

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
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

HAMMES COMPANY
HEALTHCARE, LLC, a Wisconsin
limited liability company, and HC TRI-
CITY I, LLC, a Wisconsin limited
liability company,

Plaintiffs,

v.

TRI-CITY HEALTHCARE
DISTRICT, a California public entity,
et al.

Defendants,

Case No. 3:09-cv-2324-GPC-KSC
**ORDER DIRECTING ENTRY OF
AMENDED JUDGMENT**

All claims against all parties in this case have been finally resolved, as set forth
in the following orders:

1. January 28, 2010 Amended Order: Granting in Part and Denying in Part Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss, (ECF No. 14);
2. July 11, 2011 Order: Granting in Part and Denying in Part Defendants’ Motion for Summary Judgment, (ECF No. 85);
3. December 13, 2011 Order, (ECF No. 110);
4. December 21, 2012 Order: Dismissing Claims for Declaratory Relief, (ECF No. 147); and

1 5. January 8, 2014 Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law Following
2 Bench Trial, (ECF No. 200).

3 Accordingly, the Court directs the Clerk of Court to amend the final judgment
4 entered on January 8, 2014, to finally dispose of all claims and parties to this action as
5 follows:

6 1. Final judgment shall be entered in favor of defendant Tri-City Healthcare
7 District (“District”) and against plaintiff Hammes Company Healthcare,
8 LLC (“Hammes”) on Hammes’ claim for breach of contract (Letter of
9 Intent);

10 2. Final judgment shall be entered in favor of defendant District and against
11 plaintiffs Hammes and HC Tri-City I, LLC (“HC”) on Hammes’ and HC’s
12 claim for breach of contracts (Ground Lease and Space Lease);

13 3. Final judgment shall be entered in favor of defendants District, Pamela
14 Smith (“Smith”), and Larry Anderson (“Anderson”), and against plaintiffs
15 Hammes and HC, on Hammes’ and HC’s claim for breach of the implied
16 covenant of good faith and fair dealing;

17 4. Final judgment shall be entered in favor of defendants Smith and
18 Anderson, and against plaintiffs Hammes and HC, on Hammes’ and HC’s
19 claim for fraud;

20 5. Final judgment shall be entered in favor of defendants District, Anderson,
21 and Smith, and against plaintiffs Hammes and HC, on Hammes’ and HC’s
22 claim for interference with contract and/or economic advantage;

23 6. Final judgment shall be entered in favor of defendants District, Anderson,
24 and Smith, and against plaintiffs Hammes and HC, on Hammes’ and HC’s
25 claim for promissory estoppel; and

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

7. Final judgment shall be entered in favor of defendants District, Anderson, and Smith, and against plaintiffs Hammes and HC, on Hammes' and HC's claim for declaratory relief.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: January 10, 2014


HON. GONZALO P. CURIEL
United States District Judge