vinetur

Napa wineries challenge local regulations, claiming civil rights violations

Amidst California's broader civil rights concerns, wineries in Napa County seek legal redress over tasting restrictions

Monday, November 13, 2023



In a striking contrast to typical civil rights cases in California, three Napa County wineries are positioning their fight against local wine tasting restrictions as a civil rights issue. This development emerges amidst a backdrop of more conventional civil rights allegations within the state, including excessive force by law enforcement and discriminatory practices.

Lindsay Hoopes, owner of Hoopes Vineyard, alongside Smith-Madrone and Summit Lake wineries, have taken an unusual legal stance by requesting an investigation by California's Attorney General into Napa County's restrictions on wine tastings and events. These wineries argue that these limitations constitute a violation of their civil rights, particularly in regard to property rights and their ability to conduct business.

Hoopes, leveraging her background as a former prosecutor and law professor, contends that the county's actions against her winery, which sought to prevent public tastings and tours, equate to a deprivation of rights without due process. This legal battle underscores a wider issue in the Napa region, where small wineries struggle against restrictive ordinances that they believe unfairly impact their direct sales and survival.

The county, however, maintains that exemptions in use permits do not extend to activities like tours and tastings. This stance highlights a complex regulatory environment in Napa County, which has been a subject of contention, particularly among small winery owners who view these restrictions as detrimental to their business operations.

The conflict extends beyond legal arguments to involve broader social and political dynamics in the region. Small wineries, often lacking the political clout of larger counterparts, find themselves in a challenging position, advocating for more lenient regulations to sustain their businesses, which rely heavily on direct sales through visitor tastings.

While the wineries' argument frames their situation as a civil rights issue, it introduces a novel dimension into the discourse on property rights within the realm of civil rights law. The California Attorney General's Office, known for its focus on a wide range of civil rights issues, has not prominently featured property rights in its past cases, indicating the unique nature of the wineries' claims.

As this case unfolds, it not only raises legal questions about the extent of property rights under civil rights law but also shines a light on the tensions between local regulations and small business interests in Napa County. The outcome of this dispute could have significant implications for how civil rights are interpreted in the context of business operations and property use, especially in areas with complex local governance structures like Napa County.