

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA

---

No. 208 E.M. 2007

---

CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA AND  
COUNCILMEMBER FRANK DICICCO,  
Petitioners,

v.

HSP GAMING, L.P.,  
CITY OF PHILADELPHIA, AND  
STEPHANIE W. NAIDOFF,  
Respondents.

---

REPLY BRIEF AND ANSWER OF RESPONDENTS, THE CITY OF PHILADELPHIA  
AND STEPHANIE NAIDOFF

---

January 4, 2008

CITY OF PHILADELPHIA LAW DEPARTMENT  
ROMULO L. DIAZ, JR., CITY SOLICITOR,  
Attorney ID 88795

1515 Arch Street, 17th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19102  
Tel: (215) 683-5003; Fax: (215) 683-5068

By: **FLASTER/GREENBERG P.C.**

*Attorneys for the City of Philadelphia and Stephanie W.  
Naidoff*

Abbe F. Fletman, Attorney ID 52896

Kevin Greenberg, Attorney ID 82311

8 Penn Center, 15<sup>th</sup> Floor

1628 John F. Kennedy Boulevard

Philadelphia, PA 19103

Tel: (215) 279-9393; Fax: (215) 279-9394

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

I. INTRODUCTION ..... 1

II. JURISDICTION ..... 2

III. STATEMENT OF FACTS ..... 2

IV. ARGUMENT ..... 5

    A. Standard of Review ..... 5

    B. The Legislature Specifically Delegated to the Commerce Director Decisions  
    Regarding Submerged Lands in Philadelphia..... 6

    C. The Attorney General’s Opinion of 1978 Confirmed the Commerce Director’s  
    Authority ..... 7

    D. The History of the Dam Safety and Encroachments Act Demonstrates that the  
    Delegation is Still Valid..... 8

    E. The Delegated Authority Has Been Used Extensively ..... 9

    F. The Commerce Director had an Affirmative Duty to Decide Application..... 10

    G. HSP’s Land Ownership is Appropriate for the Land Use License Decisions ..... 10

    H. Section 18-107 of the Philadelphia Code Did Not Repeal State Law ..... 12

    I. Petitioners Point to No Other Inadequacy in the Process the Director of Commerce  
    Followed, and thus the License is Valid ..... 14

V. ANSWER..... 14

VI. CONCLUSION..... 24

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES**

	<b>Page(s)</b>
<b>FEDERAL CASES</b>	
<i>United States v. Pa. Salt Mfg. Co.</i> , 16 F.2d 476 (E.D. Pa. 1926) .....	11
 <b>STATE CASES</b>	
<i>Alpha Auto Sales, Inc. v. Dept. of State</i> , 644 A.2d 153 (Pa. 1994) .....	5
<i>Aviation Properties, L.L.P. v. Chanceford Twp. Bd. of Supervisors</i> , 923 A.2d 1099 (Pa. 2007) .....	10
<i>Ball v. Slack</i> , 2 Whart. 508 (Pa. 1837) .....	11
<i>Chester Extended Care Ctr. v. Commonwealth, Dept. of Public Welfare</i> , 586 A.2d 379 (Pa. 1991) .....	5
<i>City of Philadelphia v. Commonwealth</i> , 130 A. 491 (Pa. 1925) .....	9
<i>Coady v. Vaughn</i> , 770 A.2d 287 (Pa. 2001) .....	10
<i>Commonwealth Comm'n on Charitable Orgs. v. Ass'n of Cmty. Orgs. for Reform Now</i> , 463 A.2d 406 (Pa. 1983) .....	5
<i>Fumo v. Philadelphia</i> , 207 EM 2007 (Pa. Filed December 26, 2007) .....	1
<i>Hous. Auth. of the County of Chester v. Pa State Civil Service Comm'n</i> , 730 A.2d 935 (Pa. 1999) .....	13
<i>HSP Gaming, L.P. v. City Council for the City of Phila., et al.</i> , 2007 WL 4226871 (Pa. Dec. 3, 2007). .....	2, 10, 15
<i>Kusenberg v. Browne</i> , 42 Pa. 173 (1862) .....	6
<i>Morris v. McNamee</i> , 17 Pa. 173, 1851 WL 5847 (Pa. 1851) .....	11
<i>Philadelphia v. Commonwealth</i> , 284 Pa. 225 (1925) .....	11

