

\* \* \* COMMUNICATION RESULT REPORT ( MAR. 27. 2007 5:59PM ) \* \* \*

FAX HEADER 1:  
FAX HEADER 2:

TRANSMITTED/STORED : MAR. 27. 2007 5:57PM  
FILE MODE OPTION

ADDRESS

RESULT

PAGE

0123 MEMORY TX

8605674779

OK

12/12

REASON FOR ERROR  
E-1) HANG UP OR LINE FAIL  
E-3) NO ANSWER

E-2) BUSY  
E-4) NO FACSIMILE CONNECTION

**FACSIMILE FILING  
COVER SHEET**

JD-CL-73 Rev. 5-10

**CONNECTICUT JUDICIAL BRANCH  
SUPERIOR COURT**

www.jud.ct.gov

**INSTRUCTIONS**

1. See the back/page 2 for Procedures and Technical Standards for Electronic Filing.
2. Do not fax the back/page 2 of this form to the court.
3. Type or print legibly. One cover sheet must be submitted for each document.
4. The filing party shall keep the signed copy of the pleading, document or other paper while the action is pending, during any appeal period and during any applicable appellate process.
5. The transmission record of each filing shall be the filing party's confirmation of receipt by the Court. Please do not call the Clerk's Office to confirm receipt.

**TO: The Superior Court named below.**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judicial District at: <u>Litchfield</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Geographical Area No.: _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Housing Session at: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Juvenile Matters at: _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Small Claims Area at: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Child Protection Session at Middletown

Fax number of above Court <b>860-567-4779</b>	<i>(Include prefix: for example, CI, CP, CR, CV, FA, HC, JV, MI, MV, SC, SP)</i>
Docket number <b>LLI-CV-58-0015459-S</b>	
Title of document faxed <b>Motion to Intervene of the Lime Rock Citizens Council, LLC</b>	
Number of pages <b>12</b>	<i>(Unless otherwise directed by the court, documents shall not be more than 20 pages (including cover sheet) .)</i>

**The filing party assumes the risk of incomplete transmission or other factors that result in the document not being accepted for filing.**

<b>From:</b>	Name <i>(Print or type full name of person to be contacted, if necessary)</i> <b>Beth Bryan Critton, Esq.</b>	Date <b>10/06/2015</b>
	I am an attorney or law firm excluded from e-filing: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Juris number: _____	
	Telephone number <i>(Include area code)</i> <b>860-251-5662</b>	Fax number <i>(Include area code)</i> <b>860-251-5318</b>

**To Be Completed By The Court Only**

**The document was not filed by the clerk's office for the following reason(s):**

- The document is not in compliance with procedures and technical standards established by the Office of the Chief Court Administrator. See the Judicial Branch procedure at [www.jud.ct.gov](http://www.jud.ct.gov).
- The document is longer than 20 pages.
- The document is:  incomplete.  illegible.
- The document was not accompanied by the required fax cover sheet.
- The document was faxed to the wrong court.
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Under the Procedures and Technical Standards for Electronic Filing set up by the Office of the Chief Court Administrator, the documents will not be returned by the clerk.**

From <i>(Print name and title)</i>	Date
------------------------------------	------

**The information contained in this facsimile message may be privileged and confidential and is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you receive this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately.**

**FACSIMILE FILING  
COVER SHEET**

JD-CL-73 Rev. 5-10

**INSTRUCTIONS**

CONNECTICUT JUDICIAL BRANCH  
**SUPERIOR COURT**

[www.jud.ct.gov](http://www.jud.ct.gov)

1. See the back/page 2 for Procedures and Technical Standards for Electronic Filing.
2. Do not fax the back/page 2 of this form to the court.
3. Type or print legibly. One cover sheet must be submitted for each document.
4. The filing party shall keep the signed copy of the pleading, document or other paper while the action is pending, during any appeal period and during any applicable appellate process.
5. The transmission record of each filing shall be the filing party's confirmation of receipt by the Court. Please **do not** call the Clerk's Office to confirm receipt.

**TO: The Superior Court named below.**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Judicial District at: <u>Litchfield</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Geographical Area No.: _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Housing Session at: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Juvenile Matters at: _____
<input type="checkbox"/> Small Claims Area at: _____	<input type="checkbox"/> Child Protection Session at Middletown

Fax number of above Court <b>860-567-4779</b>	
Docket number <b>LLI-CV-58-0015459-S</b>	
(Include prefix: for example, CI, CP, CR, CV, FA, HC, JV, MI, MV, SC, SP)	
Title of document faxed <b>Motion to Intervene of the Lime Rock Citizens Council, LLC</b>	
Number of pages <b>12</b>	(Unless otherwise directed by the court, documents shall not be more than 20 pages (including cover sheet) .)

**The filing party assumes the risk of incomplete transmission or other factors that result in the document not being accepted for filing.**

<b>From:</b>	Name (Print or type full name of person to be contacted, if necessary) <b>Beth Bryan Critton, Esq.</b>	Date <b>10/06/2015</b>
	I am an attorney or law firm excluded from e-filing: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Juris number: _____	
	Telephone number (Include area code) <b>860-251-5662</b>	Fax number (Include area code) <b>860-251-5318</b>

**To Be Completed By The Court Only**

**The document was not filed by the clerk's office for the following reason(s):**

- The document is not in compliance with procedures and technical standards established by the Office of the Chief Court Administrator. See the Judicial Branch procedure at [www.jud.ct.gov](http://www.jud.ct.gov).
- The document is longer than 20 pages.
- The document is:  incomplete.  illegible.
- The document was not accompanied by the required fax cover sheet.
- The document was faxed to the wrong court.
- Other \_\_\_\_\_

**Under the Procedures and Technical Standards for Electronic Filing set up by the Office of the Chief Court Administrator, the documents will not be returned by the clerk.**

From (Print name and title)	Date
-----------------------------	------

*The information contained in this facsimile message may be privileged and confidential and is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you receive this communication in error, please notify the sender immediately.*

DOCKET NO. LLI-CV-58-0015459-S : SUPERIOR COURT  
:   
ANN ADAMS, ET AL. : JUDICIAL DISTRICT  
: OF LITCHFIELD  
:   
v. :   
:   
B. FRANKLIN VAILL, ET AL. : OCTOBER 6, 2015

**MOTION TO INTERVENE OF THE LIME ROCK CITIZENS COUNCIL, LLC**

Pursuant to Connecticut General Statutes ("General Statutes") §§ 52-102, 52-107 and 52-108 and Connecticut Practice Book §§ 9-18 and 9-19, Lime Rock Citizens Council, LLC ("Council") hereby moves to intervene as a party plaintiff in this action and, in particular, in proceedings in which Lime Rock Park, LLC is seeking to modify a long-standing injunction proscribing the activities permitted at Lime Rock Park racetrack ("racetrack"), establishing days and hours of operation, and setting fines for violations of the injunction.

The Council is a Connecticut limited liability company, comprised of residents and neighbors of the Lime Rock area of Salisbury and organized for "the purpose of promoting and protecting the interests of those adversely affected by the activities of Lime Rock Park, a motorsport road racing venue located in Lime Rock." See Exhibit A, attached. The Council was formed in August 2015 to ensure that interests, including those previously represented by the Lime Rock Protection Association, Inc., are properly and vigorously protected.

The Council was notified of the pending Motion to Modify Injunction and Judgment ("Motion to Modify") by an Order of Notice signed by the Court on September 4, 2015. The Order of Notice prepared by Lime Rock Park, LLC specifically directed that notice of hearing on the Motion to Modify be served on Peter Wolf, the Council's agent for service. Pleadings

filed by Lime Rock Park, LLC included the Council's letter of August 25, 2015 (Exhibit A to this Motion), which advised this Court, Lime Rock Park and the Chair of the Town of Salisbury Planning and Zoning Commission of the Council's interests in this matter.

I. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.

Issues relating to the racetrack have been the subject of litigation as long ago as 1958 when owners of properties near the racetrack and others affected by racetrack operations filed an injunction action, alleging irreparable harm and nuisance based on racetrack operations. According to a 1969 Supreme Court decision that reviewed previous court proceedings, the trial court found in 1959 that “unrestricted racing events on defendant’s track constituted a nuisance and caused irreparable injury to the plaintiffs.” *Adams v. Vaill*, 158 Conn. 478, 480, 485 (1969).

“In March, 1966, pursuant to a stipulation of the parties, the court amended the decree to decree to define more precisely what sports car racing activities were proscribed and what were permitted.” *Id.*, p. 481.

In 1968, the original plaintiffs moved to modify the 1966 injunction. The sole basis of the motion was to the passage of a 1967 Public Act relating to unmuffled motor vehicles. The trial court modified the injunction and the Supreme Court upheld the modification. *Id.*

In 1988, Lime Rock Protection Committee, Inc. and Lime Rock Associates, Inc. came before the court and entered into a Stipulation, signed by the presidents of the Lime Rock Protection Committee, Inc. and Lime Rock Associates, Inc., modifying the injunctive order with respect to the activities permitted and the days and hours of operation.

Lime Rock Park, LLC, the current movant, was not a party to the original or subsequent proceedings and, on knowledge and belief, has filed no motion to intervene or otherwise become a party to the action. Counsel representing Lime Rock Park, LLC has filed an Appearance on behalf of "The Lime Rock Corporation," which was a defendant in the original nuisance action filed by a group of neighbors in 1958, and is, according to records of the Office of the Secretary of State, now dissolved.

In its Motion, Lime Rock Park, LLC seeks to modify the injunction originally entered, after a full trial before the Superior Court, on May 12, 1959 and modified several times over the years, most recently in 1988. The specific modifications requested would significantly extend the duration (both in terms of days and hours of operation) and change the types of activities at the racetrack, to the detriment of the interests of the Lime Rock Citizens Council, LLC with reference to noise and air pollution, property values, traffic congestion, the use and enjoyment of their properties, and the character of the community.

## II. LEGAL ANALYSIS.

General Statutes § 52-102 provides, in pertinent part, that, “[u]pon motion by any party or nonparty to a civil action, . . . the nonparty so moving . . . (2) shall be made a party by the court if that person is necessary for a complete determination or settlement of any question involved therein.” General Statutes § 52-107 provides: "The court may determine the controversy as between the parties before it, if it can do so without prejudice to the rights of others; but, if a complete determination cannot be had without the presence of other parties, the court may direct that such other parties be brought in. If a person not a party has an

interest or title which the judgment will affect, the court, on his application, shall direct him to be made a party." See also Practice Book § 9-18. General Statutes § 52-108 and Practice Book § 9-19 provide for the addition of parties "at any stage of the action, as the court deems the interests of justice require."

In considering motions to intervene or to add parties, Connecticut courts have recognized a distinction between "necessary" and "indispensable" parties. In *1525 Highland Associates, LLC v. Fohl*, 62 Conn. App. 612, cert. denied, 256 Conn. 919 (2001), our Appellate Court said it this way:

Parties are considered indispensable when they not only have an interest in the controversy, but an interest of such a nature that a final decree cannot be made without either affecting that interest, or leaving the controversy in such condition that its final [disposition] may be... inconsistent with equity and good conscience ... Indispensable parties must be joined because due process principles make it essential that [such parties] be given notice and an opportunity to protect [their] interests by making [them] a party to the [action] ... Necessary parties, in contrast, are those [p]ersons having an interest in the controversy, and who ought to be made parties, in order that the court may act on that rule which requires it to decide on, and finally determine the entire controversy, and do complete justice, by adjusting all the rights involved in it .... (Internal quotation marks omitted.)  
*Id.*, at 618.

In moving to intervene as of right, the intervenor must satisfy four requirements. *See, e.g., Kerrigan v. Commissioner of Public Health*, 279 Conn. 447, 456-57 (2006). The motion to intervene must be timely, the moving party must have a direct and substantial interest in the subject matter of the litigation, the moving party's interest must be impaired by disposition of the litigation without that party's involvement and the moving party's interest must not be represented adequately by any other party to the litigation. *Id.*

"For purposes of judging the satisfaction of [the] conditions [for intervention] we look to the pleadings, that is, to the motion ... to intervene and to the proposed complaint or defense in intervention, and ... we accept the allegations in those pleadings as true. The question on a petition to intervene is whether a well-pleaded defense or claim is asserted. Its merits are not to be determined. The defense or claim is assumed to be true on [a] motion to intervene, at least in the absence of sham, frivolity, and other similar objections. Thus, neither testimony nor other evidence is required to justify intervention, and [a prospective] intervenor must allege sufficient facts, through the submitted motion and pleadings, if any, in order to make a showing of his or her right to intervene. The inquiry is whether the claims contained in the motion, if true, establish that the [prospective] intervenor has a direct and immediate interest that will be affected by the judgment." (Citation omitted; internal quotation marks omitted.)  
Id., p. 457.

Lime Rock Citizens Council, LLC meets the four conditions for intervention as of right. Its Motion to Intervene is timely. Both in this Motion and in its letter of August 25, 2015, which Lime Rock Park, LLC itself provided to the Court, the Council has claimed an interest in the modification of an injunction that its members and other neighbors have relied upon for years. This interest will be impaired if the Council is not permitted to intervene and present legal analysis and evidence to the Court regarding the harm and inequity that neighbors will face if the Council is not permitted to protect its interests. Because many of the plaintiffs in the original 1958 nuisance action are deceased or no longer reside in Lime Rock, and because the Lime Rock Protection Committee no longer exists, there is no original party who can adequately represent the Council's interests.

For all these reasons, the Motion to Intervene of the Lime Rock Citizens Council, LLC should be granted. Lime Rock Citizens Council, LLC is a person necessary for the complete determination or settlement of the issues, warranting intervention pursuant to General Statutes § 52-102, and represents persons whose interests will be affected by any judgment, warranting intervention as of right under General Statutes § 52-107 and Practice Book § 9-18. The interests of justice will be served by the addition of the Council, supporting intervention pursuant to General Statutes § 52-108 and Practice Book § 9-19. Finally, there is no prejudice to any party to this action by permitting the Council to intervene as a party plaintiff.

III. CONCLUSION AND RELIEF REQUESTED.

Lime Rock Citizens Council, LLC is both a necessary and indispensable party to this injunction action and attempted Motion to Modify Injunction and Judgment and should be permitted to intervene pursuant to General Statutes §§ 52-102, 52-107 and 52-108 and Practice Book §§ 9-18 and 9-19. Therefore, Lime Rock Citizens Council, LLC respectfully moves this Court to grant its Motion to Intervene and order that it be added as a party plaintiff in this action.



MOVANT,  
LIME ROCK CITIZENS COUNCIL, LLC



Timothy S. Hollister  
Beth Bryan Critton  
Shipman & Goodwin LLP  
One Constitution Plaza  
Hartford, CT 06103  
Telephone: 860-251-5000  
Facsimile: 860-251-5318  
[bcritton@goodwin.com](mailto:bcritton@goodwin.com)  
Juris No. 057385  
Its Attorneys

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing was transmitted by e-mail and first-class mail, postage prepaid, on this 6<sup>th</sup> day of October 2015, to:

Charles E. Roraback, Esq.  
Roraback & Roraback  
24 Mason Street  
P.O. Box 925  
Torrington, CT 06790  
[cer@rorabacklaw.com](mailto:cer@rorabacklaw.com)

John L. Cordani, Jr., Esq.  
Richard L. Street, Esq.  
Carmody Torrance Sandak & Hennessey LLP  
195 Church Street  
P.O. Box 1950  
New Haven, CT 06509  
[jcordani@carmodylaw.com](mailto:jcordani@carmodylaw.com)  
[rstreet@carmodylaw.com](mailto:rstreet@carmodylaw.com)

James K. Robertson, Jr., Esq.  
Carmody Torrance Sandak & Hennessey LLP  
50 Leavenworth Street  
Waterbury, CT 06721  
[jrobertson@carmodylaw.com](mailto:jrobertson@carmodylaw.com)

Martha A. Miller, Esq.  
462 Lime Rock Road  
Lakeville, CT 06039  
[Martha@millertaxlaw.com](mailto:Martha@millertaxlaw.com)



Beth Bryan Critton  
Commissioner of the Court

# **EXHIBIT A**

Lime Rock Citizens Council

Re: *Ann Adams, et al., v. B. Franklin Vaill, et al., No. 15,459*

LIME ROCK CITIZENS COUNCIL (formerly known as the "Lime Rock Protection Association")  
c/o Peter S. Wolf  
45 White Hollow Rd.  
Lakeville, CT 06039

August 26, 2015

By Registered Mail:

Mr. Brandon Pelegano, Chief Clerk of Court  
Clerk's Office, Litchfield County Superior Court  
15 West Street  
Litchfield, CT 06759

*With copies to:*

By Email:

Ms. Georgia Blades  
Lime Rock Park  
60 White Hollow Rd.  
Lakeville, CT 06039

By Hand Delivery:

Dr. Michael Klemens, Chairman  
Salisbury Planning and Zoning Commission  
Town Hall  
Salisbury, CT 06068

Re: *Ann Adams, et al., v. B. Franklin Vaill, et al., No. 15,459*

Dear Mr. Pelegano,

Please be advised that a group of residents and concerned neighbors of Lime Rock have organized to form the **LIME ROCK CITIZENS COUNCIL, LLP** ("LRCC") with the purpose of promoting and protecting the interests of those adversely affected by the activities of Lime Rock Park, a motorsport road racing venue located in Lime Rock, Connecticut (the "Track"). The LRCC is a limited liability corporation established under the laws of the State of Connecticut (Business ID 1181805).

It recently has come to the attention of the LRCC that the Track intends to seek amendments to an Order and Injunction entered by the Superior Court of Litchfield County in 1959 (amended by stipulation in 1966 and 1988), in *Ann Adams, et al., v. B. Franklin Vaill, et al., No. 15,459* (the "Injunction"). This Injunction imposes significant restrictions on the Track's activities, which in

LIME ROCK CITIZENS COUNCIL  
Re: *Ann Adams, et al., v. B. Franklin Vaill, et al., No. 15,459*


turn protect the rights and interests of those home owners, business owners, residents, and concerned citizens represented by the LRCC. The LRCC understands, on information and belief, that the entity that most recently represented the interests of Lime Rock's residents and neighbors in this court action, the "Lime Rock Protection Association, Inc." is no longer in existence. The LRCC therefore has formed to ensure that those interests are properly represented and vigorously protected.

Accordingly, the LRCC respectfully requests that the Clerk of Court provide notice to the LRCC of any activity on this docket (*Ann Adams, et al., v. B. Franklin Vaill, et al., No. 15,459*, a copy of which is attached hereto) or any action filed by or on behalf of the Lime Rock Park seeking to amend or challenge the provisions of the Injunction (as amended). Notice may be provided to the LRCC's legal agent, Peter Wolf of 45 White Hollow Road, Lakeville, CT 06039, (860-435-9411), and by email to: [limerockcitizenscouncil@gmail.com](mailto:limerockcitizenscouncil@gmail.com).


Please also be advised that should the Track decide to take any legal or administrative action to modify the terms of the 1959 Injunction (as amended), the LRCC fully intends to oppose any such action.

Sincerely,

Peter S. Wolf, Managing co-Founder



Douglas R. Howes, Managing co-Founder



On behalf of the LIME ROCK CITIZENS COUNCIL