

6)

===== Start of Answer #6 (641 words) =====

1. Property Owner A v. City

Standing

Standing requires: 1) injury, 2) causation, and 3) redressibility. Here, there's an injury because A has a very good location for large and popular restaurant he's running and he's being forced to move. There's causation because but-for the C amending its zoning A would not have to move. Lastly, there's redressibility because with a favorable decision in A's favor he would not have to move.

Therefore, A has standing.

Takings Clause

The Takings Clause of the U.S. Constitution requires: 1) the taking be for public use and for 2) just compensation.

Here, the taking is for public use because, first, the public use standard is a very low standard and all that C needs is for it to be reasonably related to the taking, it's to make things safer for the kids walking along the block because currently do to traffic the parents now believe that it creates a hazard. But because the re-zoning is reasonable related to the protection of the kids, it qualifies as a public use.

However, there has been no just compensation paid for the taking of A's property by the making of them move. The government in order to complete the taking needed to pay fair market value for it's location and there is nothing in the facts that suggest that they have done that. Additionally, that business has a prime location because the space is large, so it can accommodate a lot of people which it does because it is very popular. So, the fair market value of this

