

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

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

HARTFORD LIFE & ACCIDENT
INSURANCE COMPANY,

Plaintiff,

v.

GEOFFREY V. WHITE, an
individual; LAW OFFICE OF
GEOFFREY V. WHITE;
LORRAINE BURKE, an individual;
DOES 1 through 10,

Defendant.

Case No. CV 09-05668 JSW

**(PROPOSED) ORDER FOR
DISCHARGE AND DISMISSAL
WITH PREJUDICE OF HARTFORD
LIFE AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE
COMPANY ONLY**

Upon good cause appearing and based on the Stipulation for Discharge and Dismissal of Plaintiff Hartford Life and Accident Insurance Company (“Hartford”) submitted by the parties, the Court hereby orders:

1. Plaintiff Hartford filed this Complaint in Interpleader on the grounds that it received competing claims from Defendants Geoffrey V. White and Law Office of Geoffrey V. White (“White”) and Defendant Lorraine Burke (“Burke”) to a portion of Burke’s long-term disability (“LTD”) insurance benefits that have been

1 paid and may be paid by Hartford under group disability insurance policy number
2 GLT22176 (“the LTD policy”).
3

4 2. Hartford is hereby and shall be discharged from liability to Defendants
5 to the full extent permitted by law with respect to Defendants’ competing claims for
6 that portion of (1) Burke’s benefits that it has previously paid under the LTD
7 policy, and (2) such future benefits that it may pay to Burke under the LTD policy
8 subject to this Court’s final order of distribution.
9

10 3. Defendants are hereby restrained from taking, or proceeding with or
11 commencing any action against Hartford for or on account of any transaction,
12 matter, happening or thing in any way arising out of or relating to the rights and
13 obligations of the parties with respect to Defendants’ competing claims to that
14 disputed portion of Burke’s LTD benefits which White seeks to recover for alleged
15 attorneys’ fees.
16

17 4. Hartford is dismissed with prejudice from this lawsuit. This Court
18 shall retain jurisdiction over Hartford for enforcement of its order(s) regarding the
19 disputed portion of the LTD benefits to be paid to Burke under the Hartford LTD
20 policy. Defendants White and Burke will remain in the case to litigate their
21 competing claims to those disputed funds.
22

23 5. Hartford shall not recover its attorneys’ fees and costs from
24 Defendants, nor shall Defendants recover their fees and costs from Hartford in
25 connection with this Interpleader.
26

27 ///

28 ///

///

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

6. This order shall not be construed as a determination that Burke is entitled to ongoing benefits under the LTD Policy, nor does it impact Hartford's ongoing evaluation of whether Burke is entitled to benefits under the LTD policy. Such issues are not part of this Interpleader action.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: March 10, 2010



Honorable Jeffrey S. White
United States District Court Judge
