

# Bond Case Briefs

*Municipal Finance Law Since 1971*

---

- [\*Hilgers v. Jefferson County\*](#), in which the court held that a County's power to set sewer-service charges, etc. was not limited to only that portion of those charges that arose from the repayment of the bonds issued pursuant to the Amendment to State constitution that provided county could incur bonded indebtedness exceeding the then 3.5% debt limit in order to finance improvements to its sewer system.
- [\*Koontz v. St. Johns River Water Management Dist.\*](#), a case of potentially immense significance in which the Supreme Court limited the ability of municipalities to condition land use permits on landowner's funding of offsite mitigation projects. See also, [NYT: A Legal Blow to Sustainable Development](#).
- [FINRA Fines StateTrust Investments \\$1 Million and Orders \\$353,000 in Restitution for Charging Unfair Prices in Bond Transactions](#).
- [IRS Publication: Voluntary Compliance for Tax-Exempt and Tax-Credit Bonds](#).
- [GASB Issues Implementation Guide for Pension Plans](#).
- [SIFMA Compliance & Legal Society San Francisco Regional Seminar](#).
- Fairly interesting week. Those of you who work with municipalities should familiarize yourselves with [\*Koontz\*](#), above, due to its potential to dramatically alter existing land-use and development protocols. Otherwise, the week's most significant development arose in [\*Southern California Edison Company v. City of Victorville\*](#), in which the city's cross-complaint named "Moes 1-30" (pending Curly's deposition?), ushering in a new era of Stooges-based jurisprudence. "Your honor, permission to poke the witness in the eye?" We're gonna miss the good old days of mere badgering.