

United States Court of Appeals For the First Circuit

No. 19-1474

MARÍA S. DÍAZ-BÁEZ; VÍCTOR A. BURGOS-TORRES; THELMA L. PÉREZ-GUZMÁN; MARISOL DOMÍNGUEZ-RIVERA; HÉCTOR J. ALBELO-CARTAGENA; MÓNICA MOLINA-SALAS; RAMÓN L. RIVERA-GASCOT; SYLVIA ALVARADO-HERNÁNDEZ; PEDRO R. MARTÍNEZ-AGOSTO; CARMEN E. MEDINA-ADORNO; PEDRO I. CARTAGENA-RODRÍGUEZ; EDUARDO BARREIRO-DIAZ; MELIXA MARRERO-GONZÁLEZ; MERCEDES LAMBERTY-ROMÁN; CARLOS A. AQUINO-VALENTÍN; DEBBIE A. CARDONA-CAPRE; DIANA I. SÁNCHEZ-PAGÁN; FÉLIX MARRERO-VÁZQUEZ; GISSELLE PAGÁN-MELÉNDEZ; SHIERLY CARDONA-ORTIZ; ROSA M. SOTO-GARCÍA; LIMARI MARTÍNEZ-RODRÍGUEZ; MARIEL TORRES-LÓPEZ; ANTONIO J. COLLADO-RIVERA; VIVIAN M. BRACERO-ROSA; LUIS COSS-VARGAS; BRAULIO E. FIGUEROA-DÍAZ; ROSA M. SANTOS-CARBALLO; KAROLIE GÓMEZ-RIVERA; OMAR RIVERA-PÉREZ; CLARIBEL ROSADO-FERNÁNDEZ; IVÁN E. GONZÁLEZ-GARCÍA; JOSÉ GRAU-ORTIZ; BRENDA MARTÍNEZ-FIGUEROA; CIRILO TIRADO-RIVERA; BETZAIDA ROSARIO-FÉLIX; VIRGILIO ESCOBAR-QUIÑONES; LUZ CRISTINA JIMÉNEZ-CORTÉS; HÉCTOR M. BARRIOS-VELÁZQUEZ; MÓNICA RODRÍGUEZ-OCASIO; DANIEL RAMOS-RAMOS; CARMEN HAYDEÉ RAMOS-LUNA; MELISA RIVERA-FUENTES; MARIELI RÍOS-PÉREZ; EVELYN VELÁZQUEZ-ADORNO; JOSÉ W. ORTIZ-LÓPEZ; CÉSAR E. DEIDA-TORRES; DAVID R. SHERMAN; REBECCA COTTO-OYOLA; DAVID PONCE-MENA; NATIVIDAD CURBELLO-CONTRERAS; VIRGINIA ECHEVARRÍA; PEDRO FÉLIX-TORRES; RUTH M. MELÉNDEZ-RODRÍGUEZ; ZUHER YOUSSEF-YASSIN; ASTRID M. DELGADO-IRIZARRY; TIRSO RODRÍGUEZ-APONTE; YANIRA RODRÍGUEZ-RIVERA; VIVIAN A. HERNÁNDEZ-ROBLES; ROBERTO MIRANDA-SANTIAGO; ADA I. RIVERA-GARCÍA; JOSÉ E. FIGUEROA-NIEVES; ALLAN WAINWRIGHT-ESTAPE; DAISY RODRÍGUEZ-ALEJANDRO; RADAMÉS PÉREZ-RODRÍGUEZ; MARÍA I. DELANNOY-DE-JESÚS; MANUEL R. REYES ALFONSO; AMARILIS RIVERO-QUILES; LUIS LAGARES-GARCÍA; ROCÍO RIVERA-TORRES; JONATHAN R. ORTIZ-SERRANO; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP ALBELO-HERNÁNDEZ; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP BARREIRO-ROSARIO; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP BURGOS-DÍAZ; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP CARTAGENA-MEDINA; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP COLLADO-TORRES; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP COSS-BRACERO; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP FÉLIX-ECHEVARRÍA; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP FIGUEROA-RIVERA; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP FIGUEROA-SANTOS; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP GRAU-VÁZQUEZ; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP MARRERO-PAGÁN; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP MARTÍNEZ-ALVARADO; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP MIRANDA-HERNÁNDEZ; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP MULDER-VELÁZQUEZ; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP ORTIZ-ACEVEDO; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP PONCE-COTTO; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP RAMOS-RODRÍGUEZ; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP REYES-DELANNOY; CONJUGAL

PARTNERSHIP RODRÍGUEZ-RODRÍGUEZ; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP RIVERA-
ROSADO; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP TIRADO-MARTÍNEZ; CONJUGAL
PARTNERSHIP LAGARES-RIVERO,

Plaintiffs, Appellants,

JUANA M. CONTRERAS-CASTRO; LEILA A. HERNÁNDEZ-JIMÉNEZ; YELITZA
I. HERNÁNDEZ-HERNÁNDEZ; YALITZA ROSARIO-MENENDEZ; RAQUEL
CARDONA-SOTO; MARIBEL ALICEA-LUGO; HUMBERTO L. MULER-SANTIAGO;
MARIELA TORRES-MOLINI; CARMEN YOLANDA VÁZQUEZ-ORTIZ; LUIS A.
RODRÍGUEZ-TORO; NEREIDA RIVERA-BATISTA; BERNICE BERBERENA-
MALDONADO; RICARDO ROSARIO-SÁNCHEZ; AXEL FRESSE-ÁLVAREZ;
GLORIELY MIRANDA-OCASIO; LUIS A. MULER-SANTIAGO; GRETCHEN M.
ACEVEDO-RIVERA; DOMINGO MARIANI-MOLINI; REBECA M. NEGRÓN-
UMPIERRE; JORGE APARICIO-TORRES; CARMEN E. RODRIGUEZ-SANTIAGO;
LYNETTE YAMBÓ-MERCADO; MARIANNA RAMÍREZ-ÁLVAREZ; CONJUGAL
PARTNERSHIP FRESSE-MIRANDA; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP ROSARIO-
BERBERENA,

Plaintiffs,

v.

JULIO ALICEA-VASALLO, Executive Director of the AACA, in his
official and personal capacities; AUTOMOBILE ACCIDENT
COMPENSATION ADMINISTRATION,

Defendants, Appellees,

MARIBEL CONCEPCIÓN-CANTRES, former Personnel Director of the
AACA, in her official and personal capacities; ABC INSURANCE
COMPANY; ERNESTO RIVERA-NEGRÓN; RICHARD DOE; JANE ROE; JANE DOE;
JOHN DOE; X CORPORATION; Y CORPORATION; DEF INSURANCE COMPANY;
CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP ALICEA-DOE; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP DOE-
CONCEPCIÓN; CONJUGAL PARTNERSHIP RIVERA-ROE,

Defendants.

ERRATA SHEET

The opinion of this Court, issued on December 23,
2021, is amended as follows:

On pages 11-12, footnote 3, add after "(similar)." "The district court had ruled the stay did not apply. The parties in whose interest it would have been to take advantage of the stay, if applicable at all, take the position the stay did not apply and no party appealed the determination by the district court. Our decision in HealthproMed Foundation, Inc. v. Department of Health and Human Services, 982 F.3d 15 (1st Cir. 2020), is distinguishable because it was clear the stay applied and here the issue is one of considerable complexity. See also Borrás-Borrero v. Corporación del Fondo del Seguro del Estado, 958 F.3d 26, 34 (1st Cir. 2020) (bypassing the application of the PROMESA automatic stay where the parties agreed the stay did not apply, the stay issue was "not clear-cut," and the judgment resulted in dismissal on the merits)."

On page 22, line 1, add "the" before "Board of Directors".