Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff, 467 U. S. 229 (1984)

The U. S. Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the Hawaii Land Reform Act of 1967, affirming that the use of eminent domain to redistribute land from lessors to lessees satisfies the public use requirement of the Fifth Amendment.

Summary

In Hawaii Housing Authority v. Midkiff, the Supreme Court addressed the constitutionality of the Hawaii Land Reform Act (HLRA), which allowed the state to condemn leased land and transfer it to tenants to break up land oligopolies. The Court held that the HLRA's use of eminent domain was constitutional under the Fifth Amendment, as it served a valid public purpose by reducing the concentration of land ownership. The decision emphasized that 'public use' could include broader public benefits like correcting market failures in land distribution, setting a precedent for state intervention in property rights to achieve social and economic objectives.

Facts

The Hawaii Land Reform Act of 1967 was enacted to address the concentration of land ownership in Hawaii, where 47% of the land was held by only 72 private landowners. The Act empowered the Hawaii Housing Authority (HHA) to use eminent domain to acquire leased fee interests in residential lots and transfer them to lessees. The respondents, fee owners including the Estate of Bernice Pauahi Bishop, challenged the Act's constitutionality, arguing it violated the Fifth Amendment's 'public use' requirement.

Procedural History

The case originated in the Hawaii state courts, where the Hawaii Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of the HLRA. The case was then appealed to the U. S. Supreme Court, which granted certiorari to review the public use issue under the Fifth Amendment.

Issue(s)

1. Whether the Hawaii Land Reform Act's use of eminent domain to transfer land from lessors to lessees constitutes a 'public use' under the Fifth Amendment.

Holding

1. Yes, because the Court found that the Act's purpose of breaking up land oligopolies served a legitimate public purpose, satisfying the 'public use' requirement of the Fifth Amendment.

Court's Reasoning

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.

The Supreme Court, in an opinion by Justice O'Connor, reasoned that the 'public use' requirement of the Fifth Amendment is interpreted broadly to include public purposes beyond literal use by the public. The Court cited historical precedent that 'public use' encompasses efforts to correct market failures, such as the concentration of land ownership in Hawaii. The Court rejected the argument that transferring property from one private party to another could not be a public use, emphasizing that the state's objective was to reduce the social and economic evils of a land oligopoly. The decision highlighted that the means chosen by Hawaii to achieve this end were rationally related to the public purpose, thus satisfying the constitutional requirement.

Practical Implications

This ruling significantly broadened the interpretation of 'public use' under the Fifth Amendment, allowing states greater leeway in using eminent domain for social and economic reforms. It established that redistributive land policies could be constitutional if they serve a public purpose, influencing subsequent cases like Kelo v. City of New London. Practically, it enabled states to address issues like land monopolies through eminent domain, though it also sparked debates about property rights and government overreach. Legal practitioners must consider this precedent when advising on eminent domain actions, especially those aimed at correcting market failures or promoting social welfare.

© 2025 SCOTUSreports.com. All rights reserved.