



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
July 9, 2008

CONTACT
Patsy Smith – 630-584-5700

VILLAGE BOARD AGREES TO INDEMNIFY VILLAGE CLERK

Campton Hills -- The Board of Trustees of the Village of Campton Hills adopted a Resolution last night assuring the Village Clerk she would be indemnified for litigation expenses as a result of filing a certification of the November 2007 petition to dissolve the Village with the County Clerk.

The Village Code has provisions that Village officials will not be indemnified for their inappropriate actions or acts undertaken contrary to the advice of Village legal counsel. The Village attorneys had previously determined that the November 2007 Dissolution Petition is not eligible to be placed on the November 2008 ballot. Last night's Resolution, R-08-19, reaffirms the Village's determination to present to a Kane County judge that it would be illegal to have the dissolution question, previously determined ineligible by Judge Colwell for the February 2008 ballot, put before the voters.

Village President Patsy Smith stated "The intention of the Village Code provisions on indemnification are to protect the Village in the event that a Village official acts in a manner which clearly is illegal and/or exposes the Village and the Village official to claims. For example, if a Village Trustee signs a contract on behalf of the Village without authority, that Trustee cannot look to the Village for indemnification if he or she is sued individually. In the case of the Village Clerk, she has received conflicting advice as to whether to certify the referendum question for dissolution. The Village Board decided the right thing to do under these particular circumstances was to agree to indemnify the Clerk in the event of a lawsuit. It appeared likely that someone would file a lawsuit attempting to get the referendum question on the ballot. This morning the Village Clerk decided to certify the dissolution question with the County Clerk to place the question on the ballot. As a result, the Village will be filing a lawsuit against Chris Baldwin, the agent of the petitioners, challenging the validity of the petition and to stop the dissolution question from being placed on the November ballot. One reason the Referendum Proposition is inappropriate for placement on the November ballot is because the petition, initially filed in November 2007, specifically requested the question be placed on the 'next election,' which was in February 2008."