

COURT OF APPEALS OF MINNESOTA

Weidner Apartment Homes v. B. F.

Weidner Apartment Homes · No. A25-0951 · Decided February 2, 2026

SUMMARY

The Minnesota Court of Appeals held that Minnesota Statutes section 484.014, subdivision 3(a)(5), is facially unconstitutional because its automatic, no-motion eviction-expungement requirement violates separation of powers and infringes on the judiciary’s authority to decide cases and manage its records. The court concluded that Weidner Apartment Homes had standing because the expungement resulted in the vacation of its money judgment. The court reversed the district court’s expungement and related orders and reinstated the money judgment.

CASE DETAILS

COURT	Court of Appeals of Minnesota
WRITING FOR THE COURT	Harris, Judge; Smith, Tracy M., Presiding Judge; Kirk, Judge
JURISDICTION	Minnesota Court of Appeals
DECIDED	February 2, 2026
DOCKET	A25-0951
DISPOSITION	reversed
PROCEDURAL POSTURE	Landlord appealed from district-court orders granting mandatory expungement of an eviction case, vacating a related money judgment to effectuate the expungement, and correcting a clerical error. The attorney general intervened to defend the constitutionality of the statute.
STANDARD OF REVIEW	Standing is reviewed de novo. The court reviewed the constitutional issue under controlling precedent concerning separation of powers and the judiciary's inherent authority.
PRECEDENTIAL VALUE	precedential
PARTIES	Weidner Apartment Homes v. B. F.

TOPICS

- eviction
- standing
- constitutional law
- civil procedure
- appellate procedure

PRACTICE AREAS

constitutional law

civil procedure

appellate procedure

real estate

remedies

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Whether Weidner had standing to challenge the constitutionality of Minnesota Statutes section 484.014, subdivision 3(a)(5).
2. Whether Minnesota Statutes section 484.014, subdivision 3(a)(5), is facially unconstitutional because it violates separation of powers by infringing on the judiciary's authority to hear and decide cases and to manage its own records.

HOLDINGS

1. Weidner had standing because the district court's vacatur of the money judgment caused a concrete, particularized injury to Weidner's legally protected property interest.
2. Minnesota Statutes section 484.014, subdivision 3(a)(5), is facially unconstitutional because it violates the separation-of-powers doctrine by impairing the district court's ability to hear and decide cases and infringing on the judiciary's inherent authority to manage its own records.

KEY QUOTATIONS

“section 484.014, subdivision 3(a)(5), is facially unconstitutional because it impairs the district court’s ability to hear and decide cases and infringes on the judiciary’s inherent power to manage its own records in violation of the separation-of-powers doctrine.” (at 10)

“Like the provision in Sela Investments, subdivision 3(a)(5) “leaves no room for the district court to exercise its discretion to decide whether expungement is appropriate.”” (at 9)

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

Weidner Apartment Homes filed an eviction action against B. F. in March 2022, alleging a breach of lease, and obtained judgment for recovery of the premises and allowable costs. After B. F. vacated, the district court entered a \$757 money judgment in favor of Weidner in May 2022. More than three years later, B. F. requested mandatory expungement under Minnesota Statutes section 484.014, subdivision 3(a)(5); the district court granted expungement without evidence that Weidner received notice or an opportunity to respond and vacated the money judgment to effectuate the expungement.

PROCEDURAL HISTORY

In March 2022, Weidner obtained an eviction judgment against B. F. and later obtained a \$757 money judgment for allowable costs and disbursements. In April 2025, more than three years after the eviction judgment, the district court granted B. F.'s request for mandatory expungement under Minnesota Statutes section 484.014, subdivision 3(a)(5), and vacated the money judgment to effectuate the expungement. Weidner appealed, and the Minnesota Court of Appeals reversed the April 11, April 28, and April 29, 2025 orders and reinstated the money judgment.

DISPOSITION

reversed

REMAND INSTRUCTIONS

The court reversed the April 11, April 28, and April 29, 2025 orders and reinstated the money judgment. No further remand instructions were stated.

CASES CITED

- Hanson v. Woolston, 701 N.W.2d 257, 261-62 (Minn. App. 2005)
- Thompson v. St. Anthony Leased Hous. Assocs. II, LP, 979 N.W.2d 1, 6 (Minn. 2022)
- Webb Golden Valley, LLC v. State, 865 N.W.2d 689, 693 (Minn. 2015)
- Minnesota Sands, LLC v. County of Winona, 940 N.W.2d 183, 192 (Minn. 2020)
- State v. Hoyt, 304 N.W.2d 884, 888 (Minn. 1981)
- Sela Investments, Ltd. v. J.H., 22 N.W.3d 181, 183-84, 188 (Minn. App. 2025)
- State v. M.L.A., 785 N.W.2d 763, 767 (Minn. App. 2010), rev. denied (Minn. Sept. 21, 2010)
- State v. Chauvin, 955 N.W.2d 684, 694-95 (Minn. App. 2021), rev. denied (Minn. Mar. 10, 2021)
- State v. Lemmer, 716 N.W.2d 657, 663 (Minn. App. 2006), aff'd on other grounds (Minn. 2007)