

Anaheim V. Angels

Written by Request for injunction
Sunday, 26 June 2005 12:00

City of Anaheim v. The Superior Court of Orange County, (Respondent);
Angels Baseball, a California Limited Partnership, (Real Party in Interest).

**Request for preliminary injunction enjoining real party
in interest Angels Baseball, L.P. (ABLPL) from changing
the name of its baseball team from the Anaheim Angels to the Los
Angeles Angels of Anaheim.**

June 27, 2005

Format

- Adobe PDF (Pgs. 28)

File Size - 80kb

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT
DIVISION THREE

Original

proceedings;

petition for a writ of mandate to challenge an order of
the Superior Court of Orange County, Peter J. Polos,
Judge. Petition denied.

Sheppard, Mullin, Richter & Hampton, Andrew J.

Guilford,

Matthew J.

Erwin, Jeffrey Blank; Rutan & Tucker, Michael

Rubin, Todd

Litfin, Andrew Ainsworth;

and Jack L. White, City Attorney, for Petitioner.

Stephen, Oringer, Richman & Theodora, George J.

Stephan, Robert M.

Dato, Brian P. Barrow; Powell Goldstein, William B.

Shearer, Jr., and William V. Custer

for Real Party in Interest.

* * *

Petitioner City of Anaheim (Anaheim) sought a preliminary
injunction

enjoining real party in interest Angels Baseball,
from changing the name of

L.P. (ABLPL)

its baseball team from the Anaheim Angels to the Los
Angeles Angels of Anaheim. The

trial court denied the request, and Anaheim now seeks
extraordinary writ requiring the

an

court to vacate its denial, and enter a new order

granting

Anaheim V. Angels

Written by Request for injunction
Sunday, 26 June 2005 12:00

the preliminary injunction.

Our review is narrowly limited to determining whether the court abused its

discretion in denying the preliminary injunction. abuses its discretion when its

decision is arbitrary, capricious and exceeds the reason, or ignores the

uncontradicted evidence. The trial court's decision Anaheim failed to demonstrate a

likelihood of success on the merits, as we discuss was supported by substantial

evidence and was well within the bounds of reason. therefore deny the writ petition.

Because of our inquiry's narrow focus, however, decision today does

not declare any party the ultimate victor. Indeed, today's opinion places neither

party ahead or behind in the count.

the

A court

bounds of

that

below,

We

our

at trial,