1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10	00000
11	
12	DALE M. WALLIS, D.V.M., JAMES L. WALLIS, and HYGIEIA NO. CIV. 08-2558 WBS GGH
13	BIOLOGICAL LABORATORIES, INC., a California Corporation,
14 15	<u>ORDER RE: MOTION TO ENFORCE</u> Plaintiffs, <u>SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT</u>
16	v.
17	CENTENNIAL INSURANCE COMPANY, INC., a New York corporation,
18	ATLANTIC MUTUAL INSURANCE CO., INC., a New York Corporation,
19	Defendants.
20	/
21	AND RELATED COUNTER-CLAIMS AND THIRD-PARTY COMPLAINT.
22	/
23	00000
24	Following this court's Order of April 16, 2009,
25	granting defendants' motion to compel binding arbitration with
26	
27	
28	
	1

1 respect to the amount of attorney's fees allegedly owed to <u>Cumis</u><sup>1</sup>
2 counsel, the parties entered into a handwritten agreement
3 purporting to settle the remaining claims in this action.
4 Presently before the court is plaintiffs' motion to enforce the
5 terms of that agreement.

## Dismissal of Claims

6

17

27

Plaintiffs first ask the court to enforce those 7 provisions of the agreement calling for the dismissal of all 8 9 claims, cross claims and counterclaims in this action, with the 10 exception of the claim which the court ordered to be arbitrated. Upon the representation of defense counsel that progress is being 11 made toward the preparation and filing of papers finalizing such 12 dismissals, a telephonic status conference is set for January 25, 13 14 2010, at 3:00 p.m.. Unless progress is made promptly, the court 15 may have no choice but to set aside the stay previously ordered and set this matter for trial. 16

## <u>Arbitration</u>

In the second part of their motion, plaintiffs ask the 18 19 court to require that the arbitration ordered in its April 16, 2009 Order be submitted to the Sacramento County Bar Association 20 21 ("SCBA") for arbitration in that forum pursuant to California Business and Professions Code § 6200 et seq. In support of this 22 23 request, plaintiffs seize upon the language in the agreement that 24 talks about the "mandatory fee arbitration." The court, however, 25 interprets that language as a simple reference to the terms of court's Order mandating binding arbitration of the attorney fees 26

28 <u>Inc.</u>, 162 Cal. App. 3d 358 (1984).

as required by Cal. Civ. Code § 2860(c). It is not an agreement
 to abide by the provisions of section 6200 <u>et seq.</u>

In fact, the SCBA has determined that it has no 3 jurisdiction to hear this dispute. On December 29, 2009, the 4 SCBA panel appointed to determine whether the SCBA had 5 jurisdiction to mediate the Cumis fee dispute issued a Notice of 6 Intended Decision on Objection to Jurisdiction to [SCBA] 7 Mandatory Fee Arbitration Proceeding. (Supp. Decl. Gary L. 8 Selvin Ex. B.) The Notice informed the parties that the SCBA 9 intended to rule that it lacked jurisdiction to mediate the Cumis 10 fee dispute. (Id. at 5 (stating, inter alia, that "[t]here 11 simply is no fee dispute between an attorney and a client in this 12 matter."))<sup>2</sup> 13

Section 2860(c) provides that "[a]ny dispute concerning 14 15 attorney's fees not resolved by these methods shall be resolved by final and binding arbitration by a single neutral arbitrator 16 17 selected by the parties to the dispute." It makes no reference, 18 express or implied, to California Business and Professions Code § 19 6200 et seq. The court therefore concludes that the parties are not bound to the arbitrate their dispute in a proceeding before 20 21 the SCBA. Instead, they are required by section 2860(c) to 22 select a single neutral arbitrator to resolve their dispute. 23 Absent a petition by one of the parties, it is not the 24 responsibility of this court to select the arbitrator or to 25 further instruct the parties how to proceed with their

26

Plaintiffs have since requested that the SCBA arbitration panel delay issuing a final order until the court rules on plaintiffs' instant motion. (Decl. Joanna R. Mendoza Ex. B. (Docket No. 83))

arbitration. See Cal. Code Civ. P. § 1281.6. IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that plaintiffs' motion to enforce the settlement agreement be, and the same hereby is, DENIED. January 19, 2010 DATED: 12 shabe SHUBB TT.T. IAM В UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE