of each of the Days Inn hotels in question, and his opinions about the degree to which each hotel was or was not accessible to individuals with disabilities. Id. at 173-78. Nonetheless, out of an abundance of caution, to resolve any remaining question about the admissibility of Mr. Hecker's findings, or his expert reports, the United States has provided Mr. Hecker's declaration that the reports do, in fact, contain his findings and opinions. See Declaration of Mr. William Hecker, AIA ("Hecker Dec."), Exh. 66.

true of several other newly constructed Days Inn hotels. *Id.* ¶¶ 86-90. *See also* U.S. Memorandum at 2-8. Also undisputed are the facts demonstrating DIA's control over, and participation in, the design and construction of the Willows Days Inn and other new Days Inn hotels. *See* U.S. Memorandum at 8-14.

DIA contests, as a factual matter, only two of the facts showing its control over, and participation in, the design and construction of the Willows Days Inn and other new Days Inns. In neither case, however, is DIA able to demonstrate that there is any genuine issue of material fact. First, DIA contends that Arvind Iyer, the architect for the Willows Days Inn, did not receive the Days Inn Planning and Design Standards Manual until after completing work on the Willows Days Inn. DIA is simply wrong. Iyer testified that he received the manual on October 29, 1992, about a month and a half before the project was issued for bid on December 14, 1992, and that one of the architects at his firm referred to the manual during construction of the Willows Days Inn, in order to answer a question from the contractor. Iyer Dep., Exh. 12, at 328, 330, 335-36. In any event, even if Mr. Iyer had never received the PDSM, the drawings he prepared were still required to comply with the Days Inn design standards, and were reviewed for compliance with those standards (as DIA admits). *See* DIA Fact Response ¶ 73. Given that Mr. Iyer has designed several other Days Inn hotels, *see* U.S. Facts ¶ 56, it may be that he was sufficiently familiar with the Days Inn design requirements that he had no need to refer to the PDSM to produce a set of drawings that would be acceptable to DIA. *See infra* Part E, at 23-25.

Second, citing the testimony of two architects formerly employed by HFS, DIA contends that when its architects review plans for new hotels, they make only "recommendations" or "suggestions." DIA Fact Response ¶ 46. This is a blatant misrepresentation of the record. While some comments made on plans by DIA's architects may be only "suggestions" or "recommendations," a wealth of undisputed evidence clearly shows that other comments are indeed "requirements." Mr. Keeble, DIA's Rule 30(b)(6) designee, testified that after reviewing the plans for a new hotel, DIA's architects notify licensees as to whether there are any "necessary changes" to the plans, and that he is the one who decides whether deviations from the Days Inn design standards are acceptable, or whether they must be changed. Keeble Dep., Exh. 14, at 226-27, 229. Keeble further testified that if a new hotel is not in substantial compliance with the Days Inn design standards, that hotel is not allowed to join the system, and that DIA terminates licensees for failing to comply with DIA's system standards. Id. at 815, 819.

Similarly, Mr. Hoagland, the head of the HFS Design and Construction Department until 1996, testified that while some comments were merely suggestions, others were requirements, and that if a licensee did not agree to make the required changes, DIA might refuse to allow the hotel to join the system, or would "bring a lot of pressure on them" to get them to agree to the changes. Hoagland Dep., Exh. 13, at 73-74. Mr. Hoagland explained that because licensees had made significant financial investments in obtaining the license, DIA was able to resolve virtually all of these cases without excluding the licensee from

the system. Id. Moreover, both the Days Inn UFOC and the license agreements make clear that licensees are required to comply with DIA's design standards, see U.S. Facts ¶¶ 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 29.a, and the PDSM itself repeatedly states that it sets "requirements" for new hotels. See PDSM, Exh. 4, Foreword, at 2; § 1.02.A, at 7; § 1.02.B, at 7; § 1.02.D, at 8.

The evidence cited by DIA in support of its claim that its comments are only "suggestions" or "recommendations" – the testimony of Mr. Kraft and Mr. Tischler – is insufficient to create a genuine issue of material fact. Messrs. Kraft and Tischler were formerly employed by HFS as architects; they did not have management responsibilities. Keeble Dep., Exh. 14, at 149-50, 167-68. Neither has any basis on which to contradict the testimony of their former boss, Mr. Hoagland, or of Mr. Keeble, who DIA designated to testify on its behalf, and whose testimony binds the company. See, e.g., Bank of New York v. Meridien BIAO Bank Tanzania Ltd., 171 F.R.D. 135, 150 (S.D.N.Y. 1997); Nevada Power Co. v. Monsanto Co., 891 F. Supp. 1406, 1418 (D. Nev. 1995). In sum, the record is clear that DIA exercised extensive control over, and was extensively involved in, the design and construction of the Willows Days Inn and several other inaccessible new Days Inn hotels.⁴

⁴In response to DIA's argument that only those parties who own, operate, or lease the facility in question may be held liable for violations of section 303, the United States has argued in the alternative that DIA operates the Willows Days Inn and other Days Inn hotels. See U.S. Memorandum at 32-44. In a desperate attempt to stave off summary judgment on this ground as well, DIA has confected two affidavits purporting to show that DIA's control over the daily operations of hotels in its system is insufficient to render it liable under DIA's reading of the statute. One of the affidavits is from Mr. William

C. The United States' Reading of Section 303 Does Not Make the Statute Void for Vagueness.

Rather than address the central flaw in its legal position, or coming forward with specific facts, DIA responds to the United States' motion for summary judgment by suggesting that the United States' reading of section 303 violates DIA's due process rights because it renders the statute so vague as to be unconstitutional. DIA's Opposition at 7-11. DIA's argument, however, rests on a series of misrepresentations regarding the United States' position and the testimony of the government's witnesses.

DIA opens its argument by quoting only a portion of the United States' memorandum regarding the test for liability under section 303, presenting that limited view of the government's position as if it were the whole of the matter, and proceeding to argue that the government's reading of section 303 is so vague as to be unconstitutional. DIA's Opposition at 8. The United States has not taken the position, despite DIA's claims to the contrary, that every party involved in the design and construction of an inaccessible facility is responsible for all ADA violations at that facility. Participating in, or having

Keeble, DIA's Rule 30(b)(6) designee, and the other is from Dilip Patel, one of two owners of the Willows Days Inn. Neither of the affidavits, however, is admissible or competent to create a genuine issue of material fact. The United States, by separate filings, is moving to strike both affidavits. As more fully set out in those filings, the affidavits, among other things, are not based on personal knowledge, offer inadmissible opinion and hearsay testimony, are conclusory, and contradict the witnesses' sworn deposition testimony. Perhaps most troubling is that Mr. Patel's affidavit appears to have been obtained in exchange for DIA's withdrawal of its indemnification claim against Mr. Patel.

control over, the design and construction of the facility is only one element of the inquiry; before a party may be held liable under section 303, there must also be a showing that some feature or element of the facility fails to comply with the Standards, and that the failure to comply with the Standards fell within the scope of the party's involvement in the project. See U.S. Memorandum at 17.

Thus, DIA misses the point when it discusses, at length, the testimony of the United States' expert, Mr. William Hecker, regarding the various parties that may be involved in the design and construction of a new facility. DIA's Opposition at 8. Mr. Hecker quite reasonably responded to DIA's increasingly strained hypothetical questions about what individuals or entities might be "involved in" the design of a new facility. What DIA did not ask Mr. Hecker, and what Mr. Hecker did not express any opinion on, was whether those same individuals or entities would have any liability under section 303 of the ADA for failures to comply with the Standards. That is, while DIA posed many hypotheticals involving individuals or entities with very attenuated connections to the design of the facility, DIA did not ask what the extent of the liability of those parties would be. Under the government's view of the statute — though DIA continues to refuse to acknowledge it — the scope of any party's liability is commensurate with the scope of that party's involvement in, or control over, the design and construction of the facility. See U.S. Memorandum at 17. Given that the examples offered by DIA concern parties whose involvement or control is quite attenuated, it is quite likely that those

individuals and entities would have no liability at all under section 303.

Similarly, DIA seizes on the testimony of the United States' Rule 30(b)(6) designee, Ms. Elizabeth Savage, and attempts to wring from it some inconsistency. DIA's Opposition at 9-11.⁵ As noted in the United States' initial memorandum, however, Ms. Savage's testimony was entirely consistent with the position the United States has taken throughout this case and others: any party who participates in the design and construction of an inaccessible facility may be held liable under section 303, but the scope of that party's liability extends only as far as that party's involvement in, or control over, the design and construction of the facility. See U.S. Memorandum at 17-18, n.12. Thus, a carpenter who frames doorways that are too narrow to comply with the Standards has participated in the design and construction of an inaccessible element of the facility, and can be held responsible under section 303 for doing so. That carpenter cannot, however, be

⁵DIA also complains that Ms. Savage changed certain portions of her deposition transcript, and did so in an "unnotarized, unsworn 'errata sheet.'" DIA's Opposition at 21 n.7. Ms. Savage's review of her deposition testimony, however, fully comports with the requirements of Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(e), which provides that the deponent has 30 days after the deposition "to review the transcript . . . and, if there are changes in form or substance, to sign a statement reciting such changes and the reasons given by the deponent for making them." Fed. R. Civ. P. 30(e). Ms. Savage returned the errata sheet provided by the court reporter within 30 days of her deposition, and the rule does not require that it be notarized or sworn. Moreover, as noted previously, the changed portions of Ms. Savage's testimony were consistent with other portions of her testimony, and with other discovery responses provided by the United States. See U.S. Opposition at 28-29 n.17.

held responsible for ADA violations in portions of the facility with which he had nothing to do.

Moreover, DIA flatly misrepresents Ms. Savage's testimony with respect to the liability of the owner of the facility. DIA claims that Ms. Savage testified that an owner who was not "involved in" the design and construction of a new facility would have no liability for violations of the Standards at that facility. DIA's Opposition at 4. That is precisely not Ms. Savage's testimony. In the portion of her testimony cited by DIA, Ms. Savage was asked about the responsibility of an owner who purchases a completed building from the firm that has designed and constructed it – an owner that has no input into or control over the design or construction of the facility. Savage Dep., Exh. 27, at 128-29. Given that the statute only makes it illegal to "design" and "construct" inaccessible facilities – not to purchase an inaccessible facility – it is not at all clear that the owner in the hypothetical posed by DIA's counsel would have any responsibility for ADA violations at the facility. Ms. Savage expressed her skepticism that such a situation ever would arise, and answered – quite consistently with the United States' position – that the liability of the owner would depend on the facts. Id. at 130. Indeed, as soon as DIA's counsel modified the hypothetical to include some involvement or control by the owner (the review of schematic plans by the owner), Ms. Savage testified that that would make it more likely that the owner would have some responsibility under section 303. Id. at 130-31.

Ms. Savage's testimony with regard to parties that supply construction materials was also consistent with the United States'

position. See U.S. Opposition at 19. Ms. Savage was asked about the liability of an entity who simply supplies doors for a project; there were no other facts to suggest that the entity in question had any involvement in, or control over, the design of the facility, or the construction of the facility. Savage Dep., Exh. 27, at 263. Ms. Savage responded that suppliers who do no more than supply materials are not involved in the "design" or "construction" of the facility, and therefore have no liability. Id. at 264. While DIA may not agree with the limits inherent in the United States' view of section 303, DIA is simply wrong to suggest that the government's reading of section 303 does not have such limits. To the contrary, the United States' consistently expressed position provides a carefully measured test of liability under section 303, assigning liability to those parties who engage in the conduct prohibited by Congress: the design and construction of inaccessible facilities.

In any event, even if DIA had been able to pose a hypothetical situation which confounded Ms. Savage — which it did not — doing so is insufficient to establish that the statute, or the government's reading of it, is void for vagueness. As the Supreme Court has explained, "we can never expect mathematical certainty from our language": rather, "it will always be true that the fertile legal imagination can conjure up hypothetical cases in which the meaning of (disputed) terms will be in nice question." Grayned v. City of Rockford, 408 U.S. 104, 110, 110 n.15 (1972) (parentheses in original; internal quotation marks and citation omitted). See also United States v. Powell, 423 U.S. 87, 93 (1975) (holding that a statute is not unconstitutionally

vague because doubts may be conceived "as to the applicability of the language in marginal fact situations"). Thus, there is no merit to DIA's complaint that Ms. Savage frequently responded to the hypothetical questions posed by DIA's counsel by indicating that the answers would depend on the facts of the case. A statute is not void for vagueness because its application requires a factual inquiry into a party's specific conduct.

Indeed, the cases make clear that neither section 303 nor the United States' interpretation of it are impermissibly vague. Because title III of the ADA is a civil statute regulating commercial conduct, it is subject to scrutiny less strict than that applied to criminal statutes, or statutes restricting free speech. Village of Hoffman Estates v. Flipside, Hoffman Estates, Inc., 455 U.S. 489, 498 (1982); Chalmers v. City of Los Angeles, 762 F.2d 753, 757 (9th Cir. 1985); Pinnock v. Int'l House of Pancakes Franchisee, 844 F. Supp. 574, 580 (S.D. Cal. 1993). Thus, section 303 (or the government's interpretation of it) can only be held void for vagueness if "no standard of conduct is specified at all." Hoffman Estates, 455 U.S. at 495 n.7 (1982). Further, in determining whether DIA has met this test, the Court must consider the words of the statute, and any limiting constructions proffered by the agency charged with enforcing the statute. Hoffman Estates, 455 U.S. at 495 n.5.

The language of section 303 itself provides ample notice of the conduct that it prohibits: the design and construction of inaccessible facilities. Moreover, the government has consistently interpreted section 303 to apply to all parties who engage in that conduct. The preamble to the Department of

Justice's regulation implementing title III of the ADA indicated that the section could apply to "architects, contractors, developers, tenants, owners, and other entities," and that the Department intended to enforce the section consistently with its broad prohibition of the design and construction of inaccessible facilities:

The Department will interpret this section in a manner consistent with the intent of the statute and with the nature of the responsibilities of the various entities for design, for construction, or for both.

28 C.F.R. Part 36, Appendix B, § 36.401. In addition, the Department of Justice specifically addressed the scope of section 303's coverage in its Technical Assistance Manual for title III. The TA Manual poses a hypothetical situation in which portions of a new facility are constructed inaccessibly, and warns that not just the owner, but also the architect and contractor who designed and constructed those portions of the facility may be held liable under section 303. U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Rights Division, Public Access Section, The Americans with Disabilities Act Title III Technical Assistance Manual, Covering Public Accommodations and Commercial Facilities § III-5.1000 at 45-46 (November 1993) (Exh. 62).⁶ In sum, there

⁶The Technical Assistance Manual is issued by the Department pursuant to statutory mandate, see 42 U.S.C. § 12206(a), (c), and is thus, along with the issuance of the title III implementing regulation, one of the mechanisms by which the Attorney General is to "flesh out the statutory framework" of title III. Paralyzed Veterans of America v. D.C. Arena L.P., 117 F.3d 579, 585 (D.C. Cir. 1997). Indeed, the Pinnock court relied in part on the Department's Technical Assistance Manual for title III to hold that the statute was not void for vagueness. Pinnock, 844 F. Supp. at 581. In Pinnock, a defendant charged with violating section 302 of the ADA challenged title III of the statute as being unconstitutionally

is simply no basis for DIA's claim that the statute and the Department of Justice's interpretation of it fail to provide adequate notice of either what conduct is prohibited, or who may be held liable.

D. DIA's Various Other Objections to the United States' Reading of Section 303 are Equally Baseless.

DIA also advances a hodgepodge of mistaken and irrelevant legal arguments, several of which appear in DIA's response to the United States' Statement of Undisputed Facts. For instance, DIA responds to facts relating to its control over the design and construction of new Days Inn hotels by arguing that although it had control over some aspect of the design and construction of the hotel, DIA failed to exercise that control.⁷ DIA then

vague. The court rejected this challenge, concluding that "the terms of title III are marked by well-reasoned flexibility and breadth," and that "[w]hen considered in conjunction with the Department of Justice guidelines, these terms are not unconstitutionally vague." Id.

⁷For instance, in response to the facts concerning the requirement that the Patels submit their plans to DIA, and secure DIA's approval of those plans, DIA contends that changes were made to the plans, during construction, and that the Patels did not inform DIA of these changes, or seek DIA's approval of them. DIA Fact Response ¶ 63.e. DIA does not dispute that it had the authority, under the terms of its license agreement with the Patels, to require them to secure DIA's approval for such changes.

DIA makes similar arguments about its control over the design and construction of other new Days Inn hotels. For instance, with respect to the new Days Inn hotel in Wall, South Dakota, DIA argues that it reviewed only preliminary plans for the hotel, that its comments on those plans were not incorporated into the design of the hotel, and that it was never provided with final plans for the hotel. DIA Opposition at 5. DIA does not dispute, however, that it had the authority, under the terms of its license agreement, to require the Wall licensees to submit final plans for the hotel, and to make any changes specified by DIA's architect. The reason DIA never received

contends that because it failed to exercise its authority, that element of its control over the design and construction of the Willows Days Inn contributes nothing to establishing its liability. DIA's Opposition at 3-5. That DIA failed to exercise its authority, however, does not relieve it of responsibility. When DIA reserved to itself control over the design and construction of new Days Inn hotels, including the Willows Days Inn, DIA also acquired the responsibility to comply with the ADA's requirements for new construction. See U.S. Opposition at 21-23. And because section 303 defines illegal discrimination to include the failure to design and construct new facilities to be accessible to individuals with disabilities, 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(1), it is precisely DIA's failure to act – its failure to exercise the authority it had, to make new Days Inn hotels accessible to individuals with disabilities – that is the source of DIA's liability. It is no defense for DIA to argue that by failing to act, it is not liable. Put differently, once DIA inserted itself into the process of designing and constructing new Days Inn hotels, it inserted itself into the group of parties responsible for designing and constructing those hotels to be accessible to individuals with disabilities. When it failed to act to correct ADA violations at new Days Inn hotels, DIA violated section 303.⁸

final plans for the Wall hotel is that it never asked for them. Keeble Dep., Exh. 14, at 904-05; Baumann Dep., Exh. 67, at 107, 221.

⁸Similarly, it is no defense for DIA to argue that it has left the matter of complying with the ADA to its licensees. The duty to comply with the ADA, as with other federal civil rights statutes, is not delegable. See U.S. Opposition at 25-28.

Similarly, DIA responds to the existence of ADA violations at the Willows Days Inn and the other newly constructed Days Inn hotels by pointing out that for several of the ADA violations, the feature or element of the hotel in question also violates some provision of the Days Inn Planning and Design Standards Manual. *See, e.g.*, DIA Fact Response ¶¶ 85.c, d, e, f, h, i, j, 87.a, b, c, d, f. While DIA's response does not in any way contradict the United States' contention that the feature or element of the hotel in question fails to comply with the Standards, it does establish that DIA not only failed to act to comply with the ADA, but did not even enforce its own "barrier-free" requirements. *See* U.S. Facts ¶ 174.

Another of DIA's responses to the undisputed facts is to contend that although DIA does prepare conceptual site plans, architectural renderings, prototype drawings, and other similar plans and drawings, DIA does not prepare final construction drawings for hotels, and that the materials it does prepare cannot be used by themselves to construct any facility. *See, e.g.*, DIA Fact Response ¶¶ 49.b, c. Implicit in DIA's response is the suggestion that to "design" a facility, one must prepare the final construction drawings for the facility. DIA's own architectural expert testified, however, that the process of designing a building does not include only the preparation of final construction drawings. He identified several earlier stages in the process – stages which identify and resolve various design issues – and testified that each of these stages is a necessary part of designing a building. Kiewit Dep., Exh. 21, at 219-23. Indeed, he specifically testified that many of

the design services provided by DIA, including preparation of conceptual site plans, issuance of the PDSM, and preparation of prototype drawings, were typical of the early and middle stages of designing a building (stages commonly known as schematic design and design development). Id. at 228-39. There is thus no basis for DIA's suggestion that the only activity that constitutes "design" is the preparation of final construction drawings.⁹

DIA again misrepresents deposition testimony when it argues that architects and contractors need not be held liable under the ADA to ensure that they will design and construct accessible facilities, because they have independent professional obligations to comply with the law. DIA's Opposition at 15. The only support DIA offers for this position is the deposition testimony of the United States' expert, Mr. Hecker. Mr. Hecker specifically testified, however, that he did not know if failing to comply with applicable laws would cause an architect to lose

⁹In addition, Mr. Kiewel testified that no one person designs an entire facility; rather, the design team may include not just the architect of record, but also various engineers and other designers. Id. at 40-44. He added that even though none of these individuals, including the architect of record, designs the entire facility, each of them nonetheless "designs" the facility. Id. at 127-29. (Or, as the government would put it, each of them is "involved in" the design of the facility.) Similarly, Mr. Kiewel testified that numerous parties, including the owner, the general contractor, various subcontractors, and others, typically are involved in the construction of a new facility – as he put it, they are "participating in the construction" – and that each of them was "constructing" the facility. Id. at 216-19. There is thus no basis for DIA's suggestions that because some architect "designed" the hotel, and some contractor "constructed" it, DIA could not also have "designed" and "constructed" the hotel.

his or her license. Hecker Dep., Exh. 15, at 39.¹⁰ Indeed, as DIA's own expert testified, state codes of professional conduct generally require only that architects refrain from designing facilities which both violate applicable laws and materially affect public safety. Kiewel Dep., Exh. 21, at 121-25. Accordingly, Mr. Kiewel acknowledged that an architect might well be able to design a facility that does not comply with the ADA without violating the architect's code of professional responsibility. Id. at 121-25, 144.¹¹

Finally, DIA fails satisfactorily to explain why Congress included the term "design" in section 303 if Congress did not intend for section 303 to apply to entities that design new facilities (even if those entities do not own, operate, or lease the facilities in question). See U.S. Memorandum at 25-26. DIA's only response is to point out that, in issuing the regulation to implement title III of the ADA, the Department of Justice relied on the presence of the term "design" to include, in the section of the regulation dealing with the effective date of section 303, a provision regarding applications for building permits. DIA's Opposition at 16-17. While DIA's account of why

¹⁰Further, the question was objected to as calling for a legal conclusion, and Mr. Hecker was instructed to answer the question only insofar as he could answer it as an architectural matter. Hecker Dep., Exh. 15, at 39.

¹¹DIA also errs in suggesting that if an architect or contractor fails to comply with the ADA, an owner will always have recourse under traditional tort or contract theories. DIA's Opposition at 15. If the owner has instructed the architect and contractor to design and build a facility that does not comply with the ADA, it is unlikely that the owner would have any action against parties that have followed his instructions.

that provision was included in the regulation is correct, it is irrelevant. The various implications of the use of the term "design" are not mutually exclusive: that Congress' use of the term "design" had implications for determining when the Act takes effect in no way suggests that that term does not also have implications for who the Act covers.

E. DIA has Engaged in a Pattern or Practice of Illegal Discrimination

In addition to violating section 303 of the ADA with respect to the Willows Days Inn in particular, the undisputed facts further show that DIA has repeatedly participated in the design and construction of inaccessible Days Inn hotels. See U.S. Memorandum at 6-8, 11-14. DIA responds in two ways: first, DIA posits, without citing any authority, that the United States has failed to carry its burden to establish that DIA has engaged in a pattern or practice of illegal discrimination. DIA's Opposition at 4, 6. Second, DIA misrepresents the facts and testimony relating to its involvement in the design and construction of three other new Days Inn hotels. DIA's Opposition at 5-6.

In order to establish that DIA's conduct constitutes a pattern or practice of discrimination, the United States must prove

more than the mere occurrence of isolated or "accidental" or sporadic discriminatory acts. It ha[s] to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that . . . discrimination [is] the company's standard operating procedure[,] the regular rather than the unusual practice.

International Bhd. Teamsters v. United States, 431 U.S. 324, 336 (1977). Thus, the United States is not required to offer evidence with respect to each particular example of

discrimination that is part of the pattern or practice of illegal conduct; rather its burden is to establish that a pattern or practice existed. Id. at 360. See also Craik v. Minnesota State Univ. Bd., 731 F.2d 465, 469-70 (8th Cir. 1984) (in addition to evidence relating to specific instances of discrimination, government in pattern or practice case will typically adduce more general evidence relating to defendant's standard policies or practices).¹² And while the evidence must establish that the conduct at issue was the defendant's standard policy or practice, there is no minimum number of examples of that conduct that must be provided. Indeed, if a single example can be shown to be typical of the defendant's conduct, it suffices to establish the pattern or practice. See Johnson v. Hale, 13 F.3d 1351, 1354 (9th Cir. 1994) (defendant's single statement that she would not rent to the black plaintiffs because of race "itself confesses a pattern of discrimination"); United States v. West Peachtree Tenth Corp., 437 F.2d 221, 227 (5th Cir. 1971) (holding that the number of individual acts of discrimination is not determinative, and that no mathematical formula is workable; rather, "[e]ach case must turn on its own facts"); United States v. Real Estate Devel. Corp., 347 F. Supp. 776, 783 (N.D. Miss. 1972) ("No minimum number of incidents is required").

¹²Because various civil rights statutes all employ the same "pattern or practice" language, the courts have held that the same standard of proof applies under each of the statutes. See, e.g., United States v. DiMucci, 879 F.2d 1488, 1497 n. 11 (7th Cir. 1989) (in Fair Housing Act case court noted that phrase "pattern or practice" appears in several federal civil rights statutes, and is interpreted consistently from statute to statute, citing Teamsters, 431 U.S. at 336 n. 16); United States v. Balistrieri, 981 F.2d 916, 929 n.2 (7th Cir. 1992) (same).

The undisputed facts establish that DIA's standard policy or practice is to enter into license agreements that give it extensive control over the design and construction of all new Days Inn hotels, and to involve itself in various ways in the design and construction of individual facilities (including things like visiting sites; recommending architects and contractors; assisting with construction financing; providing design services like conceptual site plans, architectural renderings, or prototype drawings; reviewing plans for compliance with DIA's design standards (as expressed in the PDSM) and requiring changes to those plans; monitoring the progress of construction; and inspecting completed facilities). See U.S. Memorandum at 11-14. DIA's control over and participation in the design and construction of the Willows Days Inn is thoroughly consistent with this pattern. See U.S. Memorandum at 8-11. And the undisputed facts show that the Willows Days Inn fails to comply with the Standards for Accessible Design in numerous respects, that numerous other new Days Inn hotels fail to comply with the Standards, and that the violations of the Standards at the Willows Days Inn are typical of violations found at other new Days Inn hotels. See U.S. Memorandum at 2-8. Indeed, DIA has come forward with no evidence to suggest that any new Days Inn hotel complies with the Standards. In sum, the United States has clearly carried its burden, and has established that DIA has engaged in a pattern or practice of illegal discrimination.¹³

¹³Similarly, assuming for the sake of argument that DIA's reading of the statute were correct – that only those who own,

DIA's only attempt to dispute the facts establishing its pattern of illegal conduct is to argue – as it did with respect to Mr. Iyer, the architect for the Willows Days Inn (*see supra* Part B., at 5) – that the architects who designed three other new Days Inn hotels did not rely on the Days Inn Planning and Design Standards Manual for guidance in complying with the ADA's accessibility requirements. DIA's Opposition at 5-6. DIA again misrepresents the record.

The facts relating to the three hotels discussed by DIA show that DIA's involvement in the design and construction of those hotels was at least as extensive as it was for the Willows Days Inn. For instance, the plans for the new Days Inn hotel in Hazard, Kentucky, had originally been used to build a new Days Inn hotel in Indiana, and were sold to Wilgus Napier, the owner of the Hazard hotel, by a DIA franchise broker. Deposition of Wilgus Napier ("Napier Dep."), Exh. 68, at 31-33. Mr. Napier and his architect, Douglas Kidd, made minor changes to those plans, and used them to build Days Inn hotels in Berea, Kentucky, and Mount Vernon, Kentucky, before using them to build the hotel in Hazard. *Id.* at 38-39, 47-48. *See also* Deposition of J. Douglas Kidd, Exh. 69, at 29-30, 36-39, 42-45. Thus, the plans for the Hazard Days Inn were not only sold by a DIA broker, but, by the time they were used to build the Hazard hotel, had been reviewed and approved by DIA, in connection with

lease, or operate the facility are responsible for its design and construction – the undisputed facts also show that DIA's control over the operations of the Willows Days Inn is typical of its control over the operations of all of the hotels in its system. *See* U.S. Memorandum at 32-44.

the Berea Days Inn. Napier Dep., Exh. 68, at 36-38. Given that before they built the Hazard Days Inn Mr. Napier and Mr. Kidd had designed and constructed two other new Days Inn hotels, both of which were accepted into the Days Inn system, it is not surprising that Mr. Kidd felt no need to refer to the Days Inn PDSM in designing the Hazard hotel.

Similarly, DIA had extensive involvement in the design of the new Days Inn hotel in Wall, South Dakota. David Baumann, the architect who prepared plans for that hotel, had previously prepared plans for two other new Days Inn hotels, in West Fargo, North Dakota, and Oacoma, South Dakota. Deposition of David Baumann ("Baumann Dep."), Exh. 67, at 19, 21, 28. In the course of doing that work, Mr. Baumann had come to know the DIA franchise salesman in the region, and that salesman recommended Mr. Baumann to the owners of the Wall Days Inn, and arranged an introductory meeting between himself, Mr. Baumann, and the owners. Baumann Dep., Exh. 67, at 48-51, 57-60. Mr. Baumann incorporated several elements of the designs for the West Fargo and Oacoma Days Inns into the plans for the Wall hotel. Id. at 93-94, 207-08. In addition, he had a copy of the PDSM, and referred to it frequently when designing the Wall Days Inn, for "all kinds of standards," including room sizes and layouts, door sizes, bathroom sizes, furniture and materials required by DIA, corridors, and other items. Id. at 98-100.¹⁴

¹⁴Although the transcript of his deposition is not yet available, Brian Pape, the architect for the Champaign Days Inn, testified that he had a copy of the PDSM, and that he referred to it for a general review of DIA's design standards. He further testified that he had also designed other Days Inn hotels, and that after DIA reviewed the plans for the Champaign Days Inn, he discussed those plans with DIA architect Richard

In the end, even if Mr. Iyer and the architects for the other three Days Inn hotels identified by DIA had never received the PDSM, each of those hotels was still required by the terms of the license agreement for that hotel to comply with the design requirements of the PDSM. The plans for each hotel were reviewed by DIA (or were subject to review by DIA) for compliance with those requirements. See DIA's Fact Response ¶ 73. Thus, even if there were a genuine dispute on the question of whether those architects had received the PDSM, or what use they had made of it, summary judgment would still be appropriate. DIA's control over, and participation in, the design and construction of those hotels (and other new Days Inn hotels) was not limited to issuance of the PDSM. The undisputed facts demonstrate that DIA's control and participation were far more extensive than that, so that the role of the PDSM is not dispositive, and its absence from any particular case in no way jeopardizes the United States' showing that DIA has engaged in a pattern or practice of discrimination.

Tischler. Once Mr. Pape's transcript becomes available, the United States will provide it to the court.

F. DIA and HFS are Effectively the Same Entity.

The undisputed facts show that DIA and HFS are so closely intertwined as to be effectively the same entity. See U.S. Facts ¶¶ 9-11, 162-70. DIA is a wholly owned subsidiary of HFS; HFS issues a consolidated annual report for itself and DIA, containing consolidated financial statements, and the two companies file a consolidated tax return. Id. ¶¶ 11, 165-67. They have the same principal place of business, and share office space. Id. ¶ 164. Perhaps most importantly, DIA has no employees of its own; all DIA functions are carried out by officers or employees of HFS. Id. ¶ 168. Neither DIA nor HFS disputes any of these facts. Every action DIA takes, from soliciting potential licensees, to reviewing plans for new hotels, to inspecting the completed facilities, is undertaken by an employee of HFS, at the direction of HFS' management. HFS owns and controls DIA and the Days Inn system, and is every bit as responsible as DIA for the violations of the ADA at new Days Inn hotels.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons stated, the United States respectfully requests that the Court grant its motion for summary judgment.

Respectfully submitted,

ISABELLE KATZ PINZLER
Acting Assistant Attorney General
Civil Rights Division

JOHN L. WODATCH, Chief
RENEE M. WOHLLENHAUS, Acting Deputy
Chief
Disability Rights Section
Civil Rights Division

MARGARITA M. PRIETO
THOMAS M. CONTOIS
JEANINE M. WORDEN
ROBERTA STINAR KIRKENDALL
Disability Rights Section
Civil Rights Division
U.S. Department of Justice
Post Office Box 66738
Washington, D.C. 20035-6738
(202) 514-0196

Deborá Luther
Assistant United States Attorney
Eastern District of California
555 Capitol Mall
Suite 1550
Sacramento, California 95814

Dated: October 6, 1997