

Bond Case Briefs

Municipal Finance Law Since 1971

- **Ed. Note:** Please note that our weekly newsletter is simply a collection of links to the articles posted on our website that week, and not a stand-alone publication. Consequently, we do not have the ability to forward past “issues.” However, the underlying website – bondcasebriefs.com – contains all our archived postings (6k+), where you can scroll through the items posted to a particular category to catch up on articles you may have missed and/or use the search function to conduct more focused research.
- [GASB Proposes Implementation Guidance Designed to Clarify Recent Pronouncements.](#)
- [22 MCDC Settlements With Firms to be Followed by Another Round.](#)
- [Butler Snow: Fed’s Proposed Treatment of Municipal Securities as High-Quality Liquid Assets.](#)
- [Junk or AAA? Rating Split Plagues Chicago as It Borrows Billions.](#)
- [Webcast: Understanding Proposed IRS Rules on Issue Price and the Industry Impact.](#)
- [Reynolds v. Leon County Energy Improvement Dist.](#) – Supreme Court of Florida holds that objector who failed to appear at trial level lacked standing to appeal validation of proposed bond issue, as full party status was granted only to those who appeared and pleaded in the circuit court proceeding and thus only such parties were permitted to avail themselves of the statutory right of appeal; receding from *Meyers v. City of St. Cloud*, *Rowe v. St. Johns County*, *Lozier v. Collier County*, and *Bruns v. County Water-Sewer Dist.*
- [Thomas v. Clean Energy Coastal Corridor](#) – Supreme Court of Florida validates bond issuance, but also holds that references to judicial foreclosure as a remedy for collecting unpaid non-ad valorem assessments contained in financing agreement securing bonds for qualifying improvements to real property under Property Assessed Clean Energy (PACE) Act, required remand to circuit court to amend the financing agreement to remove those references, as judicial foreclosure was not a remedy for such collection authorized by Florida law.
- And finally, BCB’s Department of Perhaps Understandable NIMBYism this week brings you [Neighbors for Preservation of Big and Little Creek Community v. Board of County Com’rs of Payette County](#), in which the neighbors kicked up the predictable fuss at the prospect of a minor alteration to their community. But then again, we suppose that the prospect of glow-in-the-dark pets could have that effect. “Turn right at the big cooling tower. We’re the first house on the left.”