1 2 3 4 5					
6 7					
' 8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT				
9	FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA				
10	SACRAMENTO DIVISION				
11	LAKELAND VILLAGE HOMEOWNERS	Case No. 2:10-cv-00604-GEB-GGH			
12	ASSOCIATION,	STIPULATED [PROPOSED] ORDER:			
13	Plaintiff,	1) CLARIFYING THE ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR			
14 15	V.	PARTIAL SUMMARY JUDGMENT AND GRANTING GREAT AMERICAN'S CROSS-MOTION FOR SUMMARY JUDGMENT; AND			
16 17	GREAT AMERICAN INSURANCE GROUP, TRAVELERS PROPERTY CASUALTY COMPANY OF AMERICA and DOES 1 through 50,	2) PERMITTING PLAINTIFF TO DISMISS ITS EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR VIOLATION OF			
18 19	Defendants.	BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONS CODE § 17200 WITH PREJUDICE AND ENTERING JUDGMENT IN FAVOR OF GREAT AMERICAN WITH			
20		RESPECT TO THE FIFTH, SIXTH, AND SEVENTH CAUSES OF ACTION			
21 22	FOR BREACH OF CONTRACT, BREACH OF THE IMPLIED COVENANT OF GOOD FAITH AND				
23	FAIR DEALING AND DECLARATORY				
24		FED.R.CIV.PROC. RULE 54(B)			
25					
26	Acception (III shales III) and Defendent Orest American Incomes of Commence				
27	("Great American") jointly requested that this court partially remove the				
28	pending stay of this action for the sole purpose of clarifying this Court's				
	Case No. 2:10-cv-00604 STIPULATED [PROPOSED] ORDER				

1 ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PARTIAL SUMMARY

2 JUDGMENT AND GRANTING GREAT AMERICAN'S CROSS-MOTION FOR

SUMMARY JUDGMENT, entering partial judgment in favor of Great American
as to the fifth, sixth and seventh causes of action and entering a final judgment
in favor of Great American pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. Rule 54(b). This
court hereby grants said requests as set forth below.

7

20

I. CLARIFICATION OF ORDER

On July 22, 2010, the District Court issued its "Order Denying Plaintiffs 8 Motion for Partial Summary Judgment and Granting Defendant's [Great 9 American's] Cross-Motion for Summary Judgment ("The Order"). The Order 10 states that Lakeland moved for partial summary judgment on its seventh cause 11 of action for declaratory relief and that Great American "filed a cross motion for 12 summary judgment, arguing it does not owe Plaintiff a defense and, therefore, 13 is entitled to partial summary judgment on Plaintiff's declaratory relief claim." 14 (pg.1:23-26). The Order concludes by stating: 15 16 Since Defendant has shown the absence of any potential for coverage under the policy, it does not have a duty to defend Plaintiff in Hollows 17 pending Cross-complaint or related administrative proceeding. Plaintiffs partial motion for summary judgment is denied and Defendant's [Great

- American's] cross motion for *summary judgment* is granted." (Pg.14:2-6)
 - The parties have asked the court to clarify whether the court granted summary
 - judgment as to all claims against Great American or partial summary judgment
- as to the seventh cause of action for declaratory relief. The court intended to
- grant partial summary judgment as to the Seventh Cause of Action for
- ²³ Declaratory Relief only. Accordingly, the court's order as set forth above is
- ²⁴ modified by adding the word "partial" as follows:
- Since Defendant has shown the absence of any potential for coverage under the policy, it does not have a duty to defend Plaintiff in Hollows' pending Cross-complaint or related administrative proceeding. Plaintiffs partial motion for summary judgment is denied and Defendant's [Great American's] cross motion for **partial** *summary judgment* is granted."
 (Pg.14:2-6)

Case No. 2:10-cv-00604

DISMISSAL OF EIGHTH CAUSE OF ACTION FOR VIOLATION OF BUSINESS & PROFESSIONS CODE SECTION 17200

Plaintiff Lakeland has requested that the Court allow Lakeland to dismiss its Eighth Cause of Action for violation of Business & Professions Code section 17200 with prejudice. Said request is hereby granted.

5

1

2

3

4

II.

III. FINAL JUDGMENT IN FAVOR GREAT AMERICAN

The parties have requested that this court enter judgment in favor of
 Great American on the Fifth, Sixth and Seventh Causes of Action pursuant to
 Fed. R. Civ. Proc. Rule 54(b) and have acknowledged that appeals normally
 only lie from final judgments and not from interlocutory orders or rulings. 28
 U.S.C. Section 1291. The Parties assert that this Court's ruling declaring an
 absence of a duty to defend owed by Great American to Lakeland, effectively
 defeats Lakeland's entire action against Great American.

13 California law provides that absent a duty to defend, there can be no 14 breach of contract. Construction Protective Services, Inc. v. TIG Specialty Ins. 15 Co., 29 Cal.4th 189, 198-199 (2002) and that coverage under the policy is a 16 necessary element of a cause of action for breach of the covenant of good 17 faith and fair dealing. Waller v. Truck Insurance Exchange, Inc., 11 Cal.4th 1, 36 (1995). When this Court adjudicated the declaratory relief cause of action in 18 19 favor of Great American, it essentially adjudicated all but the Section 17200 claims in Great American's favor. The Section 17200 claims have now been 20 dismissed with prejudice. Accordingly, the court hereby enters partial 21 judgment in favor of Great American only on the fifth, sixth and seventh 22 causes of action for breach of contract, breach of the implied covenant of good 23 faith and fair dealing, and declaratory relief pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Proc. Rule 24 54(b). 25 ||| 26

- 27 ///
- 28

IV. PARTIAL JUDGMENT IS APPROPRIATE UNDER RULE 54(B)

Generally an order following a motion for partial summary judgment is not final
and ordinarily not appealable. Fed. R. Civ. Proc. Rule 54(b). Under limited
circumstances, a party can request that a district court certify the order on partial
summary judgment for interlocutory appeal. 28 U.S.C. Section 1292(b). However,
such motions are rarely granted and require a showing of "exceptional
circumstances."

1

A party that loses a motion for partial summary judgment cannot voluntarily 8 9 dismiss its remaining claims without prejudice in order to render the order appealable. Such a dismissal is viewed as an attempt to "manufacture finality" and 10 thus "manipulate" appellate jurisdiction. Adonican v. City of Los Angeles, 297 F.3d 11 1106, 1107 (9th Cir. 2002). The Court is satisfied that Lakeland and Great American 12 have not attempted to manufacture finality or manipulate appellate jurisdiction, but 13 instead seek to follow the proper procedure for finally resolving the causes of action 14 asserted by Lakeland against Great American in order to pursue appellate review. 15

In multi-party or multi-claim cases, the district court will enter final judgment 16 against some but not all parties only if it determines under Rule 54(b) "that there is no 17 just reason for delay" and then expressly directs entry of judgment on that basis. Fed. 18 19 R. Civ. Proc. Rule 54(b); Noel v. Hall, 568 F.3d 743, 747 (9th Cir. 2009). Partial judgments are proper under Rule 54(b) where there are distinct and severable claims 20 and immediate review of the portion ruled upon will not result in later duplicative 21 proceedings in the trial or appellate court. Wood v. GCC Bend, LLC, 422 F.3d 873, 22 23 878-879 (9th Cir. 2005). A Rule 54(b) judgment is also appropriate where the remaining claim was related entirely to a different transaction. Stauffer Chem. Co. v. 24 Keysor-Century Corp., 541 F.Supp. 234 (D DE 1982). It is appropriate to enter 25 partial judgment under Rule 54(b) as to the fifth, sixth and seventh causes of action 26 for breach of contract, breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, 27 and declaratory relief against Lakeland and in favor of Great American since these 28

STIPULATED [PROPOSED] ORDER

Case No. 2:10-cv-00604

claims are unrelated both factually and legally from the claims asserted against
 Travelers.

Lakeland could have brought separate actions against Travelers and 3 Great America, had it so desired and not joined them together in this action. 4 Lakeland's claims asserted against Great American relate to a different 5 insurance policy and involve different policy provisions from those involved in 6 the claims against Travelers. The resolution of insurance coverage issues 7 regarding Great American has no impact on the resolution of the issues 8 regarding Travelers. As such, those causes of action are ripe for a partial 9 judgment under Rule 54(b). Furthermore, there is "no just reason for delay" 10 since resolution of Great American's duty to defend Lakeland is determinative 11 of the entire action as regards Great American. 12

On September 9, 2010, this Court granted Travelers' Motion for Certification of the Court's July 22, 2010 Order regarding Travelers' duty to defend, and stayed these proceedings pending the Ninth Circuit's review of Travelers' Motion for Certification and/or the Ninth Circuit's decision on Travelers' appeal. As such, there is "no just reason for delay" of resolution of the issues regarding Great American's duty to defend and partial judgment is appropriate under Rule 54(b).

19 20

21

22

V. CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and to avoid unnecessary litigation expenses, Lakeland's and Great American's joint request is granted and this Court provides the following relief:

23

1. The Court's July 22, 2010 Order is clarified as set forth above;

24 2. Summary judgment in favor of Great American is granted as to
 25 Lakeland's fifth, sixth and seventh causes of action for breach of contract,
 26 breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing, and declaratory
 27 relief;

28

3. Lakeland's eighth cause of action for violation of Business &
 Professions Code Section 17200 against Great American is dismissed with
 prejudice;

4 4. A partial judgment in favor of Great American pursuant to Fed. R.
5 Civ. Proc. Rule 54(b) as to Lakeland's fifth, sixth and seventh causes of action
6 for breach of contract, breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair
7 dealing, and declaratory relief is granted so that Lakeland can go forward with
8 an appeal to the Ninth Circuit; and

5. The stay of this case will remain in force pending the Ninth
Circuit's decision on whether it will allow this appeal and/or Travelers' appeal,
or if either or both appeals are permitted, or the decisions(s) on appeal.

12	Date: <u>9/16/2010</u>				
13		Jubol E. fimelly			
14		GARLAND E-BURRELL, JR. United States District Judge			
15	Approved as to form:	Officed Otales District Sudge			
16					
17	Dated: September 15, 2010	HIRSCH CLOSSON McMILLAN & SCHROEDER			
18		A Professional Corporation			
19		By: <u>/s/</u>			
20		Clifford Hirsch Attorney for Plaintiff			
21		LAKELÂND VILLAGE			
22		HOMEOWNERS ASSOCIATION			
23					
24	Dated: September 15, 2010	CLYDE & CO US, LLP			
25		By: <u>/s/ (as authorized on 9-15-10)</u> Peter J. Whalen			
26		Attorney for Defendant			
27		GREAT AMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY			
28					
		6 Case No. 2:10-cv-00604			
I	STIPULATED [PROPOSED] ORDER				

1	I		
1			
2			
3			
4			
5			
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
		7 STIPULATED [PROPOSED] ORDER	Case No. 2:10-cv-00604
		STIPULATED [PROPOSED] ORDER	