

Summary Statement
Vintage II, LLC v. Teton Saddleback
Docket No. 51455

This case concerns a quiet title action to land in Teton County that was in and adjacent to a subdivision. In 2014, Vintage II, LLC purchased land from Teton Saddleback Vistas Homeowners Association. There had been no development of the subdivision since 2009 and there were not any validly recorded and enforceable CC&Rs when Vintage acquired the parcels. When Vintage attempted to sell the property several years later, the CC&Rs emerged as a potential cloud on the title. Vintage filed a complaint seeking to quiet title to the property against Teton Saddleback under Idaho Code section 6-401. The complaint sought a judicial determination that the property was not encumbered by three separate, recorded versions of Teton Saddleback's CC&Rs and that Teton Saddleback had "no interest" in the property.

On the day of trial, Vintage filed a motion in limine to exclude the Master Plan for the subdivision from admission into evidence based on a lack of relevance. The district court admitted portions of the Master Plan, which included graphic depictions of the subdivision and an owner's certificate. Following a bench trial, the district court concluded that Vintage had actual notice of encumbrances to the land because its warranty deed referenced the Master Plan. On motions for reconsideration, new trial, and relief from the judgment, the court also ruled that it had to consider the Master Plan because the Plaintiffs asked for a determination that Teton Saddleback had no interest in the property, which required the court to consider the legal effect of any instrument in the record related to the property. Finally, the court ruled that the Master Plan created restrictive covenants and equitable servitudes on Vintage's land because the plan evinced the intent for the restrictions to bind and run with the land.

On appeal, the Idaho Supreme Court affirmed the district court's admission of the Master Plan at trial, concluding that it was relevant. However, the Supreme Court vacated the district court's amended judgment, ruling that the Master Plan did not create either restrictive covenants or equitable servitudes on Vintage's land because the plan's Area/Unit/Density Tables and the Owner's Certificate did not show a clear intent to impose restrictions on the land. The Supreme Court also ruled that the Master Plan did not create a common law dedication of the property as open space because it did not demonstrate an intent to dedicate.

******This summary constitutes no part of the opinion of the Court, but has been
Prepared by court staff for the convenience of the public.******