13 14 15	Attorneys for Plaintiffs VICKI CAPRIO and DUANE A. BARBARO  UNITED STAT	OTTO  ES DISTRICT COURT  Doc. 160	
17 18	S Corporation v. Apple, Inc. NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
19 20 21	Barbarotto's Successors in Interest, Plaintiffs,	JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT AND PROPOSED ORDER  JUDGE: Hon. Claudia Wilken	
21	v. HARTFORD LIFE INSURANCE	COURTROOM: 2, (4th Floor) DATE:	
23 24 25 26 27	COMPANY, a corporation doing business as THE HARTFORD and HARTFORD LIFE AND ACCIDENT INSURANCE COMPANY, and DOES 1 through 20, inclusive,  Defendants.	TIME: .  urbarotto and Defendant Hartford Life Insurance	

JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT AND PROPOSED ORDER

submit this Joint Case Management Statement.

2

# 1. <u>Jurisdiction and Service</u>

4

3

as plaintiffs' allege that their claims are governed by the Employee Retirement Income Security Act ("ERISA").

Jurisdiction is based on diversity. Alternatively, jurisdiction is based on federal question,

5

All parties have been served.

6 7

# 2. Facts

8

This is an action for benefits under two accidental death and dismemberment group insurance policies, issued to the State Bar of California and Attorneys Group Insurance Trust

9

("the Policies") by Hartford Life Insurance Company, under which Nicholas Barbarotto

10

participated. Mr. Barbarotto was the husband of the decedent Tamara Barbarotto. Tamara

11 12

Barbarotto died on October 18, 2002, at age 79. Mrs. Barbarotto had terminal lung cancer, and

13

her death certificate states that her immediate cause of death was lung cancer with a two month

14

interval between the onset of the condition and death. No autopsy was performed.

15

Mr. Barbarotto submitted claims for benefits under both Policies asserting that his wife

16

died as a result of injuries she sustained following an accidental fall on July 2, 2002, in which she

17

fractured her right fibula and tibia. Mr. Barbarotto claimed that the injuries his wife suffered on

18

July 2, 2002, resulted in her sudden death on October 18, 2002.

19

Hartford denied both claims on grounds that the Policies only covered losses caused by accidents, and not sickness or disease. Hartford stated that there was no evidence to support Mr.

2021

Barbarotto's claims that Mrs. Barbarotto's death was the result of an accident.

22

Plaintiffs allege in their complaint that Mr. Barbarotto is deceased, and have brought this

2324

action to recover under the Policies as Mr. Barbarotto's successors-in-interest. Plaintiffs' claims for relief include breach of contract, breach of the duty of good faith and fair dealing, and ERISA

25

Legal Issues

violation.

3.

26

27

28

a. Whether the Policies and this action are governed by ERISA;b. Whether plaintiffs' state law claims are preempted by ERISA;



-2-

6

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19 20

21 22

23

24 25

26

28

27

c. V	Whether Hartford	's claim	determinations	were reasonable a	as a matter of law;	and
------	------------------	----------	----------------	-------------------	---------------------	-----

d. Whether plaintiffs' claims for breach of the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing are barred by the statute of limitations.

#### 4. Motions

*Prior* - Hartford filed a motion to dismiss plaintiffs' complaint on the ground of res judicata, which was granted with relief for plaintiffs to move to void a prior judgment, and if successful, amend their complaint. Plaintiffs successfully moved to void the prior action brought by Nicholas Barbarotto, on grounds that he predeceased the filing of the action and therefore the action was void from its inception.

Anticipated – Plaintiffs may bring a motion to establish that ERISA applies. Hartford anticipates bringing a motion for summary judgment on all claims.

### 5. Amendment of Pleadings

Plaintiffs may amend their complaint once the issue of whether ERISA governs this action has been resolved.

### 6. Evidence Preservation

Hartford has preserved all documents related to Mr. Barbarotto's insurance claims.

### 7. Disclosures

The parties will exchange initial disclosures by September 5, 2008.

#### 8. Discovery

Hartford intends to conduct discovery into Tamara Barbarotto's medical condition leading up to her death. Hartford intends to take the depositions of Tamara Barbarotto's treating physicians.

Plaintiffs intend to take the depositions of the following individuals:

Edna Golych, Hartford Appeal Specialist, Tyrell Sampson, Examiner, Hartford Life Insurance Co, Annette Graczewski, BMS Appeal Specialist, Hartford Life Insurance Co, Susan Killeen, Hartford Life Insurance Co., Edmond Schmulbach, M.D., Oncology Dept. Kaiser Permanente Medical Center.

The parties do not propose any modifications or limitations of the federal discovery rules.

## 9. Class Actions 1 2 This is not a class action. 3 10. Related Cases 4 Northern District of California Case No. C 06-1278 was a related case in that it was 5 brought by Nicholas Barbarotto. However, this Court has found that the action was void, as it 6 was filed only after Mr. Barbarotto's death. 7 11. Relief Sought 8 Plaintiff is seeking special damages in the amount of \$175,000 for failure to pay benefits under two death and dismemberment policies, plus interest. Plaintiff is also seeking punitive damages for failure to adjust Mr. Barbarotto's claim in good faith. 10 12. Settlement and ADR 11 The parties agree to participate in an ADR Process, namely, mediation pursuant to the 12 program instituted by the Northern District of California. 13 13. Consent To Magistrate 14 The parties do not consent to a magistrate. 15 14. Other References 16 The parties do not believe the case is suitable for other references. 17 Narrowing of Issues 15. 18 The issue regarding whether ERISA applies may be decided by motion. 19 16. Expedited Schedule 20 The parties do not believe that the case can be handled on an expedited basis. 21 17. Scheduling 22 The parties propose the following dates: 23 Discovery cut-off: March 27, 2009 24 Disclosures of experts: April 3, 2009 25 Supplemental expert disclosures: April 17, 2009 26 Expert discovery cut-off: June 5, 2009 27 Hearing of dispositive motions: July 17 2009 28

1	Pre-trial conference:	August 14, 2009			
2	2 Trial:	September 14, 2009			
3	3 18. <u>Trial</u>				
4	If ERISA applies, there is no right to	a jury, and a trial, if any, would last one day.			
5	If ERISA does not apply, the parties	expect a 5-7 day jury trial.			
6	6 19. <u>Disclosure Of Non-Party Interested</u>	9. <u>Disclosure Of Non-Party Interested Entities Or Persons</u>			
7	Hartford Life, Inc. is the parent corp	Hartford Life, Inc. is the parent corporation of Hartford Life and Accident Insurance			
8	Company. Hartford Holdings, Inc. is the parent corporation of Hartford Life, Inc.; and The				
9	Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc. is the parent corporation of Hartford Holdings, Inc.				
10	0				
11	1 DATED: September <u>1</u> , 2008 S	EDGWICK, DETERT, MORAN & ARNOLD LLP			
12	2				
13		sv: lisa A. Tany			
14	<b>I</b>	BRUCE D. CELEBREZZE MICHELLE Y. MCISAAC			
15	5	LISA G. ROWE Attorneys for Defendants			
16	6	HARTFORD LIFE INSURANCE COMPANY and HARTFORD LIFE AND ACCIDENT			
17	7	INSURANCE COMPANY			
18	8 Dated: September , 2008	DYKMAN & WESTER LLP			
19	Dated. September, 2008	DIRMAN & WESTER LLF			
20	0				
21	1	By: MATTHEW D. BREKHUS			
22	2	Attorney for Plaintiffs			
23	3	VICKI CAPRIO and DUANE A. BARBAROTTO			
24	4				
25					
26	6				
27	7				
28	8				
- 11					

-5JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT AND PROPOSED ORDER

SEDGWICK DETERT, MORAN & ARNOX DULE

1	Pre-trial conference: August 14, 2009			
2	Trial: September 14, 2009			
3	18, <u>Trial</u>			
4	If ERISA applies, there is no right to a jury, and a trial, if any, would last one day.			
5	If ERISA does not apply, the parties expect a 5-7 day jury trial.			
6	Disclosure Of Non-Party Interested Entities Or Persons			
7	Hartford Life, Inc. is the parent corporation of Hartford Life and Accident Insurance			
8	Company. Hartford Holdings, Inc. is the parent corporation of Hartford Life, Inc.; and The			
9	Hartford Financial Services Group, Inc. is the parent corporation of Hartford Holdings, Inc.			
10				
11	DATED: September, 2008 SEDGWICK, DETERT, MORAN & ARNOLD	LLP		
12				
13	By:			
14	BRUCE D. CELEBREZZE MICHELLE Y. MCISAAC			
15	LISA G. ROWE Attorneys for Defendants			
16	HARTFORD LIFE INSURANCE COMPAN and HARTFORD LIFE AND ACCIDENT	Y		
17	INSURANCE COMPANY			
18	Dated: September 2 2008 DYKMAN & WESTER LLP			
19	Dated. September 22, 2006 DIRWAN & WESTER LEF			
20				
21	By: MATTHEW D. BREKHUS			
22	Attorney for Plaintiffs			
23	VICKI CAPRIO and DUANE A. BARBAROTTO			
24				
25				
26				
27				
28				
	-5-			

JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT STATEMENT AND PROPOSED ORDER

# **CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER**

The Case Management Statement and Proposed Order is hereby adopted by the Court as						
the Case Management Order for the case and the parties are ordered to comply with this order.						
addition, the Court orders:						
A	Α.	The last day to file non-dispositive motions shall be:				
В	3.	The last day to file dispositive motions shall be:				
C	C.	The last day to hear non-dispositive motions shall be:				
Ε	Э.	D. The last day to hear dispositive motions shall be:				
F	E. Each party shall file its opening trial brief on or before					
F	7.	Each party shall file its reply trial brief on or before				
C	3.	Trial shall be on	at	_ in Courtroom 2.		
Dated: HONORABLE CLAUDIA WILKIN				IA WILKIN		
			UNITED STATES DIST			

SEDGWICK