





District of Columbia

Known Condemnations Benefiting Private Parties⁷⁷

Filed/Authorized Condemnations  6

Threatened Condemnations  10

Legend  = 1  = 10

Skyland

“The Supreme Court upheld 50 years of precedent today, allowing local officials the continued use of eminent domain to bolster depressed economic neighborhoods,” said Anthony Williams, mayor of Washington D.C. and president of the National League of Cities on the day the *Kelo* decision came down.⁷⁸

Williams was especially pleased with the decision because it supported a project to take Skyland, a fully leased shopping center in Southeast D.C., with a grocery store, restaurants, nail salons and laundromats among other retailers, and replace it with other retailers and, redevelopment officials hope, a big box store.⁷⁹ According to Williams a ruling in favor of the *Kelo* homeowners “would have [had] severe long-term effects on many government projects. It would [have] jettison[ed]” the Skyland project.⁸⁰

The shopping center consists of 16 properties with 14 separate owners.⁸¹ In July 2005, the National Capital Revitalization Corporation (“NCRC”) filed

⁷⁷ These numbers were compiled from news sources. Many cases go unreported, and news reports often do not specify the number of properties against which condemnations were filed or threatened.

⁷⁸ Mathew Vadum, “High court OKs eminent domain, 5-4; Connecticut ruling upheld by justices,” *Bond Buyer*, June 24, 2005

⁷⁹ Jen Haberkorn, “2 more Skyland properties go to NCRC,” *Washington Times*, February 28, 2006, at C8.

⁸⁰ Kirstin Downey, “Fighting the power to take your home; More owners are challenging government plans to seize land,” *Washington Post*, May 7, 2005, at F1.

⁸¹ Kirstin Downey, “Fighting the power to take your home; More owners are challenging government plans to seize land,” *Washington Post*, May 7, 2005, at F1; Mathew Vadum, “D.C. strip mall in eminent domain flap,” *Bond Buyer*, December 12, 2005, at 1.

condemnations against six of the properties.⁸²

Seventeen property owners and lessees sued the NCRC to prevent officials from filing more condemnations. In December 2005, a U.S. District Court judge, citing *Kelo*, ruled in favor of the NCRC.⁸³

As of April 2006, the NCRC claims to control two-thirds of the properties.⁸⁴

⁸² “Two small domains,” *Retail Traffic*, September 1, 2005, at 14.

⁸³ *Rumber v. District of Columbia*, No. 04-1770, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 33360 (D.D.C. Dec. 12, 2005).

⁸⁴ Tom Knott, “Skyland project adrift without anchor in sight,” *Washington Times*, April 20, 2006, at B2.