SUPPER FOOLET COPY

S234269

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DOE NO. 1, Defendant and Petitioner, v.

LATRICE RUBENSTEIN, Plaintiff and Respondent SUPREME COURT FILED

JAN 2 3 2017

Jorge Navarrete Clerk

Deputy

ANSWER TO AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF

After a Decision From the Court of Appeal of California, Fourth Appellate District, Division One, Case No. D066722

*Lee H. Roistacher, Esq. (SBN 179619) Richard J. Schneider, Esq. (SBN 118580) Daley & Heft, Attorneys at Law 462 Stevens Avenue, Suite 201, Solana Beach, CA 92075 Tel: (858) 755-5666 / Fax: (858) 755-7870 Attorneys for Defendant and Petitioner: Doe No. 1

Leila Nourani (SBN 163336) Sherry L. Swieca (SBN 198700) Douglas M. Egbert (SBN 265062) Jackson Lewis P.C. 725 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 2500 Los Angeles, CA 90017 Tel: (213) 689-0404 / Fax (213) 689-0430 Attorneys for Defendant and Petitioner: Doe No. 1

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DOE NO. 1, Defendant and Petitioner, v.

LATRICE RUBENSTEIN, Plaintiff and Respondent

ANSWER TO AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF

After a Decision From the Court of Appeal of California, Fourth Appellate District, Division One, Case No. D066722

*Lee H. Roistacher, Esq. (SBN 179619) Richard J. Schneider, Esq. (SBN 118580) Daley & Heft, Attorneys at Law 462 Stevens Avenue, Suite 201, Solana Beach, CA 92075 Tel: (858) 755-5666 / Fax: (858) 755-7870 Attorneys for Defendant and Petitioner: Doe No. 1

Leila Nourani (SBN 163336) Sherry L. Swieca (SBN 198700) Douglas M. Egbert (SBN 265062) Jackson Lewis P.C. 725 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 2500 Los Angeles, CA 90017 Tel: (213) 689-0404 / Fax (213) 689-0430 Attorneys for Defendant and Petitioner: Doe No. 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	Amici's Public Policy And Fairness Arguments Are	
	Irrelevant To The Issues Presented To This Court	
	Because The Legislature Considered Them When It	
	Declined To Exempt From The Government Code's	
	Claim Presentation Requirement And Deadline Those	
	Childhood Sexual Abuse Claims Based On Repressed	
	Memories Of Pre-January 1, 2009 Sexual	
	Abuse	1
II.	Conclusion	4
CERT	PIFICATE OF WORD COUNT	

TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

Cases	
Jordache Enters., Inc. v. Brobeck. Phleger & Harrison (1998) 18 Cal.4th 739	3
Los Angeles County Metro. Transp. Auth. V. Alameda Produce Mkt., LLC	
(2011) 52 Cal.4th 1100	3

Amici's Public Policy And Fairness Arguments Are Irrelevant To The Issues Presented To This Court Because The Legislature Considered Them When It Declined To Exempt From The Government Code's Claim Presentation Requirement And Deadline Those Childhood Sexual Abuse Claims Based On Repressed Memories Of Pre-January 1, 2009 Sexual Abuse

With Senate Bill No. 1339 (2007-2008 Reg. Sess.), the Legislature considered exempting all childhood sexual abuse claims from the Government Code's claim presentation requirement because of the points Amici raises. It weighed them against the potential fiscal ramifications to government entities and struck a balance between these competing public policies. exempting only those claims based on post-January 1, 2009 conduct. (See Sen. Appropriations Com., Analysis of Sen. Bill No. 1339 (2007-2008 Reg. Sess.), as amended Feb. 20, 2008); Government Code section 905, subdivision (m).) In doing so, the Legislature knew it was holding all victims of pre-January 1. 2009 childhood sexual abuse to the six-month deadline whether or not memories were repressed during the six month claim presentations period. (See Opening Brief, pp. 41-50; Reply Brief. pp. 31-37.)

An instructive example of legislative intent is found in an Assembly Committee on Judiciary analysis of Senate Bill 640, which noted the key issue as follows: "Since victims of child sex abuse may not recognize or report their abuse until years later, should these claims brought against local public entities, such as cities and school districts, be exempted from the requirement that they first be presented to the public entity within six months of occurrence?" (Ass. Com. On Judiciary, Analysis of Sen. Bill No. 640 (2007-2008 Reg. Sess.), as amended June 9, 2008, p.1 (all capitals omitted).) Thus, the Legislature recognized victims of childhood sexual abuse repress memories of the abuse, but for policy reasons, chose not to exempt from the claim presentation requirement those claims based on repressed memories of pre-January 1, 2009 abuse. It did so even though some might be denied a remedy without the exemption.

Although policy reasons and fairness might compel providing such an exemption, this Court's role is not to "sit in judgment of the Legislature's wisdom in balancing such competing public policies. Instead, due respect for the power of the Legislature and for the separation of powers requires [this Court] to follow the public policy choices actually discernible from

the Legislature's statutory enactments." (Los Angeles County

Metro. Transp. Auth. v. Alameda Produce Mkt., LLC (2011) 52

Cal.4th 1100, 1113-1114 (internal quotes and cites omitted); see
also Jordache Enters., Inc. v. Brobeck, Phleger & Harrison (1998)

18 Cal.4th 739, 756, (court cannot "devis[e] expedients that

extend or toll the limitations period").)

II.

Conclusion

Amici make potentially viable public policy and fairness arguments supporting exemption from the government claim presentation requirements and deadline *all* childhood abuse claims. However, the Legislature already considered them and ultimately chose not to do so. The place for Amici's advocacy is the Legislature, not this Court.

Respectfully submitted,

DATED: January **/8**, 2017

Daley & Heft, LLP

Lee H. Roistacher Richard J. Schneider

Attorneys for

Defendant and Petitioner

Doe No. 1

CERTIFICATE OF WORD COUNT

The text of this brief consists of 484 words as counted by the Microsoft Office 2010 word-processing program used to generate this document.

DATED: January **\beta**, 2017

Daley & Heft, LLP

Lee H. Boistacher

Richard J. Schneider

Attorneys for

Defendant and Petitioner

Doe No. 1

Da Le Ri 46 Te	TTORNEY or party without attorney (Name, state bar number, and address): raley & Heft, LLP, Attorneys at Law ee H. Roistacher, Esq. (SBN 179619) ichard J. Schneider, Esq. (SBN 118580) 62 Stevens Avenue #201, Solana Beach, CA 92075 elephone No. (858) 755-5666 Facsimile No. (858) 755-7870 TTORNEY FOR (Name): Doe No. 1	FOR COURT USE ONLY		
St	N THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA treet Address: 350 McAllister Street city and Zip Code: San Francisco, CA 94102			
Pl	LAINTIFF(S)/PETITIONER(S) Doe No. 1	Case Number: S234269		
D	Pefendant(S)/RESPONDENT(S) Latrice Rubenstein	Court of Appeal Case No. D066722 Superior Court Case No.: ECU08107		
	PROOF OF SERVICE—CIVIL heck method of service: By Personal Service □ By Mail □ By Messenger Service By Facsimile □ By Cvernight Delivery □ By E-Mail/Electronic Transmiss	JUDGE: Hon. Juan Ulloa DEPT: 9		
	(Do not use this Proof of Service to show service of a Summons and	Complaint)		
1.	At the time of service I was over 18 years of age and not a party to this action.			
2.	My address is (specify one): a. ☒ Business: b. ☐ Residence:			
	462 Stevens Avenue, Suite 201, Solana Beach, CA 92075			
3.	The fax number or electronic address from which I served the documents is (complete if sen	vice was by fax or electronic service):		
4.	On (date): January 20, 2017, I served the following documents (specify):			
	☑ The documents are listed in the Attachment to Proof of Service-Civil (Documents	Served).		
5.	I served the documents on the person or persons below, as follows:			
	a. Name of person served:			
	b. \boxtimes (Complete if service was by personal service, mail, overnight, or messenger service Business or residential address where person was served:	2.)		
	 c. (Complete if service was by fax or electronic service.) (1) Fax number or electronic notification address where person was served: 			
	(2) Time of Service:			
	The names, addresses, and other applicable information about the persons served is on the Attachment to Proof of Service—Civil (Persons Served).			
6. The documents were served by the following means (specify):				
a.	By personal service. I personally delivered the documents to the persons at the addresses listed in item 5. (1) For a party represented by an attorney, delivery was made to the attorney or at the attorney's office by leaving the documents in an envelope or package clearly labeled to identify the attorney being served with a receptionist or an individual in charge of the office, between the hours of nine in the morning and five in the evening. (2) For a party, delivery was made to the party or by leaving the documents at the party's residence with some person not less than 18 years of age between the hours of eight in the morning and six in the evening.			

CASE NAME:		CASE NUMBER:		
Doe 1	No. 1 v. Latrice Rubenstein	S234269 Court of Appeal Case No. D066722 Superior Court Case No.: ECU08107		
6.b. 🗖	By United States mail. I enclosed the documents in a sealed envelope or packag 5 and (specify one):	e addressed to the persons at the addresses in item		
(1)	deposited the sealed envelope with the United States Postal Service, with the	postage fully prepaid.		
(2)	placed the envelope for collection and mailing, following our ordinary by business's practice for collecting and processing correspondence for mailing, collection and mailing, it is deposited in the ordinary course of business we envelope with postage fully prepaid.	On the same day that correspondence is placed for		
I am a i	resident or employed in the county where the mailing occurred. The envelope or pack, California	ackage was placed in the mail at (city and state):		
c. 🗵	By overnight delivery. I enclosed the documents in an envelope or package addressed to the persons at the addresses in item5. I placed the envelope or pa office or a regularly utilized drop box of the overnight delivery carrier.	provided by an overnight delivery carrier and ckage for collection and overnight delivery at an		
d. 🗆	By messenger service. I served the documents by placing them in an envelope or listed in item 5 and providing them to a professional messenger service for accompany this Proof of Service or be contained in the Declaration of Messenger	service. (A declaration by the messenger must		
e. 🗆	By fax transmission. Based on an agreement of the parties to accept service by persons at the fax numbers listed in item 5. No error was reported by the fax matransmission, which I printed out, is attached.	y fax transmission, I faxed the documents to the chine that I used. A copy of the record of the fax		
f. 🗆	By electronic service. Based on a court order or an agreement of the parties to accaused the documents to be sent to the persons at the e-mail addresses listed in iter			
I declar	e under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing	g is true and correct.		
Date:	January 20 , 2017			
Ma (TYPE O	Maria E. Kilcrease TYPE OR PRINT NAME OF DECLARANT) Maria E. Kilcrease (SIGNATURE OF DECLARANT)			
(If item	5d above is checked, the declaration below must be completed or a separate declar	ntion from a messenger must be attached.)		
DECLA	ARATION OF MESSENGER			
list doc ind	By personal service. I personally delivered the envelope or package received from the declarant above to the persons at the addresses listed in item 4. (1) For a party represented by an attorney, delivery was made to the attorney or at the attorney's office by leaving the documents in an envelope or package, which was clearly labeled to identify the attorney being served, with a receptionist or an individual in charge of the office. (2) For a party, delivery was made to the party or by leaving the documents at the party's residence with some person not less than 18 years of age between the hours of eight in the morning and six in the evening.			
At the t	At the time of service, I was over 18 years of age. I am not a party to the above-referenced legal proceeding.			
I served the envelope or package, as stated above, on (date):				
I declar	I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct.			
(TYPE O	R PRINT NAME OF DECLARANT) (SIGNATURE OF	DECLARANT)		

	CASE NUMBER:
Doe No. 1 v. Latrice Rubenstein	S234269
	Court of Appeal Case No. D066722
	Superior Court Case No.:
	ECU08107

ATTACHMENT TO PROOF OF SERVICE - CIVIL (DOCUMENTS SERVED)

The documents that were served are as follows (describe each document specifically): ANSWER TO AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF				
ANSWER TO AMICUS CURIAE BRIEF			-	
	·			
			١	<u>-</u>
		-		
				
		 		~
				
		*		
		-		
				
		-	-	
				
		•		

CASE NAME:	CASE NUMBER:
Doe No. 1 v. Latrice Rubenstein	S234269 Court of Appeal Case No. D066722
	Superior Court Case No.: ECU08107

ATTACHMENT TO PROOF OF SERVICE - CIVIL (PERSONS SERVED)

Name, Address, and Other Applicable Information About Persons Served:

Name of Person Served:	Where Served: (Provide business or residential address where service was made by personal service, mail, overnight delivery, or messenger service. For other means of service, provide fax number or electronic notification address, as applicable.)	Time of Service: (Complete for service by fax transmission or electronic service.)
Elliott N. Kanter, Esq. Justin O. Walker, Esq.	Elliott N. Kanter, Esq. Justin O. Walker, Esq. Law Offices of Elliott N. Kanter 2445 Fifth Avenue, Suite 350 San Diego, CA 92101 Tel: (619) 231-1883 Fax: (619) 234-4553 Email: ekanter@enkanter.com jwalker@enkanter.com Attorney for Plaintiff and Respondent Latrice Rubenstein	Time:
Holly Noelle Boyer, Esq.	Holly Noelle Boyer, Esq. Esner Chang & Boyer 234 East Colorado Boulevard Suite 975 Pasadena, CA 91101-2262 Tel: (626) 535-9860 Fax: (626) 535-9859 Email: hboyer@ecbappeal.com Attorneys for Plaintiff and Respondent Latrice Rubenstein	
Leila Nourani, Esq. Sherry L. Swieca, Esq. Douglas M. Egbert, Esq.	Leila Nourani, Esq. Sherry L. Swieca, Esq. Douglas M. Egbert, Esq. Jackson Lewis P.C. 725 S. Figueroa Street, Suite 2500 Los Angeles, CA 90017 Tel: (213) 689-0404 Fax (213) 689-0430 Attorneys for Defendant and Petitioner Doe No.1	Time:

	CASE NUMBER:
Doe No. 1 v. Latrice Rubenstein	S234269
	Court of Appeal Case No. D066722
,	Superior Court Case No.:
	ECU08107

Name of Person Served:	Where Served: (Provide business or residential address where service was made by personal service, mail, overnight delivery, or messenger service. For other means of service, provide fax number or electronic notification address, as applicable.)	Time of Service: (Complete for service by fax transmission or electronic service.)
Brittany Crowell, Psy.D.	Brittany Crowell, Psy.D. Licensed Psychologist (Psy 28712) Clinical and Forensic Case Manager Professional Clinical & Forensic Services 10065 Old Grove Road Suite 101 San Diego, CA 92131 Tel: (858) 527-1860 x4560 Fax: (858) 527-1743 E-mail: IVATpcfs@alliant.edu Amicus Curiae Family Violence & Sexual Assault Institute and Institute on Violence, Abuse & Trauma	
Louis A. Leone, Esq. Seth L. Gordon, Esq.	Louis A. Leone, Esq. Seth L. Gordon, Esq. Leone & Alberts 2175 N. California Blvd. Suite 900 Walnut Creek, CA 94596 Tel: (925) 974-8600 Fax: (925) 974-8601 E-mail: sgordon@leonealberts.com Attorneys for Amici Curiae Northern California Regional Liability Excess Fund, Southern California Regional Liability Excess Fund, Statewide Association of Community Colleges, and School Association for Excess Risk	

CASE NAME:	CASE NUMBER:
Doe No. 1 v. Latrice Rubenstein	S234269
	Court of Appeal Case No. D066722 Superior Court Case No.: ECU08107

Name of Person Served:	Where Served: (Provide business or residential address where service was made by personal service, mail, overnight delivery, or messenger service. For other means of service, provide fax number or electronic notification address, as applicable.)	Time of Service: (Complete for service by fax transmission or electronic service.)
Hon. Juan Ulloa Superior Court of California County of Imperial	Hon. Juan Ulloa Superior Court of California County of Imperial 939 West Main Street El Centro, CA 92243 (760) 482-2200	
Court of Appeal Division One 750 B Street San Diego, CA 92101	Court of Appeal Fourth District Division One 750 B Street San Diego, CA 92101 (619) 744-0760	