

1 Robert J. Nelson (State Bar No. 132797)
 Lexi J. Hazam (State Bar No. 224457)
 2 LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
 Embarcadero Center West
 3 275 Battery Street, 29th Floor
 San Francisco, CA 94111-3339
 4 Telephone: (415) 956.1000
 Facsimile: (415) 956-1008
 5

6 Michael D. Thamer (State Bar No. 101440)
 LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL D. THAMER
 7 Old Callahan School House
 12444 South Highway 3
 8 Post Office Box 1568
 Callahan, CA 96014-1568
 9 Telephone: (530) 467-5307
 Facsimile: (530) 467-5437
 10

Kathryn A. Stebner (State Bar No. 121088)
 Sarah Colby (State Bar No. 194475)
 STEBNER & ASSOCIATES
 870 Market Street, Suite 1212
 San Francisco, CA 94102-2907
 Telephone: (415) 362-9800
 Facsimile: (415) 362-9801

11 [Additional Counsel Appear on Signature Page]

12 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs Arlene Bettencourt*
 13 *and Harry Harrison*

14
 15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 16 FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
 17 SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION
 18

19 HAZEL WALSH,
 20 Plaintiff,
 21 v.
 22 KINDRED HEALTHCARE, INC., et al.,
 23 Defendants.
 24

Case No. 3:11-cv-00050-JSW

**STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED]
 ORDER REGARDING ALTER EGO
 DISCOVERY AND JURISDICTIONAL
 CHALLENGES UNDER FRCP 12(b)(2)**

The Honorable Jeffrey S. White

25 **WHEREAS** on June 15, 2011 the Court granted in part and denied in part Defendants'
 26 motions to dismiss Plaintiffs' First Amended Complaint, and granted Plaintiffs leave to amend
 27 their Complaint, *see* Order Regarding Defendants' Motions to Dismiss (Dkt. 58), at 16;

28 **WHEREAS** with respect to alleged vertical alter ego relationships between the Facility

1 Defendants,¹ Subsidiary Licensee Defendants,² and the Parent Kindred Defendants,³ the Court
2 held in its June 15, 2011 Order that “Plaintiffs have sufficiently alleged ‘unity of interest and
3 ownership’ as between Kindred and the Facilities,” and that Plaintiffs have also sufficiently
4 alleged “an injustice based on the parent Kindred entities’ attempt to avoid liability,” *id.* at 7;
5 however, the Court also held that “Plaintiffs have not alleged what injustice would result if the
6 Facilities, other than Rossmoor, were not held liable or if Hillhaven and Smith Ranch were not
7 held liable,” *id.* at 7-8;

8 **WHEREAS** the Court subsequently granted Plaintiffs’ motion for leave to conduct
9 limited discovery regarding alleged alter ego issues prior to filing a Second Amended Complaint,
10 *see* Order Regarding Plaintiffs’ Motion for Leave to Conduct Discovery (Dkt. 69);

11 **WHEREAS** on or about November 14, 2011, the parties entered a stipulation regarding
12 litigation concerning personal jurisdiction and alter ego discovery. In particular, the parties
13 agreed that Defendants will not move to dismiss Plaintiffs’ Second Amended Complaint based
14 upon insufficiency of Plaintiffs’ alter ego allegations as to 1) the vertical alter ego relationships
15 between the Facility Defendants, Subsidiary Licensee Defendants, and the Parent Kindred
16 Defendants, or 2) the horizontal alter ego relationships between the Facility Defendants, and
17 further agreed that if any Defendant or Defendants move to dismiss Plaintiffs’ Second Amended
18 Complaint based upon lack of personal jurisdiction, litigation related to the Defendants’ challenge
19 to personal jurisdiction would be stayed until further notice;

20 **WHEREAS** Plaintiffs filed a Second Amended Complaint, and the Court subsequently

21 ¹ The thirteen “Facility Defendants” are: Alta Vista Healthcare & Wellness Centre (a/k/a Alta
22 Vista Healthcare); Bay View Nursing And Rehabilitation Center; Canyonwood Nursing and
23 Rehab Center; Care Center of Rossmoor (f/k/a Guardian of Rossmoor); Fifth Avenue Health Care
24 Center; Golden Gate Healthcare Center; Hacienda Care Center; Nineteenth Avenue Healthcare
25 Center; Kindred Healthcare Center of Orange; Santa Cruz Healthcare Center; Smith Ranch Care
26 Center (f/k/a Guardian at Smith Ranch Care Center); Valley Gardens Healthcare & Rehabilitation
27 Center; and Victorian Healthcare Center (f/k/a Hillhaven Victorian).

28 ² The three “Subsidiary Licensee Defendants” are: Care Center of Rossmoor, LLC; Smith
Ranch Care Center, LLC; and Hillhaven-MSO Partnership.

³ The four “Kindred Defendants” are: Kindred Healthcare, Inc. (“Kindred Inc.”); Kindred
Healthcare Operating, Inc. (“KHOI”); Kindred Nursing Centers West, LLC (“Kindred West”);
and California Nursing Centers, LLC (“California Nursing”).

1 granted Defendants' motion to dismiss the Consumer Legal Remedies Act ("CLRA") claim with
2 leave to amend;

3 **WHEREAS** Plaintiffs filed a Third Amended Complaint, and Defendants Fifth Avenue
4 Health Care, Care Center of Rossmoor, L.L.C. fka Guardian of Rossmoor, Bay View Nursing and
5 Rehabilitation Center, Hacienda Care Center, Valley Gardens Healthcare and Rehabilitation
6 Center, Kindred Healthcare Center of Orange, Canyonwood Nursing and Rehab Center, Santa
7 Cruz Healthcare Center, Alta Vista Healthcare & Wellness Centre aka Alta Vista Healthcare, and
8 Smith Ranch Care Center have filed a motion to dismiss the CLRA claim pursuant to Rule
9 12(b)(6) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and Defendant Kindred Healthcare, Inc. filed a
10 motion to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 12(b)(2);

11 **WHEREAS** the hearing on the motions to dismiss currently is set for August 24, 2012;

12 **WHEREAS** the parties have agreed to extend their stipulation regarding personal
13 jurisdiction challenges and alter ego discovery to avoid litigation over these issues at this time;

14 **NOW THEREFORE**, it is stipulated that:

15 1. All briefing and discovery related to Defendant Kindred Healthcare, Inc.'s motion
16 to dismiss for lack of personal jurisdiction pursuant to Rule 12(b)(2) is stayed. If any Party
17 wishes to lift the stay, it may move the Court for such relief after providing all other Parties with
18 fourteen (14) days written notice;

19 2. If any Party moves to lift the stay on litigation of personal jurisdiction, then
20 Plaintiffs will have ninety (90) days from the date the stay is lifted to conduct jurisdictional
21 discovery, including on alter ego issues, before filing their opposition brief. This agreement is
22 without prejudice to Defendants' ability to challenge the scope of such discovery, including the
23 alter ego discovery previously propounded by Plaintiffs;

24 3. Nothing in this stipulation will prevent Defendants from challenging Plaintiffs'
25 vertical or horizontal alter ego theories through motion for summary judgment, opposition to
26 class certification or other motion that does not merely challenge the legal sufficiency of the
27 allegations in Plaintiffs' Third Amended Complaint or any subsequent complaint;

28

1 4. This stipulation regarding litigation related to personal jurisdiction and alter ego
2 issues applies to any subsequent complaint filed in this action;

3 5. Plaintiffs previously have withdrawn discovery requests on horizontal and vertical
4 relationships among Defendants, without prejudice to their right to reassert the requests ninety
5 (90) days prior to the close of fact discovery, or if and when any of the following occur:

- 6 a. The Court sets a schedule for class certification briefing; or
7 b. Any Defendant moves to lift the stay on personal jurisdiction; or
8 c. Any Defendant moves for summary judgment based in whole or part on the
9 insufficiency of Plaintiffs' alter ego, agency, or joint venture allegations.

10 6. Nothing stated herein shall preclude any Party from seeking a Court-ordered
11 modification of the above-stated provisions for good cause shown.

12 7. Defendants' motion to dismiss the CLRA claim pursuant to Rule 12(b)(6) of the
13 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure will remain on calendar. Plaintiffs' opposition brief will be due
14 on June 12, 2012. Defendants' reply brief will be due on June 26, 2012.

15 Dated: May 29, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

16 MANATT, PHELPS & PHILLIPS

17
18 By: /s/ Brad W. Seiling
Brad W. Seiling
Attorneys for Defendants

19
20 Brad W. Seiling (State Bar No. 143515)
Andrew H. Struve (State Bar No. 200803)
21 Jessica L. Slusser (State Bar No. 217307)
Justin C. Johnson (State Bar No. 252175)
22 11355 West Olympic Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90064-1614
23 Telephone: (310) 312-4000
Facsimile: (310) 312-4224

24
25
26
27
28

1 Dated: May 29, 2012

Respectfully submitted,

2 STEBNER & ASSOCIATES

3
4 By: /s/ Kathryn Ann Stebner
Kathryn Ann Stebner
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

5
6 Kathryn A. Stebner (State Bar No. 121088)
Sarah Colby (State Bar No. 194475)
870 Market Street, Suite 1212
7 San Francisco, CA 94102
Telephone: (415) 362-9800
8 Facsimile: (415) 362-9801

9
10 Robert J. Nelson (State Bar No. 132797)
Lexi J. Hazam (State Bar No. 224457)
LIEFF, CABRASER, HEIMANN & BERNSTEIN, LLP
275 Battery Street, 29th Floor
11 San Francisco, CA 94111-3339
Telephone: (415) 956-1000
12 Facsimile: (415) 956-1008

13
14 Michael D. Thamer (State Bar No. 101440)
LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL D. THAMER
Old Callahan School House
12444 South Highway 3; Post Office Box 1568
15 Callahan, CA 96014-5307

16
17 Christopher J. Healey (State Bar No. 105798)
LUCE, FORWARD, HAMILTON & SCRIPPS LLP
600 West Broadway, Suite 2600
18 San Diego, CA 92101

19
20 W. Timothy Needham (State Bar No. 96542)
Michael J. Crowley (State Bar No. 102343)
JANSSEN, MALLOY, NEEDHAM, MORRISON,
REINHOLTSEN & CROWLEY, LLP
730 Fifth Street
21 Eureka, CA 95501

22
23 Robert S. Arns (State Bar No. 65071)
Steven R. Weinmann (State Bar No. 190956)
THE ARNS LAW FIRM
515 Folsom Street, 3rd Floor
24 San Francisco, CA 94105

25
26 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs ARLENE BETTENCOURT and
HARRY HARRISON*

27 **Filer's Attestation:** Pursuant to General Order No. 45, Section X(B) regarding signatures, Brad
28 W. Seiling hereby attests that concurrence in the filing of this document has been obtained.

The parties are admonished to show good cause for any future requests for extensions.

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

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: May 31, 2012


The Honorable Jeffrey S. White

302301015.1