

Top Internet Comments On Vinohd Khosla Beach Closure Affluenza Scandal

Sun, 21 Feb 2016 16:00:00, newstips66, [post_tag: billionaire-shuts-off-most-beautiful-part-of-california-coast-because-he-is-a-billionaire, category: brotopia, category: energy-dept-slush-fund, post_tag: federal-entity, category: google-alphabet, post_tag: google-defamation-documents, post_tag: hot, post_tag: hot-crime-topics, post_tag: investigation-22, post_tag: key-stories, post_tag: khosla-ventures, post_tag: news-clippings-on-google, post_tag: news-video-coverage, category: san_francisco_corruption, category: senator-insider-trading, post_tag: top-internet-comments-on-vinohd-khosla-beach-closure-affluenza-scandal, post_tag: vinohd-khosla, category: worldnews]

Billionaire shuts off most beautiful part of California coast because he is a billionaire.

[–]Loquicious 715 points 20 hours ago

This is a public use easement. The public has a right to use it. Have the state or interested party sue him. They can fine him and force him to reopen it. Once an easement exists you can't just block it off. He has no rights here.
<http://legal-dictionary.thefreedictionary.com/public+easement>

public easement n. the right of the general public to use certain streets, highways, paths or airspace. In most cases the easement came about through reservation of the right when land was deeded to individuals or by dedication of the land to the government. In some cases public easements come by prescription (use for many years) such as a pathway across private property down to the ocean. Beach access has been the source of controversy between government and private owners in many seaboard states. (See: easement, prescriptive easement)

- [permalink](#)

[–]VHSRoot 152 points 20 hours ago

I was wondering if that was the case. Of course he can't close it off, but he might be having his lawyers play chicken with the state for as long as possible. David Geffen pulled this shit for something like 15 years before he complied with orders for public access in a similar situation.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–]Soncassder 70 points 10 hours ago

If I went to a public beach and closed it off the police would use a tank to run my ass over.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–]ioncloud9 133 points 10 hours ago

police are only used on the little people. Big billionaires don't deal with police.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–]Jesuslordofporn 54 points 8 hours ago

I wish this was just a joke.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–]FluffyBunnyHugs 5 points 5 hours ago

The police work for the rich. They are the only one's with anything worth protecting.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (8 replies)

load more comments (1 reply)

[–]lossvibrations 306 points 16 hours ago

Right now, rich people are taking advantage of the fact that counties are too broke to sue. If you bike down the California coast line, you can see where they are defacing/destroying signs marking public access, and adding chains/etc to close down roads. Their hope is that they can set precedent now while no one can do anything and have the beaches forever.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–]Nayr747 29 points 9 hours ago

So what's to stop people with bolt cutters from taking the areas back?

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–]judgej2 23 points 9 hours ago

Time, effort, knowledge, drive, understanding, fearlessness, ...

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–]NFN_NLN 8 points 7 hours ago

Meh, just flash mob it continually.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–]lossvibrations 10 points 9 hours ago

The gates are often put up in such a way that they appear private, and warning signs and security are often around as well. You can do it, but they're producing a barrier to try to keep people from doing it.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–]Palidd 6 points 5 hours ago

Nothing, actually that gate is constantly broken and people use the beach all the time. Best part is due to the dispute almost none of the normal beach laws apply since the police wont do anything about it so people throw some crazy party's down there

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][blablablah2016](#) 3 points 5 hours ago

That's awesome. The police probably want to use that beach too.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][GenericMidwestHunter](#) 3 points 4 hours ago

Nothing. Where I'm from, every public land has an easement unless it can be reached by a public waterway. Just call up dnr and ask them where it is. Then go in, they can't do anything about it. I've walked across someone's manicured lawn next to their mansion with a gun slung over my shoulder because it's the easement. They may give you some shit, but fuck em. If they call the cops, offer to dial the number for them.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

[–][pixelrebel](#) 22 points 12 hours ago

Not to mention all the people getting parking tickets for parking in front of fake no parking signs.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][lossyvibrations](#) 14 points 7 hours ago

This happens in LA all the time. The LA times did a story a couple years ago on a couple who had the LAPD arrest a teacher and his family even though they were legally on the beach.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][SaintNicolasD](#) 138 points 16 hours ago

What shitty people

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][cool_reddit_name_man](#) 99 points 11 hours ago

Yeah, you don't become rich by being nice, unfortunately. It's a real shame too because the rich have the means to make the world so much better.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][ammobox](#) 8 points 7 hours ago

They do make the world better.....for them.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][jamlogris](#) 41 points 10 hours ago

Straight up, if the world was better they wouldn't be rich.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][Rad_Spencer](#) 5 points 7 hours ago

They'd still be rich, they'd still have more than they could spend. They just wouldn't be this rich or getting as richer.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][RockTripod](#) 8 points 7 hours ago

I'm happy being poor, and not a backstabbing cock bite to people.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][WorkedForThatPlace](#) 7 points 4 hours ago

Yeah, every time I point this out I get lynched online. In my opinion, if you are a billionaire, you are a piece of shit, because you are needlessly hoarding more money than any one single person will ever need to live even the most luxurious lifestyle.

You only need so much money in life, once you have enough that you never need to work again, I think it is time to start trying to help make the world a better place. I can promise I would never last as a billionaire, I am not selfish enough.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][cool_reddit_name_man](#) 3 points 3 hours ago

Perhaps [this](#) is the case?

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (16 replies)

load more comments (2 replies)

[–][Vegaprime](#) 8 points 13 hours ago

Its not just ranchers anymore.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][Glimmersam](#) 155 points 16 hours ago

Guillotines. We should get some.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][percocet_20](#) 36 points 15 hours ago*

You know how expensive those are? Save money, giant hammers is the way to go
Edit: expensive not extensive

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][VictorianDelorean](#) 33 points 12 hours ago

Bullets are pretty cheap, and we've already got plenty of brick walls to face them towards.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (7 replies)

[-][The_McTasty](#) 5 points 9 hours ago

Now now, the last time someone got out Guillotines they ended up starting a continual set of revolutions in France. Burning at the stake seems like a much more fun way to do this.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (2 replies)

[-][SnapesGrayUnderpants](#) 8 points 14 hours ago

I'll bring my knitting.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][toilethumah](#) 6 points 10 hours ago

I'll bring my out of control libido.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][Problem119V-0800](#) 3 points 13 hours ago

I'll bring three dashing adventurous guardsmen

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][dacotahd](#) 2 points 9 hours ago

Seriously we need them here for our politicians too
I'm tired of this, now it's just rich people playing around with our government. Let's get rid of both

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (4 replies)

[-][Opheltes](#) 13 points 9 hours ago

FWW, the easement is written into the deed, which is a public document. They can deface the signs all they want, but it doesn't actually change the legal status of the property.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][throw_karma](#) 10 points 8 hours ago

In practice though, people who want to go to the beach are not looking at land deeds, they're looking at signage along their way to the beach.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][lossyvibrations](#) 3 points 7 hours ago

Also, cops are looking at signage. When they have a person in the house claiming the folks are walking through illegally, and there's no signage indicating a public right of way, cops tend to side with the rich. It's easier because they're the ones more likely to have lawyers/etc.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][Daronakah](#) 2 points 4 hours ago*

This shit would NOT fly in Hawaii. Every inch of coastline is public beach access. Cops would roll on this guy SO FAST.
What does 'closed an access road' mean? Why don't people just go tear the shit down and go through? Fuck him.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (6 replies)

[-][lex_uno_plures](#) 208 points 15 hours ago

[This case is different](#). Essentially, this land was privately owned prior to California being acquired by the United States, and due to provisions in the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, this particular stretch of land is legally not considered public.

Since there was no public easement attached to the property at the time the United States acquired California from Mexico, the judge reasoned, the question of whether the California Constitution now guarantees access to the beach is immaterial.

Therefore, Khosla argues, since it is private land (legally speaking), if he lets people use it and they are injured, he could be liable for those claims, and have to take out insurance, maintain it to a standard, etc. He's not technically wrong, but his PR strategy has been atrocious. But push comes to shove, the private nature of the land has been upheld in court, and he can do what he wants with it.

More history: http://www.mercurynews.com/san-mateo-county-times/ci_26142031/martins-beach-timeline-from-guadalupe-hidalgo-vinod-khosla

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-] [flubblubber](#) 9 points 9 hours ago

Isn't all land below the high tide mark considered public in the USA?

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-] [my_elo_is_potato](#) 16 points 7 hours ago

Nope, its subject to state law.

["Ownership of these submerged lands was resolved by Congress passing the Submerged Lands Act.\[12\]sic which confirmed state title to the beds of all tidal and navigable bodies of water. While this act conveyed title to lands below tidal and navigable waters to the states. non-navigable stream beds are treated like dry lands and are part of the adjoining estates. Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tides, even though non-navigable, also passed to the states while the ownership and public use of these tidal lands is based on state laws."](#)

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

load more comments (1 reply)

[-] [raisinpan](#) 11 points 14 hours ago

Completely agree. Bad PR, but in the right legally. Overpriced, but the super rich have the ability to own land supralegal within the states.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-] [rokuk](#) 4 points 6 hours ago

have the ability to own land supralegal within the states

can you elaborate on what you mean by this?

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (2 replies)

[-] [Arcturion](#) 12 points 12 hours ago

Clear argument, sourced and linked- I'm surprised you are being downvoted.

Come on folks, if you disagree with him, grow a pair and post your own reply.

He's simply stating what is, not what it should be.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

load more comments (2 replies)

[-] [dfghgfdjfdghjdgj](#) 4 points 9 hours ago

No it's not, there is no recorded easement, there was long standing use, but it was charged for which precludes the creation of a prescriptive easement. So, there is no easement by those constraints.

The government has a good case to create one, with compensation, but that is not what you and 90% of the (wrong) people in this thread are claiming.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

[-] [limbignate](#) 3 points 19 hours ago

I couldn't tell from the article, but is there actually an easement in his land? If so he has no case.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-] [eleven-thirty-five](#) 5 points 18 hours ago

According to previous articles on the subject, yes.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-] [dfghgfdjfdghjdgj](#) 12 points 9 hours ago

Actually no, there isn't a recorded easement. Things get grey very fast without that.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-] [snowbirdie](#) 16 points 16 hours ago

We should organize a reddit party there and all show up. He can't legally stop us from using a public resource. He can't call the cops, since we're not breaking any law.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-] [RedditV4](#) 33 points 14 hours ago

The cops aren't going to interpret the law. They'll see a rich dude who appears to own the land, has a house on the property, and a bunch of people who appear to be squatters. Guess who's going to jail? Not the rich guy.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (14 replies)

[-] [Leo-Deus](#) 3 points 16 hours ago

Eminent domain does not mean that they get the property for free though, they have to pay him a reasonable amount otherwise he can sue the city/county/state.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][goblinseverywhere](#) 8 points 18 hours ago

There pretty much either is or isn't an easement. I don't really get the big problem here and why reddit is up in arms. If there is, he has no case its over easement remains. If there isn't, he can sell whatever he wants for whatever price. Thats life.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][PlannEdw](#) 52 points 17 hours ago

As a planner, two possible options:

1) It is an easement. No case.

2) It is not an easement. The municipality ends up exerting eminent domain.

In 2016, people don't get to block access to public amenities. It doesn't happen any more. In 99.9% of cases an easement is already there. In the rest they are forced out by ED.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][cosmos7](#) 11 points 16 hours ago

In the rest they are forced out by ED.

Sometimes, but not always. If something is seized by eminent domain the original owner must be compensated fair market value. The cost of remuneration and/or the potential cost of litigation to seize and decide value can easily prevent such a move.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][PlannEdw](#) 8 points 15 hours ago

Market value in all cases I have ever heard of is defined by legislation in the way of formulas be they by bylaw or state/provincial legislation. It is never a mystery what it will cost to utilize ED.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][cosmos7](#) 3 points 15 hours ago

Fights over value happen all the time, usually because those formulas suck and are easily manipulated to adjust the value. The fight then becomes a court battle of "expert appraisers".

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][bigbounder](#) 20 points 15 hours ago

There is no easement. There is the Coastal Commission which says the waterline must be public, and there's an agreement from the prior owner to allow access (a sort of undocumented covenant).

This was just a power play by a billionaire to get a private beach in California. The public will use eminent domain to regain the Coastal Commission granted public access. Now that the billionaire's dream of a nine-figure priced property are gone, he just wants all his money back.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][Friscogonewild](#) 9 points 17 hours ago

He can try to sell it, but he's starting at such an unreasonable price that they're just going to take it. **That's** life.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][PlannEdw](#) 13 points 17 hours ago

They have the right to utilize eminent domain and force him off the land at average land value for surrounding property. They don't need to buy anything.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (3 replies)

[-][cosmos7](#) 4 points 16 hours ago

This is a public use easement.

Not unless it's documented at the recorder's office it isn't. In California prescriptive easements generally require a specified purpose, and recreation usually doesn't count.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][lohet](#) 18 points 12 hours ago

Beach access is one of the things that always holds up in CA. The state is very firm about enforcing beach access. It is public property and everyone has a right to access.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][cosmos7](#) 4 points 9 hours ago

The beach is public property up to the mean high-tide mark, but land access is not always guaranteed. If the state/county had any leg to stand on here they wouldn't be negotiating to buy the access rights.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][lohet](#) 5 points 8 hours ago

There's a fair bit of case law regarding previously public access over private property being denied in California and it almost always results in favor of the state. It's one of the first topics discussed in state related civil law courses in CA. Negotiating to buy the access is the least litigious solution. Exercising eminent domain or enforcing previous agreements regarding access means a decade of court and a low chance of an injunction in the interim, all in all a very expensive and time consuming proposition. Buying outright can be done quickly and simply, with a mutual agreement that will preclude court costs or time.

It's not a matter of losing, it's a matter of balancing the costs of a decade of courtroom antics

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (2 replies)

[–][Spurrierball](#) 3 points 13 hours ago

All the state would have to do is have their fish & wildlife department conduct 1 or 2 surveys out on the beach.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][Problem119V-0800](#) 2 points 13 hours ago

Access to property doesn't count? That seems surprising.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][Mekongpepsi](#) 2 points 8 hours ago

Shouldn't he be compensated for the loss of property value?

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (4 replies)

load more comments (25 replies)

[–][hello3pat](#) 847 points 20 hours ago

Fuck him. The access was there when he bought it and now he's holding it hostage for nearly the price of his entire property.

- [permalink](#)

[–][Cast_Away_Bob](#) 401 points 19 hours ago

This is the first instance I have read about where I would agree that eminent domain is probably fully justified.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][hello3pat](#) 142 points 19 hours ago

I'd agree that some cases for transit systems being justified too such as the people blocking a Texas high speed train to connect Houston and Dallas

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][totallynotfromennis](#) 117 points 16 hours ago

The biggest argument they have is that the project is technically privately owned and shouldn't be able to have that type of authority. However, DFW Airport is and was a privately owned entity built by privately owned companies and still used eminent domain. This isn't a Walmart, this is a massive infrastructural project that would immensely benefit the state of Texas, and sometimes, you need to get some stubborn asses out of the way that inhibit the project.>

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][waaaghbosss](#) 30 points 14 hours ago

While not popular, you can use eminent domain for companies that are privately held.

Here are some examples: <http://www.acton.org/pub/commentary/2003/07/30/make-way-mall-principled-look-eminant-domain>

The wording is that the taking has to be for "public use". Courts have argued successfully that a shopping mall or something of that nature is public use.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][UWantWhatUGet](#) 10 points 9 hours ago

heads-up

that article pre-dates the Kelo scotus case. While the Kelo case said you can condemn (use ED) for private use, many (40+, iirc) States changed their laws to prevent that from happening, in response to Kelo.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][waaaghbosss](#) 3 points 8 hours ago

Thanks, I'll look into that.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][MeMyselfAnDie](#) 5 points 10 hours ago

Pretty much everything is made by private companies, contracted by the government. Hell, the trans continental railroad was made by 2 private companies with government money.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (2 replies)

load more comments (3 replies)

load more comments (43 replies)

[–][GaiusBaltar_](#) 44 points 18 hours ago

Really? You've never heard of the interstate highway system?

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][GollyWow](#) 31 points 18 hours ago

Came here to say this. If it was one of us half acre land owners there wouldn't be any "negotiations"

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][Cast_Away_Bob](#) 53 points 18 hours ago

You know it. City recently took 10 feet off my yard for a new utility right of way, except they didn't pay me jack shit for it. Instead, that 10'x80' strip is still counted in my valuation for taxes, and they still expect me to keep the grass mowed.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][EvangelionUnit00](#) 32 points 18 hours ago*

What? How are they legally justifying that? Are you thinking of suing?

Edit: Looked up [right of way easements](#) and in some cases if you go to court you can get property and school taxes split between the owner and the user. That said, if this is a utility easement you're not going to prevail but [in certain states like Minnesota state law](#) provides credits for such easements, but you have to request it from the local property tax assessing agency.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][PlannEdw](#) 26 points 16 hours ago

An easement defines legal access, not ownership. You pay taxes based on ownership. The easement is like saying "people can walk on 5 feet of my property". It is still your property, ergo you still pay taxes on it.

Unless of course for some reason your municipality has a bylaw changing that. That would be the exception to the norm.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][ipe77](#) 13 points 16 hours ago

It should reduce FMV, though. If I can't restrict access, it's worth less than identical property that I could restrict access to.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][hitemlow](#) 6 points 16 hours ago

Yeah, if you were to build a fence for pets it would be 800ft² smaller because you couldn't fence off the easement.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

load more comments (1 reply)

[-][Zulu321](#) 9 points 17 hours ago

Utility access is considered priority and applies to anyone for common good, sidewalks likely are the same type issue. Not all bad, had a large tree die (Dutch elm) in my front yard. The city sidewalk stops at my property line but this tree was where its right of way should be, so the city removed it. Easy \$2k savings there, though a neighbor's tree still remains an issue.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][thor214](#) 4 points 15 hours ago

Dutch elm

Was it Dutch Elm Disease?

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (3 replies)

[-][Readwhatsaid](#) 17 points 15 hours ago

Wait...what????

You would be against the government paying people fair market value for their house in order to put in a train or highway that could lower the cost of transportation for the nation (allowing for lower food prices)....

But you support making it easier for people to get to the beach?

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][Cast_Away_Bob](#) 12 points 9 hours ago

No, I am against government forcefully taking someone's property and then handing it over to a developer who will make millions from it. When used for development that benefits the public (such as ensuring access to a beach that was public until someone purchase the access, or building public transportation or infrastructure) it is a different case.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (6 replies)

[-][I_divided_by_0](#) 3 points 9 hours ago

Still have to pay him

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][thecyclingman](#) 2 points 7 hours ago

there are plenty of valid circumstances to use it but do agree that it is misused by corrupt officials all too much, usually because they are bribed by developers and corporations.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (10 replies)

[-][fallen243](#) 14 points 17 hours ago

Was it? Everyone is saying prior use easement but there are very very specific rules that have to be met before an adverse use easement is granted, most dealing with length of time used. If it does turn out to be an easement then he has grounds to sue the original owner of the property for not disclosing a devaluing easement. If they do try and eminent domain it, they still have to pay value and that can get tied up in court for a long time.

- [permalink](#)

- [parent](#)

[–][hello3pat](#) 10 points 17 hours ago

They have to pay a value, yes, just not 30 million if they are only taking part of it and he paid 35 for the whole thing

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

[–][Outlaw-In-Law](#) 21 points 18 hours ago

You're absolutely correct. Use of that access over the years created a right of way/easement.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][_manoftheyear_](#) 9 points 9 hours ago

But the previous owners charged a fee for use of the road. Does that still create an easement?

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][joshuads](#) 3 points 3 hours ago

No it does not.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

[–][brainhack3r](#) 2 points 5 hours ago

It's a really dickhead thing to do ... in California there is a LOT of private property and public property which is dual use and has access to the public. We have a LONG tradition of this. MOST walks in that region have both public and private property access.

There's an implied license to access the property when you buy it if the previous owners did allowed it as well.

Plus.. these are just kids and families trying to enjoy their weekend. It's not ruining your property to give people the ability to enjoy a beach.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (60 replies)

[–][FluffyBunnyHugs](#) 132 points 20 hours ago

He sure looks unhappy for someone with a Billion Dollars.

- [permalink](#)

[–][mathyu1010](#) 34 points 20 hours ago

no money, no problems.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][ramot1](#) 10 points 17 hours ago

No money, no problems?

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][justaquestion93](#) 5 points 17 hours ago

I actually read an article once that said when it comes to money, people are most happy when they make ~75k a year. Considering you don't live in a crazy expensive area and don't have tons of debt its enough to have comfortable life, maybe take one nice trip a year, drive a dependable car, etc. But not enough where you can live a crazy lifestyle. Might be a little more now with increasing prices of life. But seems like a reasonable assumption.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][GundalfTheCamo](#) 9 points 8 hours ago

That was not what the article said, IIRC. It said that happiness does not increase drastically with income past 75k\$, as it does until 75k\$.

All it is that you need to break a certain level of income to have good level of happiness, and extra money does not make you much happier. **That extra money also does not make you unhappy.**

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][ProjectManagerAMA](#) 3 points 16 hours ago

That only works out if you're single. I make more than that but have a wife and two very young kids. I haven't taken a real vacation since my honeymoon and I worry about finances all the time. I'm in the suburbs of Austin, got my house significantly cheap in a cul de sac, have a dependable car, etc. My salary isn't enough to be "happy" or "comfortable".

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][masturbateAndSwitch](#) 3 points 7 hours ago

Frankly, it should be if you manage it properly.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][Fragaholik](#) 7 points 15 hours ago

At 24 I have seriously no desire to get married or have kids. I don't want to deal with that shit.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (2 replies)

[[OneAndOnlyJackSchitt](#)] 2 points 7 hours ago

I'm married with \$30k per year. What's a honeymoon?

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

load more comments (3 replies)

load more comments (1 reply)

load more comments (5 replies)

[[DaveSW777](#)] 190 points 19 hours ago

You can't purchase the beaches in California. At least not this one. It's public property, he has no right to it.

- [permalink](#)

[[Spectre211286](#)] 148 points 19 hours ago

He didn't buy the beach he bought the land in front of the beach and then closed the only road with access to the beach.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[[zootam](#)] 112 points 18 hours ago

but there was a precedent of public access established for many years by the previous owners.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[[doctorjerome](#)] 28 points 13 hours ago

Not that I agree but the argument he had been making is that it has always been a private beach...at least since The treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo after The Spanish American War. While generally there are no private beaches in California, if it was privately owned when it became part of the US it can still be considered private. His argument is that The previous owners had been charging a fee to access the beach in order to maintain the beach and access road. If it can be determined that this land had always been private then he can legally cut off access.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (19 replies)

[[legalroc](#)] 48 points 18 hours ago

Can't block the public's access to public property by blocking the established road or path leading to it.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[[juiceboxzero](#)] 5 points 15 hours ago

Depends on who owns the road... For example, logging road owned by the logging company is the only way to drive into some national forest land. The company can still prevent me from using their road because it's *their* road, and I can still access the forest land by other means, like hiking in from the other side.

I'd like to know whether or not this is the only feasible way to get to this beach, and what the case for why there is sufficient public interest that is served by ensuring it's accessible to the public (e.g. not many other beaches of similar quality around). Eminent domain relies on the test of whether or not there is a compelling public interest in taking over private property. I'd be interested what the state's case is on that subject.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (2 replies)

[[cosmos7](#)] 10 points 16 hours ago

Yes you can. If there is no specified easement you certainly can.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[[crackanape](#)] 4 points 10 hours ago

He said "established road". That creates a prescriptive easement.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[[cosmos7](#)] 2 points 8 hours ago

Prescriptive easements generally require specific purpose, and recreation isn't usually an acceptable purpose.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

load more comments (12 replies)

[[darkshy](#)] 6 points 10 hours ago

What if I get like a jet ski and travel around to the beach is that OK?

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[[SexyWhitedemoman](#)] 4 points 10 hours ago

Yes. He only blocked the road

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[[pillsneedlespowders](#)] 4 points 12 hours ago

Still illegal, you can't deny public access to a beach in California. He's got no legal leg to stand on, he's just being a cunt.

- [permalink](#)

- [parent](#)

[–][KyuAA](#) 1 point 17 hours ago

Is it possible to build a new road then?

>

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][KyuAA](#) 3 points 17 hours ago

Hmm... I guess not:

<https://www.google.com/maps/place/Cowell+Ranch+Beach/@37.420972,-122.4342944,601m/data=!3m1!1e3!4m2!3m1!1s0x808f0b9ccadeb659:0x96f4d5890507b474!6m1!1e1>

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][Melaronius](#) 2 points 11 hours ago

That isn't the beach. This is: <https://www.google.com/maps/place/Cabrillo+Hwy+%26+Martin's+Beach+Rd,+Half+Moon+Bay,+CA+94019/@37.3764988,-122.4039537,17z/data=!3m1!1e3!4m2!3m1!1s0x808f097521707d43:0xa6df019f07067dd4>

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][energydrinksforbreak](#) 2 points 10 hours ago

There are houses down the road heading towards the beach, how could he cut off access to all of that?

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][Melaronius](#) 4 points 8 hours ago

It's a private community of rental houses. I'm guessing he owns all of that. http://www.mercurynews.com/san-mateo-county-times/ci_27252267/martins-beach-new-law-goes-into-effect-public

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (2 replies)

load more comments (1 reply)

[–][eleven-thirty-five](#) 13 points 18 hours ago*

Sort of.

All property up to the mean high water line is public. If it gets wet naturally, you can use it freely and no one can own it. Beyond the mean high tide line is private, though this would not hold in cases of artificial construction that changes where water goes (He can't wall off the ocean to increase property size).

This isn't about the beach being public or private though. This is about using the property to access the beach. Easement grants public ability to travel over portion of land this guy owns to get to beach, which he is preventing.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][legalroc](#) 9 points 18 hours ago

I believe ten feet above the high water line is public. And there has to be an easement or right of way though privately owned land for the public to access it if there is no public property attached with an access road or path to it.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–][eleven-thirty-five](#) 3 points 18 hours ago

water line to mhtl is public. easements cover landward areas beyond that, but this is more complicated area of law. I guess it is fun if you are an attorney though. Federal, state, environmental, and military areas have different rules as well.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

load more comments (5 replies)

[–][alatar214782](#) 83 points 20 hours ago

Fuck, this guy's like a disney channel villain

- [permalink](#)

[–][Hulagukan](#) 7 points 13 hours ago

Need a group of misfit kids with a dog to sort him out! And a grizzled old man who lives in a junkyard.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

[–][laurelriba](#) 15 points 10 hours ago

He doesn't want the money. He wants to keep people off the beach.

- [permalink](#)

load more comments (3 replies)

[–][Designer94](#) 9 points 15 hours ago

rich people are so weird.

its a public beach, thats the point. Just walk onto the beach

- [permalink](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

[–] [tihsgniklat](#) 12 points 16 hours ago

In Canada you can't own the coastline.

- [permalink](#)

[–] [daredevilis](#) 27 points 16 hours ago

Same is true in California. This guy is scum.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (3 replies)

load more comments (1 reply)

[–] [Couchlock123](#) 6 points 12 hours ago

I've surfed Martin's a few times, awesome break. Really not hard to gain access, just have to step over a little car barrier and walk a few hundred yards. No one has ever given me trouble there and there have always been a few other surfers.

- [permalink](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

[–] [Outlaw-In-Law](#) 20 points 18 hours ago*

Screw Khosla, the state of California should simply take that land by eminent domain and tell him to fuck off.

- [permalink](#)

load more comments (4 replies)

[–] [lossyvibrations](#) 30 points 16 hours ago

Welcome to California, and good luck getting people's rights enforced. I used to live in LA. Rich fuckers who lived near the beach would routinely deface signs pointing to public access, allow plants to overgrown small parking areas, etc. They'd often call the cops on people just hanging out in front of their houses, even if they were staying below the high tide mark. And California doesn't do much about it, because these guys own the politicians and the cops. In an ideal world, this sort of behavior would just result in the county getting to come in, take your house, knock it down, and make a great beach for everyone else.

- [permalink](#)

load more comments (7 replies)

[–] [ssuv](#) 4 points 17 hours ago

Someone should hire boats

- [permalink](#)

[–] [Diabetesh](#) 3 points 10 hours ago

Just tell people to go to the beach. When he calls the police dont send anyone.

- [permalink](#)

[–] [losthalo7](#) 26 points 20 hours ago

Everyone in the area should just go down there and camp out until he shuts the fuck up like the little bitch that he is. The courts shouldn't have to waste their time on this crap, someone makes a little money suddenly they think they're the Duke of San Francisco... Sure hope he never again needs a permit for anything. Bring along a few police officers if necessary to ensure he doesn't do something *really* stupid like physically blocking access.

- [permalink](#)

[–] [ShroudofTuring](#) 18 points 18 hours ago

Duke of San Francisco

Fun fact: San Francisco was once home to an [Emperor](#).

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–] [wrath_of_grunge](#) 3 points 15 hours ago

Don't forget [Bummer and Lazarus](#).

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–] [cosmos7](#) 4 points 16 hours ago

If there is no documented easement he has a perfect right to close access to people tramping across his land.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–] [waaaghboss](#) 4 points 14 hours ago

<http://realestate.findlaw.com/land-use-laws/express-and-implied-easements.html>

Not always.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

load more comments (1 reply)

[–] [Life_Tripper](#) 3 points 16 hours ago*

It's not like he's asking for a billion or to president.

- [permalink](#)

[–] [ImaDentGuy](#) 3 points 15 hours ago

uhh 8 yrs later...sounds like a good investment by billionaire. teach me

- [permalink](#)

[-][Zombiep](#) 2 points 12 hours ago

The lesson for today is this; if it flies, fucks or floats - rent it.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][witchsbrew](#) 11 points 19 hours ago

This guy is an absolute shameless scum bag.

- [permalink](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

[-][leipdredy](#) 2 points 15 hours ago

it's sad. 3 generations of my family have been going to this beach and now we're unable to since he closed it to the public. its a shame.

- [permalink](#)

[-][Fishermansterminal](#) 2 points 9 hours ago

did your family pay fee the old owner wanted?

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

[-][I_divided_by_0](#) 2 points 9 hours ago

Can you help me with a map as to what exactly he is doing?

- [permalink](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

[-][Olav_](#) 2 points 9 hours ago

Couldn't even read article, 5 seconds in "you won an iPhone 7" covers my screen. Kinda makes me doubt the headline

- [permalink](#)

[-][never-troll](#) 2 points 7 hours ago

This thread reminds me of the wise words of Gavin Belson <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=t5zQpN28xa4>. Y'all are just a bunch of anti-billionaire Nazis.

- [permalink](#)

[-][th30be](#) 2 points 7 hours ago

It says he bought the beach in 2008. How is it public?

- [permalink](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

[-][GovtCheese1](#) 2 points 7 hours ago

Even if it's private, with no recorded easement, there is a thing called "Prescriptive Easement" in Ca, which could establish access. <http://www.bullivant.com/mobile/showarticle.aspx?show=6875&>

- [permalink](#)

[-][docmongre](#) 2 points 6 hours ago

Now I know [where to go for my beach fun](#).

- [permalink](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

[-][Vadtaltos](#) 2 points 4 hours ago

A perfect case for eminent domain if there ever was one (Greedy bastard). Hell, I'd take his house out too while I was at it and turn it into a community center. just to make sure there's no future "issues".

- [permalink](#)

[-][Scathe](#): 2 points 1 hour ago

Trump was right, imminent domain does have its uses.

- [permalink](#)

[-][wee_knee](#) 6 points 17 hours ago

Fuck that asshole - scoop up the access by invoking "imminent domain" and buy that shit for pennies on the dollar - just like the government does to poor folks when it wants their land "for the greater good".

- [permalink](#)

[-][reckie87](#) 3 points 6 hours ago

Eminent domain. And the government pays fair market value.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

[-][egalroc](#) 3 points 18 hours ago

Take over the track of land leading to the beach by eminent domain, huh? I thought the right of way for public easement to the beach already was covered under eminent domain. Why did they let this guy pull this shit in the first place?

- [permalink](#)

[-][CaptainBayouBilly](#) 2 points 8 hours ago

The guy is a class A prick <http://www.businessinsider.com/vinod-khosla-awkward-techcrunch-disrupt-interview-2015-9>

- [permalink](#)

[-][fourth_throwaway](#) 9 points 17 hours ago

Trump says eminent domain is a good idea. Redditors: "how horrible, what right does the government have to take someone's land like that!! trump is an ass!!" in this thread: "just use eminent domain!!" the hypocrisy. can't make this shit up.

- [permalink](#)

[-][Footyking](#) 14 points 16 hours ago

The funny thing about reddit is that we disagree with each other all the time. There is no "reddit" there are a lot of people talking on reddit, some believe eminent domain is good, some not, and some believe that it is useful for some things.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][lossyvibrations](#) 2 points 16 hours ago

Actually, no one here is pushing for eminent domain. The public already has a right to beach access. If his actions have limited that, then using his land to correct it is simply a civil settlement, not eminent domain. Also, there's a difference between eminent domain for the public good (adding beach access road for the public on someone's beach house, which still allows them to enjoy and use the house) and demolishing someone's home for a parking lot for a casino. One is in the best interest for the community and minimally harms the home owner, the other is a richer fucker just taking stuff.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][UWantWhatUGet](#) 2 points 9 hours ago

demolishing someone's home for a parking lot for a casino.

you of course know that trump did not do this, right?

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

[-][Spastic_hawk](#) 3 points 10 hours ago

Why must we jealously punish his success? The wealth will trickle down...

- [permalink](#)

[-][herewegoaga1n](#) 2 points 14 hours ago

Eminent Domain. Level his property, put up a parking lot for free beach access. Problem solved. Beaches are for everyone.

- [permalink](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

[-][wtevame](#) 2 points 12 hours ago*

this is retarded. Everyone knows that the beach is a public property even if you own a beachfront property. The lawyers have got to know this, I don't understand. Edit: actually, if the land (including the road) is completely owned by him, he has the right the close access to the beach if somebody wants to use his property to get there. The beach still remains public, though, but only accessible by boat or similar means.

- [permalink](#)

[-][hiphoprising](#) 2 points 8 hours ago

Use eminent domain. They do it on poor people all the time.

- [permalink](#)

load more comments (2 replies)

[-][tirpider](#) 2 points 20 hours ago

Why is San Francisco worth it? Seems like it's just yet-another consumerist wasteland.

- [permalink](#)

[-][Fishermansterminal](#) 3 points 9 hours ago

half moon is magical.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][zauzau](#) 13 points 20 hours ago

Because the Bay Area is a really nice place.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[-][fourth_throwaway](#) 5 points 17 hours ago

hmm. today is my first day in San francisco. I'm staying near union square. TONS of homeless people. I've never seen so many homeless and pan handlers in my entire life, and I've been to many big cities (berlin, new york, paris, madrid, london, bangkok, manila, etc) of course this is the only part of the city I've been to, but so far I'm not impressed.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (2 replies)

[–] [uncreativemynameis](#) 4 points 16 hours ago

Been in the bay area for 5 years - this place is an above-ground cesspool.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

[–] [crackanape](#) 2 points 7 hours ago

The Bay Area has more than its share of dismal suburban wastelands, but San Francisco itself is an incredibly diverse city that even now, after 20 years of technology-fueled economic distortion, retains plenty of very interesting character. It is also surrounded by some of the USA's most amazing natural beauty. It's not as exciting and interesting as New York, but compared to most of the rest of the country it's about as good as it gets if you're a city person.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (1 reply)

[–] [Balls99111000](#) 2 points 2 hours ago

it's one of the few places right now to start your careers, there are a lot of people doing that, and they're willing to pay a lot to do so.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–] [Lazy_millennial](#) 2 points 20 hours ago

He funds startups for a living, he's basically shackled to that area if he doesn't want to commute every day (like most of the people working at those startups). Bay Area is nice, but \$\$\$\$ >>> the weather

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–] [zootam](#) 2 points 18 hours ago

so living in a house about an hour from Menlo Park and an hour from SF doesn't count as commuting?

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–] [Lazy_millennial](#) 2 points 18 hours ago

sorry, meant every weekend not every day. Weekdays @ work, weekends at home type deal

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–] [zootam](#) 2 points 18 hours ago

oh ok

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–] [eleven-thirty-five](#) 2 points 18 hours ago

He should buy a helicopter like a normal human being.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

[–] [p0ncedele0n](#) 0 points 18 hours ago

the guy is the one who created java, thought that was interesting but fuck him

- [permalink](#)

[–] [A530](#) 5 points 17 hours ago

I thought it was James Gosling who created Java.

- [permalink](#)
- [parent](#)

load more comments (4 replies)

[–] [afaintsmellofcurry](#) 1 point 16 hours ago

Awesome photo of this guy. Martin, I'm guessing, as that's the name of the beach..

- [permalink](#)

[–] [DrTreeMan](#) 1 point 15 hours ago

This is part of the reason why developers were so eager to get rid of the head of Coastal Commission.

- [permalink](#)

[–] [C00kiz](#) 1 point 12 hours ago

Sounds like something Montgomery Burns would do.

- [permalink](#)

[–] [letsnotargueplease](#) 1 point 11 hours ago

Didn't I read this story last year... is even the news re-posting now?

- [permalink](#)

[–] [decgcc](#) 1 point 11 hours ago

ok, if you want to have your fence and general land not respected by surfers that's fine but by engaging in this bs he's put a target on his property for local surf rats to vandalize. Although...Cali surfers are pretty lame atm, if you tried to pull this in Aus your family would be set on fire

- [permalink](#)

[-][unikilarki](#) 1 point 10 hours ago

Khosla bought a \$32.5 million beachfront property there in 2008 and two years later closed access to the beach. A state law passed in 2014 directs officials to consider taking the right of way by eminent domain if negotiations fail.